National Government and Law Enforcement Capacity Building

A Systematic Literature Review of Effectiveness of Counter-Terrorism and Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism Activities

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

A P/CVE programming workshop funded by the Government of Canada, held in Kenya, 2018. Courtesy of Khadija Suleiman/Street Mentorship

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands

RUSI
www.rusi.org

Contents

Acknowledgments

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 2 -

Acronyms

CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
CT	Counter-Terrorism
EU	European Union
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OECD-DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee
P/CVE	Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism
PSP	Police, Social Services and Psychiatry
RUSI	Royal United Services Institute
SSR	Security Sector Reform
UK	United Kingdom
UNCTED	United Nations Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 3 -

Systematic Review: Introduction

Dutch counter-terrorism (CT) efforts overseas draw on the 2018 – 2022 integrated foreign and security strategy (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands 2018), which is built on three strategic pillars: prevention, defence and reinforcement. CT efforts in this strategy include measures taken to prevent, pursue, protect and respond to terrorism. CT programmes are designed to address capacity gaps and deliberately counter terrorist actors and methods. Dutch efforts also include interventions designed to address the root causes of extremism, typically known as preventing or countering violent extremism (P/CVE). This is a broad umbrella term to categorise activities that seek to prevent or mitigate VE and factors of VE through non-coercive measures (Chowdhury Fink 2015, 65).

Despite the proliferation of CT and P/CVE interventions, the field has been criticised for being overly reactive, externally imposed, infringing on civil liberties (including the right to privacy), targeting specific communities and increasing risk of stigma (Wolfendale 2007). There are also definitional and conceptual problems (Berger 2016). Practice has remained poorly evidenced, lacking robustness in design or evaluation. The impact of interventions is rarely well described, and the effectiveness of different approaches or programmes remains largely unmeasured (Lum et al. 2006, Mastroe and Szmania 2016). Efforts can be criticised for lacking well-developed theories of change (DuBois and Alem 2017) and for being over-reliant on anecdotal evidence, exposing the field to a range of practical, conceptual and ethical problems (Freese 2014, RUSI 2020).

The question of 'what is working' (and what is not) in CT and P/CVE policy and practice is therefore important. Donors supporting overseas CT and P/CVE interventions are under increasing pressure to demonstrate positive outcomes and to represent value for money and accountability to taxpayers. In April 2020, the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) commissioned the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) to help fill this evidence gap by providing a systematic review of existing literature to assist the current and future policy decisions of the Government of the Netherlands. This research answers the question: "What is known about the effectiveness of CT and P/CVE interventions in the three areas of most interest for the MFA: 1) youth engagement; 2) reintegration; and 3) capacity building of national government and law enforcement?"

The project involved a systematic review of the relevant literature to collect and synthesise evidence on the conditions for effectiveness for each of the three categories. The techniques applied were systematic in that they relied upon the use of an objective, transparent and rigorous approach for the entire research process in order to minimise bias and ensure reliability (Mallett et al. 2012). However, methods, including search terms and inclusion/exclusion criteria, were tailored to each thematic area. Each paper includes its own methodology section which can be found in the annex.

The research was complemented by a restricted analysis of literature reviews in two pre-identified RELATED areas - security sector reform (SSR) and work with gangs or criminal groups.

National Government and Law Enforcement Capacity Building

1. Introduction

This report covers interventions to build CT and P/CVE capacity in national government and law enforcement agencies. The first section briefly sets out the process used for discovery, selection and evaluation for this strand of the review. The next four sections address the project's research questions in turn: What is the evidence for effectiveness (including ineffectiveness) and impact?; What conditions promote or hinder success?; What is the evidence for the underpinning assumptions of the interventions?; and, What are the research gaps?. The final section is a brief conclusion.

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB)
of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 4 -

The systematic review of law enforcement capacity building in CT and P/CVE (labelled here as the FOCUS topic) was expected to identify a small corpus of evaluations and scholarly assessments, so as part of the wider project we were asked to look at one or more categories of RELATED literature, which could generate findings potentially applicable to the FOCUS topic. At the planning stage, we identified SSR as a suitable RELATED topic according to two criteria: it had produced more studies and studies of higher quality than the FOCUS topic, and it shares important characteristics with the FOCUS topic (i.e., both involve capacity building targeted at security sector organisations, often in fragile and conflict affected environments). Given the expected scale of literature on SSR, the RELATED search was confined to existing literature reviews (systematic and otherwise), supplemented by a small number of studies on SSR that were discovered in the FOCUS systematic searching but were subsequently screened out on relevance grounds, such as an evaluation of an SSR intervention in Northern Nigeria that shared many features of a CVE project but was not labelled as such (Trujillo 2018).

During the FOCUS study, we identified community policing as an additional category for the RELATED study. This was on the grounds that a small number of studies, discovered but screened out of the FOCUS study, examined community policing in the context of CT and P/CVE and identified significant findings. These studies did not meet the criteria for FOCUS, because they were not evaluating a capacity building intervention, but instead were focused on what constitutes an effective community-oriented police service in a CT or P/CVE context. We judged that these studies were sufficiently applicable to the FOCUS topic to be worth noting, even though they did not pass all criteria for the systematic review.

2. Discovery, Selection and Evaluation

From the string searching (using the strings identified in the methodology, see Annex B) 864 records were identified, which were reduced to 766 records after removal of duplicates. The vast majority of records were located via Google Scholar (n=313)[1] and ProQuest (n=429). From a review of titles and abstracts, 702 papers were excluded on the grounds of relevance, and the remaining 64 were subject to full-text review for relevance. This identified 14 potentially relevant studies. An inter-coder reliability exercise was conducted, which suggested the removal of six of these studies on relevance grounds, but only two of these were removed as the first reviewer judged that the other four were still potentially relevant. This left 12 papers. Separately, a hand-searching exercise was conducted by a different team, which identified an initial tranche of 14 additional papers. This was reduced to 10 after full-text review for relevance. A further two studies were added from snowballing (i.e., were identified from bibliographies of other selected studies).

The 24 papers from both string searching and hand searching were then reviewed according to the inclusion/exclusion criteria specified in the methodology (see Annex B). Four papers were found to meet all inclusion criteria. Four (RUSI 2017, Peters and Saeed 2017, Sestoft et al. 2017, Reitano et al. 2015) were considered to be relevant but satisfied only some of the inclusion criteria, so were retained but with caveats. A further four were considered to be partially or tangentially relevant and were retained for the RELATED strand of the research. Twelve papers were excluded on quality and relevance grounds.

The eight included studies covered seven different interventions (two studies reported on the same project). Five were formal evaluations (although Reitano et al. 2015 is self-contradictory on whether it is an evaluation or a review), two (which did not meet all of the quality criteria) were reports that set out lessons learned and an implementer's perspective of achievements, and one was a descriptive study with an evaluation element. Table 1 summarises the studies in terms

---

[1] The actual number of results from this search engine was significantly larger and unusable; thus, only up to the first five pages per first string were counted, with 50 hits on each page.

of the nature/method of the intervention evaluated, the targeted population and location, and the intended outcome. Studies which have been included with caveats are marked with an asterisk.

Table 1: Summary of Included Studies (FOCUS only)

Study (Author/ Date)	Project and Implementer	Intervention Method	Target Population(s) and Location	Intended Outcome
Ahnaf (2013)	Non-governmental organisation (NGO) – Security Service Engagement to Stem Human Rights Abuses (Search for Common Ground)	Meetings and training to facilitate engagement between the security personnel and civil society leaders: (a) meetings to facilitate engagement between key civil society actors and security personnel, (b) trainings for security personnel in human rights and conflict transformation, (c) policy brief on international legal framework for CT activities that respect human right principles, and (d) media-based monitoring of the Densus CT operation.	Indonesian security forces (including Densus 88, the elite CT unit); civil society representatives.	Transform the adversarial relations between the security personnel and civil society leaders into constructive relations.
Sestoft, Hansen & Christensen (2017)*	Police, Social Services, and Psychiatry (PSP) Programme (Danish government and agencies)	Training on handling radicalisation cases by raising awareness, providing insights into the politics, psychology and sociology of the problem, and instructing participants in the 'Danish model' and its standard operating procedures.	Employees working on PSP (including police officers) in Denmark	Improved knowledge and skills in identifying and handling concerns of radicalisation and extremism in a multi-agency formation.
Peters and Saeed (2017)*	Pakistani Policewomen Case Study (Inclusive Security)	Workshops to deepen participants' understanding of women's roles in CVE, particularly within the security sector, and increase participants' advocacy knowledge and skills; technical assistance to participants to conduct research, consultations, and	Women from parliament, police, and civil society in Pakistan	Decrease VE in Pakistan by ensuring that women are represented in CVE-related security policies and processes through capacity building of female leaders so that they are included in policymaking related to security issues, particularly within law enforcement.

