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## Introduction

Now more challenges are confronting the Intelligence Community (IC) than ever before. In some cases, the IC struggles to use their most key component to recognize and analyze threats, such as the one in the simulation, especially when it comes to indications and warnings (I&W). One of the challenges faced during the simulation that is similar from today’s IC, are the affects from human-centric intelligence. Human-centric intelligence must be developed in order to detect and analyze threats more effectively. (Indications 2016, pp. 12-13) A target-centered approach identifies two primary objectives for the IC. In a book published by Robert Clark, (Clark 2016, pp. 448) the first goal of Robert’s focus was the “ reclassify the intelligence process to make the intelligence cycle work smoothly and efficiently for all parts of what is usually called the intelligence system. The aim also focused on analyst collector and the analysis customers and on a few philosophies to enhance analysis.” The process of human-centric intelligence and I&W are the first steps for preventing a terrorist attack.

I&W Functions/Support/Preparedness

The intelligence cycle and the technique must work hand-in-hand and impeccably for the key aspects to function effectively and prosperously. Some quandaries have been recognized at some point of the simulation was where the outbreak took place. This is a genuine fight for the IC when it comes to such an event. In a case that led to a bioterrorist attack, it is onerous to determine I&W. I&W is the first bulwark line. Some of the crucial areas for intelligence activities are the detection and reporting of intelligence data from the United States (U. S.) citizens, the military, political, and economic or U. S. coalition allies. When it comes to the simulation, it would have been better to isolate the sources due to the fact I&W perspicacity assessments would have been provided. It would withal have kept the recognition and bolstered the focus wanted to identify threat precautionary occasions and activities.

The I&W method examines and integrates tasks and up-to-date data, as demonstrated in the simulation. The assessment process has begun once these facts and tasks have been recognized, examined and incorporated. The chance of harmful activities provided congruent caution, which typically counteracted and reduced the outcome. The focus of I&W has been translated on each caliber, identifying the most specific operational and strategic dimensions. In all dimensions, I&W rely on suggestions from every source. The integration and response engineering of perception were designed to fulfill the preconditions. The local government capacity could assist the situation and would have identified essential areas that might have better isolated the sources. It might once have been better prepared and more quickly reacted. Although the DHS, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) participated, they must also be notified to the DHS Office for Intelligence and Analysis (I&A) as it supports I&W to the Homeland Security Advisory System (NTAS). NTAS assess the extent of the terrorist practice in the U. S., (Security, n. d.) coordinates DHS segments, other agencies, local government and non-public sector statistics related to terrorist activity. I&A fixes on the safety hazards at the frontier, such as the hazards of chemical, biological, radiological or atomic warfare (CBRN). (Gortney 2012, pp. 168)  It presents withal vital bulwark infrastructure, naturally irresistible infections, extremists within the U. S., and people entering the country. The Defense Intelligence Agency 2 (DIA) may have isolated the sources better since they focus on strengthening the sources of insight in the development of political insight, showing and providing protection strategy prospects and providing I&W of manageable emergencies. (Gortney 2012, pp. 172)

Bioterrorism is especially intangible and has delayed effects, such as that used in the simulation, punishing those who use it to instill fear and disorder among the unfortunate victims and to escape undetected. A bioterrorism attack not only caused sickness and decreased in massively hapless victims but also precipitated fear, panic, and incapacitation. (Riedel 2004, pp. 400-406). The terrorist attack killed and was based on revenge; government experts broke down, and reactions were emasculated. Incredible time, effort and funding are spent by the U. S., Canada, and the European Union (EU) in order to fight another potential terrorist attack. These three are ready, regardless of what kind or threat of terrorist attacks they occur. Every terrorist attack like the one conducted in the simulation may be catastrophic. The US, Canada, and the EU’s strategies are all adversely affected by preparation and aversion. The main focus of the creation of a global defense strategy is bioterrorism avoidance. Prevention of bioterrorism leads to early disclosure and promotes treatment for the disease. In an auxiliary aversion with the aid of the interest in the perception and divulgation of diseases and the official denotation of the use of organic weapons, the therapeutic community postulates a crucial role. (Riedel 2004, pp. 400-406) Data sharing is the essential step in prevention, as is much intelligence.

