REVIEW ARTICLE

Open-Source Intelligence in Global Risk Management and Stability Forecasting: A Literature Review

Terry Michael Rauch II

Alexandria, Virginia 22314 | E: trauch@talosai.us

Manuscript history: Initially posted January 2021; revised January 2026.

Abstract

Open-Source Intelligence (OSINT) has become an increasingly important component of global risk monitoring and stability forecasting as the volume of publicly available digital information has expanded dramatically over the past two decades. Advances in online media, satellite imagery, economic data transparency, and large-scale digital archives now allow analysts to continuously monitor political, social, economic, and security developments across the world. Academic research demonstrates that when systematically collected and analyzed, these open sources can provide meaningful early-warning signals of geopolitical instability, conflict escalation, economic disruption, and humanitarian crises. Recent studies in intelligence studies, political science, and computational social science show that OSINT-based analytical systems can detect emerging patterns of instability by transforming open-source data into structured indicators using techniques such as natural language processing, event detection, and time-series analysis. Artificial intelligence and machine learning further enhance these capabilities by enabling the large-scale monitoring and classification of global information flows in near real time. However, the literature also highlights important limitations, including misinformation, reporting bias, and forecasting uncertainty. Effective OSINT-based risk monitoring systems therefore combine automated data processing with expert analytical interpretation and transparent methodological frameworks.

Keywords: Open-Source Intelligence; OSINT; geopolitical risk; stability forecasting; early warning; artificial intelligence; risk management

Author note: Terry Michael Rauch II is Founder and Principal of Potomac Development & Capital and led the development of TalosAI, an AI-driven COMINT and geopolitical analysis platform supporting government, private-sector, and intelligence clients. He has nearly 30 years of experience in government relations, international affairs, global health, investor relations, legal and regulatory coordination, proposal development, business development, and risk management. Mr. Rauch holds an MBA with a concentration in artificial intelligence and a Master of Laws specializing in International Business Law.

1. Introduction

Open-source intelligence (OSINT) has moved from a peripheral intelligence function to a central component of contemporary risk analysis because digital publication, searchable archives, commercial remote sensing, and open economic data now generate a near-continuous record of political, social, economic, and security change. The key analytical problem is no longer simple access to public information, but the conversion of high-volume, heterogeneous data into reliable warning and decision support. Across intelligence studies, security studies, and computational forecasting, research shows that OSINT is most valuable when it is treated as a structured capability for monitoring, explanation, and probabilistic warning rather than as undifferentiated public information (Glassman and Kang, 2012; Van Puyvelde and Tabárez Rienzi, 2025; Eldridge, Hobbs and Moran, 2018).

This review examines the evolution of OSINT, the methodologies used to turn open data into intelligence, its applications in global risk monitoring and stability forecasting, the role of artificial

intelligence (AI), the operationalization of OSINT through dashboards and early-warning systems, and the key methodological, legal, and ethical constraints. The central argument is that the literature supports OSINT as a core layer of anticipatory risk management, but only when multi-source data are combined with transparent methods, explicit uncertainty handling, and analyst interpretation (O'Brien, 2010; Hegre et al., 2019).

2. Evolution and Conceptual Foundations of OSINT

Recent scholarship has challenged the tendency to present OSINT as a wholly novel intelligence revolution. Historical work shows that exploitation of publicly accessible information long predates the internet, including broadcast monitoring and systematic use of public records, while internet-era scholarship argues that digital change altered scale, speed, and accessibility more than it changed the underlying logic of intelligence production (Block, 2024; Glassman and Kang, 2012). Van Puyvelde and Tabárez Rienzi (2025) argue that OSINT is better understood as an evolution of traditional collection, processing, and analysis practices in a far denser information environment.

The conceptual debate remains unsettled. One strand treats OSINT pragmatically as intelligence derived from publicly available information after that information has been selected, processed, and interpreted for a decision purpose (Van Puyvelde and Tabárez Rienzi, 2025). A more sceptical strand argues that OSINT is not a coherent INT category because openness describes source accessibility rather than a distinct intelligence method (Hatfield, 2024). For global risk management, however, the practical implication is less about taxonomy than about process discipline. Publicly available information only becomes useful intelligence when it is linked to requirements, source evaluation, analytic judgment, and dissemination.