Study (Author/ Date)	Project and Implementer	Intervention Method	Target Population(s) and Location	Intended Outcome
		policy meetings; increasing policewomen's understanding of civil society perceptions and vice versa; connecting participants to policymakers and security sector officials in Pakistan to share policy recommendations.		
(a) Brett and Kahlmeyer (2017); (b) RUSI (2017)*	Strengthening Resilience to Violent Extremism (STRIVE) Horn of Africa (RUSI)	Workshops on CVE policy and practice, and trust-building between civil society and law enforcement/security.	Law enforcement and security officers (mid-management level) and civil society representatives in Kenya.	Decrease Kenya's vulnerability to VE by increasing CVE skills/knowledge in law enforcement/ security sector and building trust between the sector and civil society organisations (CSOs).
Naik (2016)	Sub-programme on CT: East and Southeast Asia Partnership on Criminal Justice Responses to Terrorism – United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)	Workshops and technical assistance on thematic legal aspects of CT.	Law enforcement and criminal justice sector in Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos, Philippines and Vietnam.	New CT legislation drafted and ratified; criminal justice systems enhanced 'for effective implementation of CT legal provisions' with a focus on extradition and cooperation; improved coordination and cooperation between and among national entities.
UNODC (2016)	Nigeria-European Union (EU) – UNODC – CT Executive Directorate (CTED) Partnership on Strengthening Criminal Justice Responses for Multi-dimensional Security	Training workshops on CT measures (domestic and international law and policy) and on international cooperation.	Government officials in the criminal justice sector in Nigeria.	Enhance the capacity of national criminal justice officials to implement CT measures in accordance with rule of law, with due respect for human rights, and with relevant international legal instruments and Security Council resolutions; reinforce international criminal justice cooperation, especially with the Sahel, Western and Central Africa sub-regions; reinforce inter-agency collaboration,

Study (Author/ Date)	Project and Implementer	Intervention Method	Target Population(s) and Location	Intended Outcome
	(Terrorism) (UNODC)			sustainability and ownership of criminal justice responses to terrorism among relevant national entities; reinforce knowledge and analysis of relevant domestic legislation.
Reitano, Knoope & Oustinoff (2015)*	CT Sahel (European Commission)	Training workshops on information and intelligence exchange to prevent terrorism and organised crime.	Law enforcement agencies (police, gendarmerie, garde nationale) and specialised judicial institutions.	Improve national capacity in information and intelligence exchange to prevent/deter organised crime and terrorism; improve the capacity of internal security forces and judiciary of the project's target states to pursue and respond to terrorist acts; support the progressive development of regional cooperation against terrorism and organised crime.

3. Evidence of Effectiveness and Impact

NB: Annex A summarises the results (divided into effectiveness and impact) of the seven interventions, together with any lessons learned identified in the studies.

The primary purpose of 'capacity building' in most of the included studies was to develop skills and knowledge, and potentially attitudes and behaviours, in government and law enforcement officials working in CT and P/CVE. Capacity building usually meant the delivery of training workshops, supported in some cases (e.g., Naik 2016) by technical assistance – the supply of equipment or expertise – and, in the case of CT Sahel, the development of an institution that took on some responsibility for training (Reitano et al. 2015).

In most cases, the eight studies pointed to effectiveness in terms of achieving short-term increases in knowledge and skills on the part of direct beneficiaries. In a capacity building/development assistance context, training is a means to transfer knowledge to developing countries. Most studies reported effective results in this regard (Ahnaf 2013, Brett and Kahlmeyer 2017, Naik 2016, UNODC 2016, Reitano et al. 2015). STRIVE Horn of Africa, for example, delivered "highly relevant" training workshops and a curriculum that increased "law enforcement's understanding of CVE", contributed to "positive attitude changes" amongst personnel, and will continue to "have an impact on front-line policing and other law enforcement" (Brett and Kahlmeyer 2017). Although it was focused on internal capacity building rather than development assistance, Denmark's PSP programme confirms the conclusion that training in CT and P/CVE can lead to tangible improvements in knowledge, skills and attitudes. Sestoft et al. (2017) evaluated training outcomes over a two-year period and found substantial increases in self-reported levels of knowledge of radicalisation, with the percentage rating their knowledge of radicalisation as 'good' or higher increasing from 35% before training to 95% afterwards.

However, a closer examination suggests substantial limitations to training workshops as a means of capacity transfer. For example, a capacity building project in Nigeria delivered well-received workshops to officials in the criminal justice sector but its evaluation (UNODC 2016) concluded that evidence of effectiveness is "highly limited" and that outcomes were only "partially achieved". Although the study does not clearly explain this finding, it appears to have been a result of the study's short duration and the training not being part of a holistic approach to reforming the criminal justice sector in Nigeria. A case study on a programme to increase representation of women in CT decision making in Pakistan (included with caveats, as it was written by the implementers and is at risk of bias) reported "tremendous success" against its goal of raising awareness of CT and P/CVE policy, but notes that during implementation there was actually a decline in the number of participants meeting CT and P/CVE policy makers (Peters and Saeed 2017). This was attributed to female exclusion from CT policy-making in Pakistan, but given that this was the issue the project was designed to address, it suggests that in this case training was not an effective means of achieving substantive change.

As these examples suggest, training programmes may be effective in developing capacity for direct participants, but the effect will be limited to those participants unless there is a multiplier effect in the form of curriculum development (as in STRIVE Horn of Africa), training for trainers (Partnership on Criminal Justice Responses to Terrorism), or the development of institutions responsible for training (as in CT Sahel). Moreover, problematic behaviours are likely to be deeply entrenched, and therefore not liable to be substantially influenced by ephemeral workshops. In addition, contexts and personnel change over time, so that learning may become out-of-date and trained individuals move on to other duties. For this reason, several studies (most notably UNODC 2016) highlight concerns about the sustainability of training workshops as a method of capacity building – even the most successful workshop will achieve little, if it is not part of a sustained programme to build capacity. UNODC's Partnership on Criminal Justice Responses to Terrorism included training along with technical assistance in implementation of legal instruments, but even this more holistic approach will not deliver sustained effectiveness if the support simply ends once the programme has been completed (Naik 2016).

The role of national governments and law enforcement agencies in managing but also – through excessive force, human rights abuses, or lack of knowledge – contributing to terrorism/VE is well-known.[2] This suggests that seeking to mitigate this factor through capacity building is a valuable and important aim for CT and P/CVE interventions. (The RELATED literature shows that reforming the police to become a 'service' to the community, rather than a 'force', is also a potential outcome for SSR interventions: Bakrania 2014). Accordingly, four of the interventions sought to increase government and law enforcement agencies' P/CVE knowledge and skills and to raise awareness of the potential for security forces to contribute to the problem through human rights abuses and by generating mistrust on the part of communities. This theory of change was explicit in NGO-Security Service Engagement to Stem Human Rights Abuses (Ahnaf 2013), while in the Pakistani Policewomen Case Study (Peters and Saeed 2017) and STRIVE Horn of Africa (Brett and Kahlmeyer 2017) the aim was framed more generally as building trust between law enforcement agencies and civil society/communities. The evidence on how far these outcomes were achieved is mixed. Ahnaf (in a mid-term evaluation) noted that trust between security professionals and civil society remained low. Moreover, from interviews with programme participants, Ahnaf concluded that structural and institutional factors had significantly greater weight in the problem being addressed than knowledge and awareness of the officers being targeted for capacity building. This, together with a lack of institutional support for the intervention, implies that capacity building interventions can achieve only limited outcomes without either political support or where abuses have contributed to radicalisation. However, one positive observation from the evaluation was that recipients benefited from opportunities for networking and informal interaction – so much so that the evaluation called for more opportunities for such engagement. The lack of quantifiable outcomes for the law enforcement component of the Pakistani Policewomen study (Peters and Saeed 2017) also limits what can be said about its effectiveness in this area, although the study highlights the positives of

---

[2] For law enforcement abuses as a factor in radicalisation in Southern locations, see UNDP. "Journey to Extremism in Africa: Drivers, Incentives and the Tipping Point for Recruitment." (2017): 65-6. For a discussion of the training needs of law enforcement in counter-terrorism in a Western context, see Lenos, S., & Keltjens, M. "RAN POL's Guide on Training programmes for police officers in Europe." (September 2016): 1–36. https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-pol/docs/ran_pol_guide_on_training_programmes_for_police_officers_en.pdf.

network building. In a 'lessons learned' study of its own programme (which therefore carries a risk of bias), RUSI (2017) noted that surveys showed that law enforcement trainees became more positive about the contribution of CSOs and that there was evidence of greater cooperation following the intervention.