The EU

The EU has four priorities in the effective fight against terrorism, according to the EU Counter-Terrorism Strategy (EUR-Lex i32375-EN). The focus of technology is obviation, the pursuit of bulwarks and replication. This method was used to replicate the ongoing terrorist threat in Europe. Like the US, terrorism is a genuine risk for democracy, the rule of law and human rights in the EU. The operations of law enforcement related to terrorist threats and activity. It is essential that the EU focus on counter-terrorism. The key to preserving harmony and security is not over. This would also include the general rule of law and democracy to protecting it from terrorism. (Strasbourg, 2018) In future, the EU has the necessary means of avoiding and combating terrorism. The EU’s strategy on terrorism is simple. The Council of Europe has helped to develop and consolidate basic legal requirements for the avoidance and abolition of terrorist acts. (Blog, 2017) Terrorism in the EU affects every angel. The challenges were identified and an action plan developed. As noted above, the EU Strategy Against Terrorism has been included. The Directive is no longer in force and has been incorporated in the Record of Passengers (PNR). This involves the systematic collection, use, and maintenance of individual statistics about the peregrinators of providers, including dates and agendas, contact details and payment statistics. They have also introduced legislation to oversee EU decisions and have created a blacklist to prevent radicalization and have created better legislation to enhance their efforts to fight terrorism, cyber-crimes and various terrorist crimes.

Canada

Canada, like the EU, has taken every step to combat terrorism. The Counter-Terrorism Strategy of Canada is defined to prevent, detect, deny, and respond. (Towes, 2013) Canada is at the forefront of worldwide anti-terrorism and threatening efforts in the community. Strategy, Building Resilience Against Terrorism has set its standards for key terrorist areas. Their approach to dealing with global and domestic terrorism is simple. As a guide to fighting terrorism, Canada’s approach is implemented. Canada favors not only to bulwark its citizens but also to combat global terrorism in its strategy. In the future, Canada has obligatory assets to prevent and combat terrorism. Strategy, Building Resilience Against Terrorism focuses its focus on Canadian law enforcement, safety, and IC around a crucial possible goal. It provides a regular basis for verbalizing the methodology and core values of Canada. It serves to establish future priorities for countering terrorism. Finally, periodic review works while the concepts of the terrorist risk are considered routinely.

The U. S.

In contrast to EU and Canada, the U. S. is the anti-terrorist bellwether for the ecumenical support not only of their citizens. The U. S. has the necessary resources in the future to avoid and counter-terrorism. The President of the U. S. has made a promise to their citizens. The promise, which is never forgotten or misunderstood, is to keep every American’s protected and secure. Trump 2018, pp. 1) The U. S. elimination, obviation, recognition and response shall be determined by the national safety strategy for counter-terrorism. The U. S. after 9/11 learned a precious lesson. Efforts to stop measures against terrorism, protect the homeland, build vigorous borders, secure infrastructure and rely on allies to degrade and maintain the pressure on terrorists. The U. S. National Security Strategy for Counter-terrorism is laid not only bulwark their citizens but to provide assistance all over the globe. The U. S. feels vigorous when they are acting in accordance with their strategy. (Trump 2018, pp. 21)  The U. S. maintains all information of terrorist; the U. S understands the felicitous environment in which explicit terror and counter-terrorism practices are established. It identifies and accumulates utilizable information when indispensable. The U. S. substratum for investigating the viability of counter-terrorism efforts perpetuates in comparative and different contexts to provide insight into future fundamental leaderships as the hazards evolve in incipient areas.

Conclusion

One significant result of the rise of terrorist acts is the World War on Terror, in particular, Islamic extremist groups. All three countries mentioned have compulsory assets in the future to avoid and counter-terrorism. Since 9/11, the tipping point for counter-terrorism for all countries, a large number of countries has spent time, time and money on counter-terrorism strategies. It is difficult for Campbell to assess evidence on counter-terrorism strategies globally based on the Campbell Systematic Review findings. (Lum, Kennedy, & Sherley, 2006) The efforts of all nations have even increased to a much higher degree with an assessment of the Campbell Systematic Review. Fighting terrorism will continue to be a rule of uncertainty. Preparation and obviation are the way forward for all nations. The only way to sustain terrorism is to alter and take considerable account of the popularity and replicas of terrorist threats. Given viable dangers, the possibility of terrorist attacks should be reported formally by national strategic objectives and their back-up premise. Terrorist threats continue to transmute, and our political discourse suggests that because of the lack of assets, responsibility or facility, our sensitivity is fundamental. Furthermore, security efforts should be continued for assessment on a high level of risk. It can be concluded that although we are not 100% sure of the war on terror, today we are safer than ever before.
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