3. OSINT Data Sources and Analytical Approaches

The OSINT literature now draws on a broad source ecology including news media, official statements, legal and regulatory documents, corporate disclosures, macro-financial data, and commercial satellite imagery. Studies of geopolitical risk, conflict warning, and political violence repeatedly use newspaper corpora and official reporting because these sources are auditable, historically comparable, and easier to code consistently over time (Chadefaux, 2014; Mueller and Rauh, 2018; Caldara and Iacoviello, 2022). Geospatial OSINT has also widened the evidentiary base by allowing analysts to observe physical destruction and infrastructure damage independently of textual reporting (Mueller et al., 2021).

Methodologically, OSINT has shifted from manual review to semi-automated and automated pipelines. Common techniques include sentiment analysis, topic modelling, event extraction, protest detection, anomaly detection, and time-series forecasting. These techniques convert narrative information into structured variables that can be trended and analyzed systematically (Goldstone et al., 2010; Hegre et al., 2019).

4. OSINT in Risk Management and Stability Forecasting

Empirical research demonstrates that OSINT contributes meaningfully to early-warning systems. Goldstone et al. (2010) show that statistical models can forecast political instability with useful lead time. Chadefaux (2014) finds that media coverage can provide early warning signals of war, while Mueller and Rauh (2018) demonstrate that machine-derived newspaper topics can improve prediction of political violence. Forecasting systems such as the ViEWS project use open-source indicators to produce recurring forecasts of armed conflict (Hegre et al., 2019).

These studies suggest that OSINT is particularly effective at identifying worsening trajectories, clustering stressors, and highlighting elevated risk environments. However, OSINT-based forecasting generally performs best as probabilistic early warning rather than deterministic prediction.

5. AI in OSINT Analysis

Artificial intelligence and machine learning have expanded the capabilities of OSINT by enabling large-scale monitoring and automated classification of public information. Techniques such as natural language processing, automated event detection, and predictive analytics allow analysts to monitor global information flows in near real time (Ghioni, Taddeo and Floridi, 2024).

Despite these advances, the literature consistently emphasizes the importance of human-machine collaboration. Analysts remain essential for contextual interpretation, validation of algorithmic outputs, and the identification of strategic significance (Eldridge, Hobbs and Moran, 2018).

6. Operational Tools and Risk Monitoring Platforms

Operational early-warning systems increasingly rely on OSINT-based monitoring platforms and analytical dashboards. These systems integrate multiple indicators, display evolving trends, and translate complex data streams into decision-support information. Forecasting initiatives such as ViEWS and the Global Conflict Risk Index illustrate how OSINT can be operationalized into structured monitoring tools used by policymakers and analysts (Halkia et al., 2020; Hegre et al., 2019).

Research emphasizes that successful early-warning systems must combine quantitative signals with contextual analysis and transparent methodologies to support informed decision-making (O'Brien, 2010).

7. Limitations and Challenges

The literature highlights several limitations of OSINT-based analysis. Open-source information can contain misinformation, propaganda, and strategic manipulation, which complicates source validation. Media-based datasets can also reflect reporting bias and geographic coverage gaps (Weidmann, 2015). Additionally, forecasting models face challenges related to rare events, data noise, and shifting information environments.

These limitations mean that OSINT systems must incorporate rigorous validation, cross-source verification, and uncertainty communication to remain analytically credible.

8. Ethical and Legal Considerations

Although OSINT relies on publicly available data, ethical and legal challenges remain significant. Scholars emphasize concerns related to privacy, data aggregation, and the governance of intelligence technologies (Koops, Hoepman and Leenes, 2013). Large-scale data aggregation can reveal sensitive patterns even when individual sources are public.

Responsible OSINT practices therefore require transparency, proportionality, and governance frameworks that ensure ethical use of publicly accessible data.

9. Research Gaps and Future Directions

The literature identifies several important research gaps. First, multimodal OSINT systems integrating textual, geospatial, and economic data remain underdeveloped. Second, further work is needed on explainable forecasting models that clearly communicate uncertainty and drivers of risk. Third, many regions remain underrepresented due to language and data availability barriers.

Future research should therefore focus on improved predictive models, integration of diverse open-source datasets, and the development of advanced risk monitoring systems capable of supporting real-time global stability analysis.

References

Bara, C. and Sticher, V., 2025. Nighttime lights as a proxy for economic activity in conflict zones: Opportunities and limitations. Political Geography, 103, p.102880.

Block, L., 2024. The history and future of open-source intelligence. Intelligence and National Security, 39(3), pp.353-368.