Similarly, the RELATED research examined an evaluation of a Search for Common Ground intervention in Northern Nigeria (Trujillo 2018) which aimed to promote and protect human rights, including through improved collaboration between CSOs, state human rights agencies and security forces, and through increased CSO capacity. The project's principal outputs were 'platforms' – meetings between state and non-state organisations to discuss human rights issues. The evaluation found these to be effective in terms of promoting collaboration and trust between sectors, and identifying improvements to ways of working. However, the project fell short in identifying and acting upon practical measures to support human rights protection in the region.

At the impact level, the studies present scarce evidence of positive change. Several did not evaluate at this level, either because the intervention was still ongoing (e.g., Ahnaf 2013), or because design flaws in the intervention prevented impact assessment (UNODC 2016), or because the study simply did not address impact (Peters and Saeed 2017). In the case of STRIVE Horn of Africa, evaluators identified the potential to achieve P/CVE or CT impacts in the event, but only if, the intervention was to be continued and rolled out more widely, especially to officers working in locations particularly exposed to radicalisation (Brett and Kahlmeyer 2017). Naik (2016) is contradictory on this point: the Partnership on Criminal Justice Responses to Terrorism was "highly impactful" even though the evaluation also found that the timeframe and funding of the project was insufficient to allow it to demonstrate impact, and in any case the project did not develop impact indicators. This evaluation found some evidence, however, of improved investigations and increased prosecution rates in the Philippines and Laos. However, Naik (2016, 25) adds that these results cannot be directly attributed to the programme given "high level policy and legislative change" and "the unknown role of other players and factors." Reitano et al. (2015) claim that CT Sahel achieved impacts, such as (in an illustrative case study) the identification and arrest of a Boko Haram member in Niger. However, this claim lacks supporting evidence, and more generally this study, which lacks amongst other elements methodological explanation, should be considered lower quality.

The included studies did not yield any evidence on ineffectiveness. However, there was evidence of a potentially serious omission in UNODC's Partnership on Criminal Justice Responses to Terrorism, where Naik (2016) observed that the human rights implications of the intervention were not sufficiently addressed. Thus, implying that a project focused on the technical CT capacity of law enforcement agencies can, if poorly designed or implemented, achieve counter-productive outcomes as well as do actual harm. Similarly, the RELATED research into SSR showed that SSR interventions have been subject to significant criticism for neglecting human rights risks, not least as they have the potential to entrench or reward those security actors who were responsible for the problems that the SSR intervention was meant to solve (Ansorg & Gordon 2019).

4. Conditions Promoting and Hindering Success

As capacity building interventions for national governments and law enforcement lack substantial evidence of effectiveness and impact, it is not possible to identify any generalisable evidence of conditions promoting and hindering success. It is only possible to identify what conditions correlated with or were estimated to contribute to the achievement of results in seven specific interventions.

The mid-term evaluation of NGO-Security Service Engagement to Stem Human Rights Abuses (Ahnaf 2013) was necessarily limited in what it could say about success, let alone conditions for success. However, the evaluation observed that the human rights challenge in Indonesian CT was not awareness or knowledge of human rights principles, but structural issues that limit the agency of individuals to put human rights principles into practice. This suggests that capacity building targeted at individuals or small groups in training workshops is unlikely to make a significant difference, if the political and institutional environment is not conducive to a rights-based approach to CT.

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 10

The Pakistani Policewomen study (Peters and Saeed 2017) is not of sufficient quality to draw firm conclusions, although it notes as success factors the value of an effective local partner, the importance of taking into account local context, and the value of a cross-sectoral approach. Some of these observations are echoed in Brett and Kahlmeyer's (2017) high-quality evaluation of STRIVE Horn of Africa, which identified the support of a centrally placed counterpart (in this case, Kenya's National CT Centre) as critical to the results achieved.

The Partnership on Criminal Justice Responses to Terrorism in Asia combined capacity building with expert technical assistance, and the evaluation (Naik 2016) suggested that the two elements were mutually supportive: UNODC experts provided expert knowledge to officials who were also beneficiaries of workshops. This CT intervention was also notable for the more limited aims of its capacity building element – the transfer of technical knowledge and skills – compared to those P/CVE interventions which were focused on behaviour change. Naik also attributed the intervention's success to a comprehensive situation analysis followed by a "flexible and consultative approach to working with beneficiary partners". The Partnership on Strengthening Criminal Justice Responses in Nigeria was a less successful intervention and its weaknesses were largely the converse of the Asia programme's strengths: UNODC's evaluation (2017) identified the absence of context assessment, at the design stage, as a constraint on effectiveness and recommended that capacity building interventions should be part of a holistic approach to strengthening the criminal justice sector.

The evaluation/review of CT Sahel says nothing about conditions for success, but it makes recommendations for future programming, including that capacity building should be designed for sustainability by employing a training of trainers approach (Reitano et al. 2015). The study of Denmark's PSP programme (Sestoft et al. 2017) says nothing about conditions for success, but it is noteworthy that capacity building for officials was one component in a strategic and multi-stakeholder risk management programme, which was itself based on precedents in behavioural risk management in other fields (such as drug abuse). This perhaps supports observations in other studies that capacity building is likely to be most effective when it is one element in a wider programme.

In the high-quality evaluation studies, there was also a consistent message about programme design. Several evaluations found significant weaknesses, whether it was the lack of an explicit theory of change (Brett and Kahlmeyer 2017), or a lack of contextual analysis at the design stage (UNODC 2017), or a lack of measurement at the outcome or impact levels (Naik 2016, UNODC 2017). This suggests an obvious but important point, that an intervention is only as good as its design and implementation, and these programmatic factors are critical to success. In the RELATED research, this was echoed by Weine et al.'s study (2017) of the Los Angeles Police Department's (LAPD) use of community policing for P/CVE purposes. This recommended programmatic improvements, notably an assessment at the design stage of contextual factors such as community relations/cohesion and the opposition to P/CVE programmes (among some communities), as well as developing a theory of change, planning multi-level outcomes, and evaluating outcomes.

From the RELATED research, there is also support for the concerns raised by Ahnaf (2013) that structural factors may weigh more heavily than skills and knowledge in holding back reform. In the SSR field, it has long been observed that donors have tended to take an "apolitical and technical approach", even though the relationship between the state and society, which is at the heart of SSR, is inescapably political; thus, implying that SSR is limited by its inability to address political factors (Bakrania 2014; Denny and Valters 2015).

5. Evidence for Underpinning Assumptions

The underpinning assumptions are rarely discussed in the eight included studies, and the apparent lack of an explicit theory of change approach across all interventions suggests that assumptions were not articulated fully in the interventions themselves. However, it is possible to infer two general assumptions underpinning capacity building of governments and law enforcement in this area. The first is that it is possible to transfer capacity from high to low-capacity states. The second is that training and technical assistance are effective methods of transferring capacity.

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 11

The FOCUS studies suggest that capacity transfer may be possible but there is simply too little evidence to be conclusive. The two UNODC interventions suggest the range of possibilities: some success appears to have been achieved in Asia, while in Nigeria capacity transfer appears to have been very limited in effectiveness. As for the second assumption, the higher quality evaluations (Brett and Kahlmeyer 2017, Naik 2016, UNODC 2017) suggest that training workshops can only have a limited effect and, to achieve sustainable results, need to be part of a holistic and long-term approach to institutional capacity building.

The RELATED research, however, provided some important insights. SSR is heavily dependent on activities normally labelled as capacity building, yet both 'capacity' and 'capacity building' remained largely unexplored concepts, with the result that SSR usually equates to 'train and equip' approaches which "treat the problem as one of capacity deficit, neglecting the fact that dysfunction is often the result not only of weak capacity but of a particular constellation of political incentives" (Denny and Valters 2015). This conclusion is echoed in Ahnaf's finding that Indonesia's problem with rights-based CT was largely not the result of deficits in knowledge and skills. The SSR literature "overwhelmingly suggests a weak relationship between capacity building and improved security outcomes" in the long-term, despite some success in expanding short-term operational capacity in state-sector security providers (Denny and Valters 2015). Moreover, there is a potential conflict between improved security sector capacity on the one hand and accountability and human rights on the other, with the latter being "frequently neglected in SSR" (ibid).

