

SECUGC49: Risk and Contingency Planning: Herve Borrion

View Online



1.

Campbell, S.: Determining overall risk. *Journal of Risk Research*. 8, 569–581 (2005).
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13669870500118329>.

2.

Kaplan, S., Garrick, B.J.: On The Quantitative Definition of Risk. *Risk Analysis*. 1, 11–27 (1981). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.1981.tb01350.x>.

3.

Lowrance, W.W.: *Of acceptable risk: science and the determination of safety*. W. Kaufmann, Los Altos, Calif (1976).

4.

Leitch, M.: ISO 31000:2009-The New International Standard on Risk Management. *Risk Analysis*. 30, 887–892 (2010).

5.

IRM's risk management standard,
<https://www.theirm.org/knowledge-and-resources/risk-management-standards/irms-risk-management-standard/>.

6.

A structured approach to Enterprise Risk Management and the requirements of ISO 31000, https://www.theirm.org/media/886062/ISO3100_doc.pdf.

7.

Willis, H.H.: Guiding Resource Allocations Based on Terrorism Risk. *Risk Analysis*. 27, 597–606 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2007.00909.x>.

8.

Aven, T.: What is a Risk Analysis? In: *Risk Analysis*. pp. 3–15. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470694435.ch1>.

9.

Dowie, J.: *Against Risk*.

10.

A structured approach to Enterprise Risk Management and the requirements of ISO 31000, https://www.theirm.org/media/886062/ISO3100_doc.pdf.

11.

Vose, D.: *Risk analysis: a quantitative guide*. Wiley, Chichester (2008).

12.

Biological Attack Fact Sheet | Homeland Security, <https://www.dhs.gov/publication/biological-attack-fact-sheet>.

13.

Haas, C.N.: The Role of Risk Analysis in Understanding Bioterrorism. *Risk Analysis*. 22, 671–677 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1111/0272-4332.00239>.

14.

J, T., D, M.: The Role of Protection Measures and their Interaction in Determining Building Vulnerability and Resilience to Bioterrorism. *Journal of Bioterrorism & Biodefense*. 04, (2013). <https://doi.org/10.4172/2157-2526.1000123>.

15.

Borrión, H., Mitchener-Nissen, T., Taylor, J., Lai, K.-M.: Countering Bioterrorism: Why Smart Buildings Should Have a Code of Ethics. In: 2012 European Intelligence and Security Informatics Conference. pp. 68–75. IEEE (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1109/EISIC.2012.45>.

16.

Aven, T.: The risk concept—historical and recent development trends. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*. 99, 33–44 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ress.2011.11.006>.

17.

Fitting Hierarchical Holographic Modeling (HHM) into the Theory of Scenario Structuring (ASCE).

18.

Borrión, H.: Quality assurance in crime scripting. *Crime Science*. 2, (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1186/2193-7680-2-6>.

19.

Cornish, D.: The procedural analysis of offending and its relevance for situational prevention.

20.

Aven, T.: Risk Analysis Methods. In: *Risk Analysis*. pp. 57–84. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470694435.ch6>.

21.

Willis, H.H.: Guiding Resource Allocations Based on Terrorism Risk. *Risk Analysis*. 27, 597–606 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2007.00909.x>.

22.

Ezell, B.C., Bennett, S.P., von Winterfeldt, D., Sokolowski, J., Collins, A.J.: Probabilistic Risk Analysis and Terrorism Risk. *Risk Analysis*. 30, 575–589 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01401.x>.

23.

Stirling, A.: Keep it complex. *Nature*. 468, 1029–1031 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1038/4681029a>.

24.

Nissen, T.: Designing for Socially Acceptable Security Technologies, <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1426195/>.

25.

Chemical Attack Fact Sheet | Homeland Security.

26.

Biological Attack Fact Sheet | Homeland Security, <https://www.dhs.gov/publication/biological-attack-fact-sheet>.

27.

IED Attack Fact Sheet | Homeland Security.

28.

Clarke, R.: Hot Products.

29.

Police Got Camera Drones To Control Crime – Best Aerial Photography,
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mwHbEk89kug>, (1) AD.

30.

Police Drone Looking For Criminals with Heat Cameras & AR Drone,
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YfePcliKwWs>, (8) AD.

31.

Air Force Bugbot Nano Drone Technology,
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z78mgfKprdg>, (11) AD.

32.

Tokyo Police intercept active drone by unfurling net,
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RKvf_gpVVU4, (2015).

33.

Home Affairs Committee - BTP Submission to Parliament,
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmhaff/112/112we07.htm>.

34.

Wolff, J.: Railway safety and the ethics of the tolerability of risk,
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.404.6699&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.

35.

Paoli, Letizia: The Harms of Cocaine Trafficking: Applying a New Framework for
Assessment. *Journal of Drug Issues*. 43, 407–436.

36.

Andrew von Hirsch and Nils Jareborg: Gauging Criminal Harm: A Living-Standard Analysis. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*. 11, 1-38 (1991).

37.

Albanese, J.S.: Risk Assessment in Organized Crime: Developing a Market and Product-Based Model to Determine Threat Levels. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 24, 263-273 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986208318225>.

38.

Cohen, M.A.: Pain, Suffering, and Jury Awards: A Study of the Cost of Crime to Victims. *Law & Society Review*. 22, (1988). <https://doi.org/10.2307/3053629>.

39.

Hamilton-Smith, N., Mackenzie, S.: The geometry of shadows: a critical review of organised crime risk assessments. *Policing and Society*. 20, 257-279 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2010.505287>.

40.

Levi, M., Burrows, J.: Measuring the Impact of Fraud in the UK: A Conceptual and Empirical Journey. *British Journal of Criminology*. 48, 293-318 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azn001>.

41.

Tusikov, Natasha: Measuring organised crime-related harms: exploring five policing methods. *Crime, Law and Social Change*. 57, 99-115.

42.

Aven, T., Wiley InterScience (Online service): Risk analysis: assessing uncertainties beyond expected values and probabilities. Wiley InterScience, Hoboken, N.J. (2008).

43.

Ezell, B.C., Bennett, S.P., von Winterfeldt, D., Sokolowski, J., Collins, A.J.: Probabilistic Risk Analysis and Terrorism Risk. *Risk Analysis*. 30, 575–589 (2010).
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01401.x>.

44.

Lefebvre, Mario: *Applied probability and statistics*. Springer, New York (2006).

45.

Zemp, S., Stauffacher, M., Lang, D.J., Scholz, R.W.: Generic functions of railway stations—A conceptual basis for the development of common system understanding and assessment criteria. *Transport Policy*. 18, 446–455 (2011).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2010.09.007>.

46.

Kaplan, S., Haimes, Y.Y., Garrick, B.J.: Fitting Hierarchical Holographic Modeling into the Theory of Scenario Structuring and a Resulting Refinement to the Quantitative Definition of Risk. *Risk Analysis*. 21, 807–807 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1111/0272-4332.215153>.

47.

Gibson, John E., Scherer, William T., Gibson, William F.: *How to do systems analysis*. Wiley-Interscience, Hoboken, N.J. (2007).

48.

Bedford, T., Cooke, Roger M.: *Probabilistic risk analysis: foundations and methods*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2001).

49.

Borrion, H., Mitchener-Nissen, T., Taylor, J., Lai, K.-M.: Countering Bioterrorism: Why Smart Buildings Should Have a Code of Ethics. In: *2012 European Intelligence and Security*

Informatics Conference. pp. 68–75. IEEE (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1109/EISIC.2012.45>.

50.

The Procedural Analysis of Offending and its Relevance for Situational Prevention.