In addition, some studies of SSR argue that capacity transfer is unrealistic in the situations where SSR is usually required – the "norms and practices of democratic security governance" simply cannot be transferred to post-conflict states or those emerging from decades of poor governance (Bakrania 2014). The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) and the United Kingdom's (UK) Stabilisation Unit have noted that "SSR programmes have largely been directed towards reforming state institutions based on idealised templates" which have proved especially unrealistic in fragile and conflict-affected contexts (ibid).

A further assumption can be inferred from the law enforcement P/CVE interventions: that community-oriented and rights-based policing will achieve P/CVE outcomes, for example, by reducing the incidence of real or perceived grievances on the part of individuals and communities. Again, the RELATED research provides some insights missing from the FOCUS studies. There is consensus in the literature on community policing that "partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions" of "crime, social disorder, and fear of crime" has greater reach and depth than, for example, paramilitary policing, and has the potential to achieve important social cohesion outcomes (Dunn et al. 2016). Even in stable security environments, it is more successful in improving "citizens' satisfaction with and trust in the police, but it does not necessarily decrease crime" (Weine et al. 2017). Nevertheless, the US in particular has seen the rise of community policing initiatives with explicit P/CVE purposes. In the UK, one police force developed a P/CVE policing approach, which shares many characteristics of community policing by building trust with communities before engaging on more sensitive issues (Lamb 2013). However, the study which discusses this is descriptive and does not attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of the approach.

6. Remaining Knowledge Gaps

The evidence for effectiveness in CT and P/CVE capacity building is, clearly, weak. The knowledge gaps are therefore considerable. Some basic questions concerning the concept of capacity building have not been answered in the CT and P/CVE literature, notably what do 'capacity' and 'capacity building' mean in that context? These terms are sufficiently imprecise to warrant conceptual exploration, as well as requiring specific definition within programmes to ensure results can be measured and assessed.

Moreover, the interventions assessed here routinely rely on training workshops as a means of achieving capacity transfer. As the RELATED study shows, and some of the FOCUS studies imply, it is by no means certain that training by itself can achieve any more than short-term and limited results, in the absence of sustained and holistic programmes and strategies for institutional reform. The RELATED literature adds that training in general has received a lot of

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 12

attention from researchers, and yet the knowledge from disciplines such as education and management studies has not been applied to SSR. It appears from the FOCUS studies that it has not been applied to P/CVE and CT either.

A further area for research is the relationship between CT and P/CVE training and other forms of relevant development assistance (technical assistance, institutional reform, SSR, etc.) As the FOCUS study suggests, a package of measures is likely to be more effective and achieve more impact than training in isolation. Therefore, it would be valuable to understand how different elements in a strategic, long-term programme might support each other.

Finally, both FOCUS and RELATED studies identify the risk of causing harm by building capacity in national government and law enforcement institutions which is then used to repress political adversaries and/or limit the enjoyment of human rights. Research into the potentially negative outcomes of capacity building is, therefore, needed.

7. Conclusions

From the discussion above, it is possible to draw the following conclusions:

- The evidence base is extremely weak. With only five studies fully meeting the inclusion and eligibility criteria, it is clear that the apparent concern about law enforcement capability as a factor in both CT success and its potential to contribute to radicalisation is not being matched by either independent evaluations of CT and P/CVE interventions or by scholarly investigations of these interventions' wider effects. The lack of independent evaluations of law enforcement interventions, including of those discussed above, shows that opportunities are being missed to learn and to share knowledge.

- The studies agree that national government and law enforcement are a vital target population for CT and P/CVE interventions. However, from the higher quality studies, it is also clear single projects are unlikely to achieve significant and sustainable impact unless they are part of long-term interventions that address capacity gaps systematically and strategically.

- If evaluations are in any way representative of capacity building programmes, there appears to be an (over-) reliance on training workshops as the principal method of capacity building. Other methods of building capacity (which might include mentoring, South-South cooperation, secondments, institutional reform, etc.) do not appear to have been assessed in the publicly available CT and P/CVE literature.

- Any intervention that seeks to build the capacity of law enforcement agencies in CT has human rights implications and risks doing harm. In most of the cases examined here, those risks are 'priced in' by the fact that the intervention is, explicitly or implicitly, supporting human rights norms. Where that is not the case, implementers (and donors) need actively to manage the risks.

From the RELATED study the following additional conclusions can be drawn, which are potentially relevant:

- Building the capacity of security sector organisations brings risks and potential disbenefits: it is not a given that greater capacity leads automatically to better security. Capacity building may involve a donor-led imposition of an unrealistic, Western-oriented security model. Moreover, capacity building is by its nature an intervention that may change the balance of power in fragile contexts, suggesting a significant risk of inadvertently doing harm. In particular, providing security organisations with capabilities they would not otherwise have means that donors and implementers need to be especially alert to the human rights implications of their interventions.

- The SSR literature shows that capacity building is under-explored and subject to a range of unexamined assumptions. In its reliance on ephemeral methods such as training workshops, and its lack of attention to

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 13

political factors and incentives, SSR has often been criticised for lacking sustainability. CT and P/CVE capacity building interventions may demonstrate similar weaknesses.

- Community policing approaches tend to command greater support from citizens, even if they have not been proven to be more successful at preventing and detecting crime. This suggests that community policing initiatives may be valuable outputs and outcomes of P/CVE interventions, where distrust of security forces has been shown to be a factor in radicalisation and recruitment.

Bibliography

Berger, J. M. "Making CVE Work." International Centre for Counter-terrorism - The Hague (2016). http://icct.nl/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/J.-M.-Berger-Making-CVE-Work-A-Focused-Approach-Based-on-Process-Disruption-.pdf.

Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. "CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Health Care." (University of York, 2008). https://www.york.ac.uk/media/crd/Systematic_Reviews.pdf.

Chowdhury Fink, Naureen. "The Blue Flag in Grey Zones: Exploring the Relationship between Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) and Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) in UN Field Operations." In James Cockayne and Siobhan O'Neil (eds), "UN DDR in an Era of Violent Extremism: Is it Fit for Purpose?" (Tokyo: United Nations University, 2015).

DuBois, David L., and Fasika Alem. "Mentoring and domestic radicalization." (2017).

Freese, Rebecca. "Evidence-Based Counterterrorism or Flying Blind? How to Understand and Achieve What Works." Perspectives on Terrorism, 8(1) (2014): 37–56.

Lindekilde, Lasse. "Value for Money? Problems of Impact Assessment of Counter-Radicalisation Policies on End Target Groups: The Case of Denmark." European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, 18(4) (2012): 385–402.

Lum, Cynthia, and Leslie W. Kennedy, Alison J. Sherley. "The Effectiveness of Counter-Terrorism Strategies: A Campbell Systematic Review." (Washington, DC: Crime and Justice Coordinating Group, The Campbell Collaboration, 2006). https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2008-01077-006.

Mallett, Richard, Jessica Hagen-Zanker, Rachel Slater and Maren Duvendack. "The benefits and challenges of using systematic reviews in international development research." Journal of Development Effectiveness, 4(3) (2012): 445-455.

Mastroe, Caitlin, and Susan Szmania. "Surveying CVE Metrics in Prevention, Disengagement and De-Radicalization Programs." (College Park, MD: START, Office of University Programs, Science and Technology Directorate, Department of Homeland Security, 2016).

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands. "The Integrated International Security Strategy 2018-2022." (2018) https://www.government.nl/documents/reports/2018/05/14/integrated-international-security-strategy-2018-2022.

OECD. "Evaluation Criteria." https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm

Richard Mallett, Jessica Hagen-Zanker, Rachel Slater and Maren Duvendack. "The benefits and challenges of using systematic reviews in international development research." Journal of Development Effectiveness, 4(3) (2012): 445-455.

RUSI. "Methodology for the Prevention Project. What works (and what doesn't): Assessing the Evidence Base for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism publication series." (2020). https://rusi.org/publication/other-publications/prevention-project-methodology.

Wolfendale, Jessica. "Terrorism, Security, and the Threat of Counterterrorism." Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 30(1) (2007): 75-92.

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 15

Annex A: Summary of Interventions

Higher Quality Evidence

1.

Project Name	NGO-Security Service Engagement to Stem Human Rights Abuses
Project Implementer	Search for Common Ground
Intervention Method	Meetings to facilitate engagement between key civil society actors and security personnel, training workshops for security personnel in human right and conflict transformation, publishing policy briefs on international legal framework for CT activities that respect human right principles, and media-based monitoring of the Densus CT operation.
Location	Indonesia
Target Population(s)	Security personnel and civil society representatives
Intended Outcome	Transform the adversarial relations between the security personnel and civil society leaders into constructive relations.
Quality Narrative	Although poorly written, this is a methodical and well-evidenced evaluation. There is a substantial methodology section which details research questions, sources, and the analytical framework (derived from OECD-DAC evaluation criteria). It set out the intervention's assumptions (implicitly its theory of change, but it's not described as such), traced its design, detailed its implementation, and conducted extensive and in-depth interviews with beneficiaries to assess results.
Evidence of Effectiveness	(i) Helped transfer knowledge to security personnel on "upholding human right principles in CT activities"; (ii) "created spaces for engagement between security personnel and civil society leaders" which identified perception gaps over the appropriate use of force that "can be addressed to transform the current tension into constructive relations", although "trust between both parties remains low".
Evidence of Impact	Too early to say: the study is a mid-term evaluation (and no final evaluation of the project appears to be available).
Lessons Learned	With human rights in law enforcement, the challenge is often not awareness or knowledge but structural issues and the capacity to operationalise the principles. The project needs to create space for informal engagement between security personnel and civil society leaders.

2.

Project Name	Police, Social Services, and Psychiatry (PSP) programme
Project Implementer	Danish government and agencies
Intervention Method	Training on handling radicalisation cases by raising awareness, providing insights into the politics, psychology and sociology of the problem, and instructing participants in the 'Danish model' and its standard operating procedures.
Location	Denmark
Target Population(s)	Employees working on PSP (including police officers) in Denmark
Intended Outcome	Improved knowledge and skills in identifying and handling concerns of radicalisation and extremism in a multi-agency formation.
Quality Narrative	It is a largely descriptive study, and (appropriately) doesn't offer firm conclusions, but the results of the evaluation of the capacity building activities are presented accurately.
Evidence of Effectiveness	Internal evaluation of the programme's training component showed increase in knowledge (e.g., number rating themselves as having good or extensive knowledge of radicalisation increased from 35% to 95%), and over half of participants said they were

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 16

	able to apply the knowledge/skills. However, police participants gained less but had higher baselines. Study concludes that the model is promising.
Evidence of Impact	Impact was not assessed.
Lessons Learned	None identified.

3.

Project Name	STRIVE Horn of Africa
Project Implementer	RUSI
Intervention Method	Workshops on CVE policy and practice, and trust-building between civil society and law enforcement/ security.
Location	Kenya.
Target Population(s)	Law enforcement and security officers (mid-management level) and civil society representatives.
Intended Outcome	Decrease Kenya's vulnerability to VE by increasing CVE skills/knowledge in law enforcement/ security sector and building trust between the sector and CSOs.
Quality Narrative	The evaluation involved mixed methods: document review, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with stakeholders, beneficiaries and experts. It is openly acknowledged that this was an exploratory – and short-term – pilot project and results were assessed in light of this consideration. For the same reasons, sustainability was not included as a criterion. Some of the findings are vague, with conclusions apparently drawn largely from interviews with those carrying out the interventions.
Evidence of Effectiveness	Training workshops and curriculum are "highly relevant" to the challenge posed by VE in the region, are "increasing law enforcement's understanding of CVE", contribute to "positive attitude changes" amongst personnel, and will continue to "have an impact on front-line policing and other law enforcement". Lessons learned report adds: "data indicate a concerted change in perspectives, with only one participant out of 80 objecting to the involvement of civil society in the implementation of CVE. The vast majority of beneficiaries similarly claimed they appreciated the virtues of collaborating with civil society and civilian actors in a way they had not previously. They were also able to more articulately describe CVE related issues. Finally, there is evidence of greater cooperation between law enforcement personnel and CSOs in certain precincts following the programme's conclusion. This suggests that cognitive shifts induced by the training course precipitated changes in how local security and CVE programmes were subsequently implemented on the ground."
Evidence of Impact	Evaluation concludes that the project had demonstrated outcomes but not impact, and results at that level would require sustained engagement with all law enforcement agencies at various ranks, especially those in 'hot-spot' locations, plus implementation of learning in law enforcement activities and institutional support. Ultimately, behavioural change will need to be observed.
Lessons Learned	Evaluators concluded project demonstrated the value in securing a centrally placed counterpart (Kenya's National CT Centre) and nurturing the relationship.

4.

Project Name	Sub-programme on CT: East and Southeast Asia Partnership on Criminal Justice Responses to Terrorism
Project Implementer	UNODC
Intervention Method	Workshops and technical assistance on thematic legal aspects of CT.
Location	South and Southeast Asia (Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos, Philippines and Vietnam).
Target Population(s)	Law enforcement and criminal justice sector.

Intended Outcome	New CT legislation drafted and ratified; criminal justice systems enhanced 'for effective implementation of CT legal provisions' with a focus on extradition and cooperation; improved coordination and cooperation between and among national entities.
Quality Narrative	A mixed method approach combined interviews with beneficiaries and existing 'quantitative data to validate findings against more objective data sources', although no new quantitative data was collected as part of the evaluation. The interview list was created by the sub-programme which raises some questions as to the impartiality of the respondents. However, the evaluation appears balanced and reasoned in its findings, identifying areas where improvements are required. It adheres to existing UN guidelines on evaluations.
Evidence of Effectiveness	The evaluation found substantial outcomes in the intervention's three outcome areas (legislation, capacity development and transnational cooperation), both in terms of policy development and knowledge/skills imparted. The programme supported implementation, not just ratification of CT legal instruments. Capacity building and technical assistance enhanced criminal justice systems for effective implementation of CT legal provisions, improved coordination and cooperation between and among national entities, and provided instruction on "thematic legal aspects of CT". Concerns were raised over sustainability: "more support is required" in some countries to ensure work is continued in the absence of the programme, despite training of trainers. The evaluation notes a lack of gender mainstreaming.
Evidence of Impact	The programme was said to be "highly impactful" with demonstrable "tangible achievements", although these appear to have been mostly at outcome rather than impact level. However, respondents identified better investigations and increased prosecution rates in the Philippines and Laos. Evaluation notes that impact indicators were not developed.
Lessons Learned	Evaluation attributes success to a "flexible and consultative approach to working with beneficiary partners", and a comprehensive situation analysis. The evaluation recommends setting aside "enough time and budget to see visible results".

5.

Project Name	Nigeria-EU-UNODC-CTED Partnership on Strengthening Criminal Justice Responses for Multi-dimensional Security (Terrorism)
Project Implementer	UNODC
Intervention Method	Training workshops on CT measures (domestic and international law and policy) and on international cooperation.
Location	Nigeria.
Target Population(s)	Government officials in the criminal justice sector.
Intended Outcome	Enhance the capacity of national criminal justice officials to implement CT measures in accordance with rule of law, with due respect for human rights, and with relevant international legal instruments and Security Council resolutions; reinforce international criminal justice cooperation, especially with the Sahel, Western and Central Africa sub-regions; reinforce inter-agency collaboration, sustainability and ownership of criminal justice responses to terrorism among relevant national entities; reinforce knowledge and analysis of relevant domestic legislation.
Quality Narrative	The evaluation has been conducted in line with UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) standards. However, there is limited discussion in the evaluation of analytical methods and how/why the evaluators reached the conclusions they did, and there are some significant gaps in data presented. Although evaluations such as this tend to work to different criteria from peer-reviewed academic studies, such gaps in my view limit the reliability of the study.

Evidence of Effectiveness	The evaluation found some positive evidence of effectiveness at the output level (satisfactory training workshops) but concludes that evidence of effectiveness is "highly limited", and evidence of results at outcome level is "anecdotal" and sketchy: the evaluation says outcomes have been "partially achieved" but it is not specific about which and to what extent, and it highlights a lack of data at this level.
Evidence of Impact	The evaluation concludes that not much can be said due to the short duration of the project and the emphasis on data collection at the activity and output level. Sustainability of project benefits was also a concern, given a lack of evidence on the uptake of the training by beneficiaries.
Lessons Learned	Lessons learned included the importance of a context assessment at the design stage, a proper logframe/results framework and associated metrics, the value of both international and regional experts. Capacity building must be part of a broader, holistic approach to strengthening the criminal justice sector, and synergies with other forms of crime should be exploited.

Lower Quality Evidence

1.

Project Name	Pakistani Policewomen Case Study
Project Implementer	Inclusive Security
Intervention Method	Workshops to deepen participants' understanding of women's roles in CVE, particularly within the security sector, and increase participants' advocacy knowledge and skills; technical assistance to participants to conduct research, consultations, and policy meetings; increasing policewomen's understanding of civil society perceptions and vice versa; connecting participants to policymakers and security sector officials in Pakistan to share policy recommendations.
Location	Pakistan.
Target Population(s)	Women from parliament, police, and civil society.
Intended Outcome	Decrease VE in Pakistan by ensuring that women are represented in CVE-related security policies and processes through capacity building of female leaders so that they are included in policymaking related to security issues, particularly within law enforcement.
Quality Narrative	This is not a rigorous evaluation. It is an advertisement for a project and approach which includes participant survey data but only on one (less relevant) part of the project. Claims of success in this component are overstated and the references to improving trust appear to be based on impressions rather than data. Given the absence of methodological rigour, and the high risk of bias from the fact that the report was produced by the project's implementers, material from this study should be included with strong caveats.
Evidence of Effectiveness	Results based on endline survey reported "tremendous success" of the project achieving its goal of raising awareness of CT and P/CVE policy and increasing knowledge of policy analysis. However, there was a decline in the number of participants meeting CT and P/CVE policy makers, possibly due to the confounding factor of female exclusion from CT policy-making. The report does not evaluate achievement of policy capacity-building objectives except to say "participants began to build policymaker awareness of the roles of policewomen in CVE and counterterrorism and began to address the trust deficit between civil society and police forces within their multi-sectoral group."
Evidence of Impact	None provided.
Lessons Learned	Report notes the importance of an effective local partner, the need to take local context into account, and the value of a cross-sectoral approach.

2.

Project Name	STRIVE Horn of Africa
Project Implementer	RUSI
Intervention Method	Workshops on CVE policy and practice, and trust-building between civil society and law enforcement/ security.
Location	Kenya.
Target Population(s)	Law enforcement and security officers (mid-management level) and civil society representatives.
Intended Outcome	Decrease Kenya's vulnerability to VE by increasing CVE skills/knowledge in law enforcement/ security sector and building trust between the sector and CSOs.
Quality Narrative	This is a lessons learned report rather than an independent evaluation and lacks the methodological rigour that would be found in a peer-reviewed academic study. While this has been included to complement the independent evaluation, it will be necessary to caveat any references as being potentially subject to bias.
Evidence of Effectiveness	Report summarised effectiveness of the law enforcement component: "data indicate a concerted change in perspectives, with only one participant out of 80 objecting to the involvement of civil society in the implementation of CVE. The vast majority of beneficiaries similarly claimed they appreciated the virtues of collaborating with civil society and civilian actors in a way they had not previously. They were also able to more articulately describe CVE related issues. Finally, there is evidence of greater cooperation between law enforcement personnel and CSOs in certain precincts following the programme's conclusion. This suggests that cognitive shifts induced by the training course precipitated changes in how local security and CVE programmes were subsequently implemented on the ground."
Evidence of Impact	None provided.
Lessons Learned	i) It is crucial that law enforcement personnel receive CVE training that instructs how excessive use of force, ethnic profiling and the lack of rule of law can contribute to increased radicalisation; ii) CVE training for security actors should be implemented in as many locations as possible but should prioritise areas with a history of violence and discrimination against minority groups, high levels of recruitment and high rates of terrorist attacks; iii) CVE programmes need to be grounded on strong partnerships between government actors, CSOs and CVE specialists.

3.

Project Name	CT Sahel
Project Implementer	European Commission
Intervention Method	Training workshops on information and intelligence exchange to prevent terrorism and organised crime.
Location	Sahel.
Target Population(s)	Law enforcement agencies (police, gendarmerie, garde nationale) and specialised judicial institutions.
Intended Outcome	Decrease VE in Pakistan by ensuring that women are represented in CVE-related security policies and processes through capacity building of female leaders so that they are included in policymaking related to security issues, particularly within law enforcement.
Quality Narrative	The study contains the caveat that it is a 'review' rather than a 'formal evaluation' and is designed to guide the EU's thinking about programming, although it follows standard OECD-DAC and EU evaluation criteria. As such, it lacks some of the characteristics of a high-quality evaluation (clear statement of methodology, presentation of data, analytical framework). As a result, it is impressionistic and lacks rigour. The case study (in the form of

	two short paragraphs) claiming a Boko Haram arrest was attributable to the project seems overstated.
Evidence of Effectiveness	The evaluation found that the College of Sahelian Security (CSS, an institute developed through the project for transnational cooperation) was successful in improving regional cooperation, while the national pillars delivered 84 training activities to 1963 officers. The evaluation is less clear on human rights issues, noting that there was human rights content but it was not designed with a comprehensive human-rights based approach and did not measure results in this area.
Evidence of Impact	The evaluation claims the project led to improved capacity in CT organisations in the region and provides one illustrative case study where a Boko Haram member was identified and arrested in Niger, partly as a result of officers putting their learning into practice. The evaluation is somewhat vague on impact, although it praises the CSS as a sustainable institution, which went on to implement its own capacity building activities before being absorbed into the G5 Sahel.
Lessons Learned	Lessons learned included the need to build sustainability into project design, e.g., by focusing on training for trainers instead of workshops for mainstream officers, better metrics (outcomes not activities/ outputs), a stronger focus on CVE over CT objectives, and greater consistency/ sustainability in political support.

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 21

Annex B: Methodology

The overall objective of this research project is to conduct a literature review across a range of studies to collect and synthesise evidence on the (conditions for) effectiveness in three separate areas: *1) youth engagement; 2) reintegration; and 3) capacity building of national government and law enforcement.*

Each of these categories approach CT and P/CVE from a different angle:
- **Youth engagement (*aimed at dealing with recruitment*)**: this category includes the establishment of youth groups, providing education/training, and counter narrative approaches.
- **Reintegration (*aimed at disengaging violent extremists*)**: this category includes support for the reintegration of (former) detainees, members of terrorist groups and ex -combatants. Reintegration can involve vocational training, coaching and psychosocial support, and in-kind or cash support.
- **Capacity building of national government and law enforcement (*aimed at containment of VE*)**: this category includes training of policy makers (both local and national) and security personnel (police, prison, border) in subjects ranging from terrorist profiling to community policing.

Research Questions

There are five key sub-research questions:

- *What evidence is there on what works (effectiveness)?*

Effectiveness is assessed at different levels. At the activity or project level, the question explored is "how well did the activity (described in the literature) achieve its objectives?" Analytically, effectiveness is defined using the OECD-DAC criteria for international development evaluations: the extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and its results, including any differential results across groups. This involves taking account of the relative importance of the objectives or results (OECD).

By this definition, an activity might be effective on its own terms but not achieve impact-level change, i.e., not be able to demonstrate an 'impact' or positive change on levels of VE. In fact, many of the studies reviewed in this report do not evaluate success at this level, either because the intervention is still ongoing, because design flaws in the intervention prevent impact assessment or because the study simply does not address impact. This also reflects the challenge in proving causation and attribution, with the lack of short, manageable causal chains making it challenging to exclude rival explanations for a specific trend or effect (Lindekilde 2012). Intended outcomes in P/CVE are sometimes said to involve "nothing happening", for example, the absence of radicalisation and recruitment. Assessing the mechanics of interventions is therefore problematic as any metric relies on an imperfect set of proxies to "prove a negative", particularly as ethical constraints in complex and challenging contexts usually preclude any comparison between treatment and control groups.

- *What evidence is there on what does not work?*

Assessing what does not work is as difficult as assessing what works, but is rarely invested in to the same extent. At the activity or project level, studies concluding that the intervention failed to produce the desired results are regarded as "ineffective." However, the evaluations included in the review provided limited information about ineffectiveness. As a result, the authors tried to identify areas of omission or shortfalls in the interventions.

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 22

- *What conditions promote or hinder success?*

Given the importance of context in CT and P/CVE interventions, a more appropriate question is "what circumstances tend to make programmes ineffective." These include: 1) intervention context; 2) intervention design (for example, timeframe, resources available, scale and scope, beneficiaries and whether the intervention is standalone or part of a wider package of interventions); 3) implementation (who is the implementing organisation or was there a specific interlocutor that was effective?).

Given the lack of substantial evidence of effectiveness and impact gathered in this study, it is largely not possible to identify any generalisable evidence of conditions promoting and hindering success. It is only possible to identify what conditions correlated with or were estimated to contribute to the achievement of results.

- *What are the assumptions underpinning each of the three intervention areas, and what evidence is available to support or counter these assumptions?*

This question involves diagnosing the underlying assumptions or theories of change that underpin the three categories of CT and P/CVE programmes. This, however, is rarely discussed in the documents included in this study and the apparent lack of an explicit theory of change approach across all interventions suggests that assumptions were not articulated fully in the interventions themselves. Instead, the authors attempted to infer assumptions. The answering of this question therefore inevitably involves a degree of subjectivity.

- *What knowledge gaps are there regarding CT and P/CVE activities?*

This question explores areas where there are knowledge gaps in CT and P/CVE programmes. In particular, the review highlights areas of programming in which there are insufficient data at present to draw any concrete findings. The identification of gaps is, however, useful, as it reflects the need for more evidence on certain assumptions or suggests potential effective as well as ineffective approaches that are worth testing further.

Methodological Approach

Each thematic category is treated as a separate work stream and led by a key author, with the same techniques applied across each work stream. Three separate systematic literature reviews are carried out for the three separate work streams (FOCUS). Systematic reviews rely upon the use of an objective, transparent and rigorous approach for the entire research process, in order to minimise bias and ensure future replicability (Mallett et al 2012).

Accompanying the systematic reviews, the study includes a RELATED literature search on the basis that there is likely insufficient material available to answer all of the above questions.

For each of the three work streams, two search categories are included:
1. A systematic review of studies and evaluations of programmes focussed on CT and P/CVE, i.e., activities directly aimed at countering or preventing terrorism and VE (FOCUS).
2. A review of existing literature reviews (systematic and otherwise) in related areas such as SSR, community policing, interventions with ex-combatants or gang members (RELATED).[3]

---

[3] See also Dandurand (2015) who also discusses similarities between P/CVE programming and programmes focusing on gang violence.

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 23

Due to time and available resources, the RELATED category is not systematic but is confined to existing literature reviews (systematic and otherwise), supplemented by a small number of studies that were discovered in the FOCUS systematic searching but were subsequently screened out on relevance grounds.

Two separate inventories were created for each work stream, which can be found in Annex C and D. In the case of the youth engagement and reintegration themes, the need to consider related literature is less relevant because of the volume of data gathered in the focus area. This paper, exploring the capacity building of national governments and law enforcement, draws more on the related literature in the analysis.

There are four stages to the literature review. These are outlined in detail below. The stages are consistent across all three thematic areas, with tailored approaches adopted where relevant.

1. Development of Criteria for Inclusion/Exclusion and Search Terms

As part of the literature review for this project, the team designed a set of inclusion/exclusion criteria that ensure adequate coverage in its data-collection.

Table 1: Inclusion/exclusion criteria for capacity building of national governments and law enforcement

	Inclusion	Exclusion
Date	Papers since 2001	Pre-2001 material
Language	English	Papers in all other languages
Population	Government and law enforcement	
Geographical locations	Any/ all	None
Interventions	Capacity building Training Technical assistance	
Study design	Any peer-reviewed study (theoretical, empirical, qualitative, quantitative) <u>and</u> literature reviews/systematic reviews <u>and</u> evaluations of projects or programmes, whether independent or internal	Opinion pieces/op-eds, generic critiques of policy (e.g., of the UK's Prevent strategy), workshop and conference reports, policy briefs.
Medium of publication	Scholarly journal, thinktank/research institute report, NGO report, government publication, PhD thesis	Blogs, opinion pieces, newspaper articles, academic books
Relevance	Counter-terrorism, countering/preventing violent extremism/ radicalisation/ recruitment	Social cohesion/social integration initiatives, police reform.

This phase involved identifying keywords for searches according to each thematic area. The research question is broken down into population, intervention and outcome, to identify appropriate search terms and how they should be combined into search strings.

Table 2: Keywords

Keywords 1 (outcome): a OR b OR c	prevent/preventing/prevention, terrorism/terrorist, violent extremism/extremist, radicalisation, recruitment, PVE, CVE, P/CVE, counter-radicalisation, counter-terrorism, violence prevention
AND Keywords 2 (intervention): d OR e OR f	capacity building, capability, train/training, workshop(s), twinning, mentoring, support, consultancy, interventions, enhance/enhancing, improve/improving, reform(ing)
AND Keywords 3 (population): g OR h OR i	police/policing, law enforcement, security, security sector, security sector reform, justice, criminal justice, government, local government, mayor/mayoral, state, official(s), prison(s), probation, service, judiciary, judges, executive, prosecutor(s), prosecution, national, federal, state, local

Search strings

Search terms are unique to the strand of work.

The following search strings were identified for the searches. They aimed to capture as many interventions and studies as possible, hence include a variety of synonyms.

They were tested for two weeks.

1) prevent* AND radicalisation OR terrorism OR recruitment AND "capacity building" OR capability AND police OR "law enforcement" OR security

2) counter-terrorism OR "counter terrorism" AND "capacity building" OR capability AND police OR "law enforcement" OR security

3) PVE OR CVE OR P/CVE AND support OR interventions OR "capacity building" AND government OR "law enforcement" OR "security sector"

4) counter-terrorism OR "counter terrorism" OR "countering violent extremism" OR "preventing violent extremism" AND "capacity building" AND judiciary OR "criminal justice" OR probation OR prison OR legal

5) "security sector reform" AND "counter terrorism" OR "countering violent extremism" OR "preventing violent extremism"

2. Literature Search and Division

Each strand involved an independent document search process, following the same systematic steps. The identification of potential sources was related to the three FOCUS categories in CT and P/CVE interventions and conducted through academic databases and library catalogues. These include:

- Google Scholar
- Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts (ASSIA)
- Criminal Justice Database
- Digital National Security Archive
- European Sources Online
- International Bibliography of Social Sciences (IBSS)
- ProQuest Central
- Scopus
- Web of Science

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 25

We decided to restrict the fields of research to criminology, political science, law, management, development studies, psychology, anthropology, sociology, social sciences, public administration, etc.

We also adopted a systematic approach across all three strands to hand searching. Hand searching was conducted on the following websites:

- Institute for Strategic Dialogue (ISD): https://www.isdglobal.org/
- International Centre for Counter-Terrorism (ICCT): https://icct.nl/
- Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF), CVE working group: https://www.thegctf.org/Working-Groups/Countering-Violent-Extremism
- United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism: https://www.un.org/en/counterterrorism/
- RAND Corporation: https://www.rand.org/topics/counterterrorism.html
- Radicalisation Awareness Network, including Communications and Narratives Working Group (RAN C&N): https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-c-and-n
- Royal United Services Institute (RUSI): https://rusi.org/publications
- Resolve Network: https://www.resolvenet.org/research/publications
- NATO Centre of Excellence Defence Against Terrorism, Ankara http://www.coedat.nato.int ; Defence Against Terrorism Review: http://www.coedat.nato.int/datrvolumes.html
- Europol: https://www.europol.europa.eu/publications-documents plus Advisory Group on Online Terrorist Propaganda, & EU Internet Referral Unit
- Tech Against Terrorism: https://www.techagainstterrorism.org/research/
- VoxPol: https://www.voxpol.eu/
- Tony Blair Institute: https://institute.global/
- The Commonwealth, Counter-Extremism Unit: https://thecommonwealth.org/countering-violent-extremism
- Against Violent Extremism (AVE) Network: http://www.againstviolentextremism.org/projects
- International Civil Society Action Network: https://icanpeacework.org/
- TSAS – Canadian network for research on Terrorism, Security and Society: https://www.tsas.ca/
- Impact Europe: http://www.impact.itti.com.pl/index#/home
- Search for Common Ground: https://www.sfcg.org/
- CT-MORSE – Counter-Terrorism Monitoring, Reporting and Support Mechanism: http://ct-morse.eu/activities/publications/
- DEMOS: https://demos.co.uk/research-area/casm/
- Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance (DCAF): https://www.dcaf.ch/resources?type=publications
- Global Centre on Cooperative Security: https://www.globalcenter.org/publications/
- Terrorist Research and Analysis Consortium (TRAC) https://www.trackingterrorism.org/publishing-center
- International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation (ICSR): https://icsr.info/publications/reports/
- Department for International Development, Research for Development: https://www.gov.uk/research-for-development-outputs
- European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR): https://ecpr.eu/
- GCERF – Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCTF inspired body): https://www.gcerf.org/
- Institute for International Justice (GCTF inspired body): https://theiij.org/

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 26

- UNDP Regional Addis Ababa and Amman (PVE Hub): https://www.africa.undp.org/content/rba/en/home/about_us/regional-hub.html
- The African Centre for the Study and Research on Terrorism (ACSRT/CAERT): https://caert.org.dz/
- International Crisis Group (ICG): https://www.crisisgroup.org/
- United States Institute for Peace (USIP): https://www.usip.org/
- Overseas Development Institute (ODI): https://www.odi.org/
- OSCE (Transnational Threats Department/ODHIR): https://www.osce.org/odihr
- CTED (specifically publications from Global Research Network (GRN)): https://www.un.org/sc/ctc/focus-areas/research;
- UNICRI: http://www.unicri.it/
- Hedayah: https://www.hedayahcenter.org/
- ISS Africa: https://issafrica.org/
- ICPVTR: https://www.rsis.edu.sg/research/icpvtr/
- International Alert: https://www.international-alert.org/
- UNICEF: https://www.unicef.org.uk/
- EU: DEVCO, EEAS or at the Council Secretariat of CT-Coordinator Gilles de Kerchhove: https://ec.europa.eu/info/departments/international-cooperation-and-development_en
- ACCORD
- Humanitarian Dialogue: https://www.hdcentre.org/

This stage also involved collecting documents for the RELATED areas, using existing literature reviews through Campbell Collaboration and 3ie (International Initiative for Impact Evaluation).

3. Literature Screening

Screening of the documents took place during the third phase. This comprised 1) elimination of duplicates, 2) elimination of irrelevant studies based on title and/or abstract. Of the remaining studies, eligibility was decided on the basis of the inclusion/exclusion criteria (see above). This stage of the screening was led by the work stream leader and, to ensure consistent screening, an inter-coder reliability exercise was conducted.

Studies that passed both screening stages were classified, and a classifsation chart was created for the FOCUS category, which includes the following information:
- Study Location (e.g., country where programming took place)
- Type of Study (e.g., peer reviewed study, literature/systematic review, evaluation of intervention)
- Summary
- Quality Assessment
- The relevance of the paper and importance for the research question

An annexed inventory was also created which includes:
- Title
- Author
- Publication Date
- Publication Issue

4. Literature Analysis and Writing

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 27

The final phase focused on analysing the studies. Three types of analysis were conducted.

Firstly, we diagnosed common assumptions – whether articulated or implicit, what evidence informed these, and the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of different interventions at the project or programme level.

Secondly, we observed and noted the methodological approach, providing a narrative quality assessment of the bias (internal validity) and generalisability (external validity) of the paper. From the outset of the research, we noted an inherent contradiction between the information required to conduct a systematic review and the way peer reviewed journal articles and even evaluations are written in this field. Much of the research in this field is multi-disciplinary and includes quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Quality appraisal techniques lack consensus and are still undeveloped.

We, therefore, discussed at length a suitable quality appraisal approach. The decision was taken that quality would be defined according to the robustness of research or evaluation methodology. We assessed that knowing how strong the research or evaluation methodology (whether the study is theoretical, qualitative or qualitative) of a particular paper is facilitates our analytical process and essentially defines how much 'weight' to attribute to the conclusions of the paper. We stress that there is no preference in this study for theoretical, qualitative or quantitative research or evaluation studies. Quality is assessed on the methodological rigour, rather than the choice of approach.

In this study, quality is not an inclusion or exclusion criterion. We also decided against a quality scoring process, in line with good practice in the field. Using quality scores has been identified to be problematic. Instead, it is preferable to consider individual aspects of methodological quality in the quality assessment and synthesis. Where appropriate, the potential impact that methodological quality had on the findings of the included studies should be considered (Centre for Reviews and Dissemination 2008). Therefore, we conducted a narrative assessment of the methodological approach and provided comments on bias and on generalisability. We also noted the relevance of the paper to our study – how far the study answers the research questions relevant to each theme. Quality assurance was overseen by the Team Leader.

Thirdly, the analysis compared findings on programme effectiveness or ineffectiveness across the intervention field to assess generalisability. We adopted a tiered analytical assessment looking at multiple levels:

Programmatic: how far did the activity/project or programme (described in the literature) achieve its set goals or objectives.
Unpacking this further: the extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and results – including any differential results across groups. This involved taking account of the relative importance of the objectives or results (OECD).

Impact: For those activities that were successful programmatically, do they usually or sometimes help to solve the problem of VE?
It is acknowledged that the analytical assessment of effectiveness was a judgement made through examination of the evidence. This impact assessment is based on the expertise of the research team, and therefore incurs some level of subjectivity.

A fourth phase of analysis was undertaken in the government and law enforcement work strand, which considered the findings from the RELATED research.

Annex C: FOCUS Inventory

Author	Publication Date	Title	Publication Issue
Naik, Asmita	2016	Sub-programme on Counter-Terrorism: East and Southeast Asia Partnership on Criminal Justice Responses to Terrorism	UNODC (East and Southeast Asia)
Brett, Julian and Kahlmeyer, André	2017	Evaluation Report: Strengthening Resilience to Violent Extremism – STRIVE (Horn of Africa)	TANA and CMC, The European Union's Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP)
Iqbal Ahnaf, M.	2013	NGO-Security Service Engagement to Stem Human Rights Abuses in Indonesia: Report for Mid-Term Evaluation	Search for Common Ground
Sestoft, D., Hansen, S. M. and Christensen, A.B.	2017	The Police, Social Services, and Psychiatry (PSP) cooperation as a platform for dealing with concerns of radicalization	International Review of Psychiatry, 29(4): 350-354
Peters, A. and Saeed, J.	2017	Promoting Inclusive Policy Frameworks for Countering Violent Extremism: Bridging Theory and Practice: A Pakistani Policewomen Case Study	Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security (GIWPS)
RUSI	2017	STRIVE Strengthening Resilience to Violence and Extremism Lessons Learned Horn of Africa	European Commission paper
Stigter, Elca and Sambei, Arvinder	2016	Independent project evaluation of the "Nigeria-EU-UNODC-CTED Partnership on Strengthening Criminal Justice Responses for Multidimensional Security (Terrorism)"	UNODC
Reitano, Tuesday, Knoope, Peter and Oustinoff, Iris	2015	Final Review of the CT Sahel Project, December 2015	Counter-Terrorism, Monitoring, Reporting and Support Mechanism (CT-MORSE) and European Commission

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 29

Annex D: RELATED Inventory

Author	Publication Date	Title	Publication Issue
Ansorg, Nadine and Gordon, Eleanor	2019	Co-operation, Contestation and Complexity in Post-Conflict Security Sector Reform	Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding, 13(1), 2–24
Bakrania, Shivit	2014	Helpdesk Research Report: The role of security organisations in security sector reform: key themes	Governance, Social Development, Humanitarian, Conflict (GSDRC) Helpdesk Research Report
Bullock, Karen and Johnson, Paul	2018	Police engagement with Muslim communities: breaking out, breaking in, and breaking through	Policing and Society, 28(8): 879–897
Cherney, Adrian and Murphy, Kristina	2017	Police and community cooperation in counterterrorism: Evidence and insights from Australia	Studies in Conflict and Terrorism, 40(12)
Denney, Lisa and Valters, Craig	2015	Evidence Synthesis: Security Sector Reform and Organisational Capacity Building Rapid Evidence Assessment	UK Department for International Development (DfID)
Dieng, Moda	2019	The Multi-National Joint Task Force and the G5 Sahel Joint Force: The limits of military capacity-building efforts	Contemporary Security Policy, 40(4): 481-501
Dunn, Kevin M. et al.	2016	Can you use community policing for counter terrorism? Evidence from NSW, Australia	Police Practice and Research, 17(3): 196–211
England, Madeline and Boucher, Alix	2009	Security Sector Reform: Thematic Literature Review on Best Practices and Lessons Learned.	Henry L. Stimson Center
Lamb, John B.	2013	Preventing Violent Extremism; A Policing Case Study of the West Midlands.	Policing : A Journal of Policy and Practice, 7(1), 88
Pickering, Sharon, McCulloch, Jude and Wright-Neville, David	2008	Counter-terrorism policing: Towards social cohesion	Crime Law and Social Change (50): 91-109
Schroeder, Ursula C., Chappuis, Fairlie and Kocak, Deniz	2013	Security Sector Reform from a Policy Transfer Perspective: A Comparative Study of International Interventions in the Palestinian Territories, Liberia and Timor-Leste	Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding, 7(3), 381–401
Trujillo, Horacio R.	2018	Expanding Initiatives to Reduce Human Rights Abuses in Northern Nigeria (Search for Common Ground)	Search for Common Ground

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 30

Weine, Stevan, Younis, Ahmed and Polutnik, Chloe	2017	Community Policing to Counter Violent Extremism: A Process Evaluation in Los Angeles.	National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START)

Report commissioned and financed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 31