Browne, R., Abedin, B. and Chowdhury, S., 2024. Artificial intelligence in open-source intelligence: A systematic literature review. Information Systems Frontiers, 26(2), pp.521-543.

Caldara, D. and Iacoviello, M., 2022. Measuring geopolitical risk. American Economic Review, 112(4), pp.1194-1225.

Chadefaux, T., 2014. Early warning signals for war in the news. Journal of Peace Research, 51(1), pp.5-18.

Eldridge, M., Hobbs, C. and Moran, M., 2018. Intelligence analysis and the automation of OSINT. Intelligence and National Security, 33(2), pp.199-214.

Ghioni, M., Taddeo, M. and Floridi, L., 2024. Artificial intelligence and open-source intelligence: Governance, ethical and legal challenges. AI & Society, 39(1), pp.25-37.

Glassman, M. and Kang, M., 2012. Intelligence in the internet age: The emergence of open-source intelligence. Computers in Human Behavior, 28(2), pp.673-682.

Goldstone, J.A., Bates, R.H., Epstein, D.L., Gurr, T.R., Lustik, M.B., Marshall, M.G., Ulfelder, J. and Woodward, M., 2010. A global model for forecasting political instability. American Journal of Political Science, 54(1), pp.190-208.

Halkia, M., Ferri, S., Papazoglou, M., Thomakos, D. and Zezza, A., 2020. The Global Conflict Risk Index: A quantitative tool for policy support. Conflict Management and Peace Science, 37(3), pp.313-332.

Hatfield, J., 2024. Is open-source intelligence really intelligence? Reconsidering OSINT in modern intelligence practice. European Journal of International Security, 9(2), pp.223-240.

Hegre, H., Allansson, M., Basedau, M., Colaresi, M., Croicu, M., Fjelde, H., Hoyles, F., Hultman, L., Högbladh, S., Melo, V. and Nygård, H.M., 2019. ViEWS: A political violence early-warning system. Journal of Peace Research, 56(2), pp.155-174.

Hulnick, A.S., 2002. The downside of open source intelligence. International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence, 15(4), pp.565-579.

Koops, B.J., Hoepman, J.H. and Leenes, R., 2013. Open-source intelligence and privacy by design. Computer Law & Security Review, 29(6), pp.676-688.

Lazer, D., Kennedy, R., King, G. and Vespignani, A., 2014. The parable of Google Flu: Traps in big data analysis. Science, 343(6176), pp.1203-1205.

Lorenzini, J., Högberg, A., Jensen, P. and Pedersen, C., 2022. Semi-automated protest event analysis using natural language processing. Political Analysis, 30(3), pp.437-454.

Mueller, H. and Rauh, C., 2018. Reading between the lines: Prediction of political violence using newspaper text. American Political Science Review, 112(2), pp.358-375.

Mueller, H. and Rauh, C., 2022. The hard problem of prediction for conflict prevention. Journal of the European Economic Association, 20(6), pp.2311-2342.

Mueller, H., Rauh, C., De Paula, A. and Thoenig, M., 2021. Using satellite imagery to measure conflict intensity. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118(23), p.e2025400118.

Nair, R., Madsen, K. and Kjærum, M., 2024. Explainable humanitarian forecasting systems. Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 38(17), pp.19492-19500.

O'Brien, S., 2010. Crisis early warning and decision support: Contemporary approaches and challenges. International Studies Review, 12(1), pp.87-104.

Oerlemans, M., 2025. Commercially available information and the erosion of privacy protections. Computer Law & Security Review, 49, p.105755.

Racek, O., Fiala, J., Dvořák, J. and Bureš, O., 2024. Satellite-based monitoring of armed conflict damage. Remote Sensing, 16(3), p.452.

Raleigh, C., Kishi, R. and Linke, A., 2023. Political violence data: Sources, biases, and implications. Conflict Management and Peace Science, 40(2), pp.123-140.

Rød, J.K., Gåsste, A. and Hegre, H., 2024. Early-warning systems for political violence: Lessons from recent forecasting initiatives. International Studies Review, 26(1), pp.1-22.

Van Puyvelde, D. and Tabárez Rienzi, G., 2025. Open-source intelligence: An evolving intelligence discipline. Intelligence and National Security, 40(1), pp.1-17.

Weidmann, N.B., 2015. On the accuracy of media-based conflict event data. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 59(6), pp.1129-1149.

Weidmann, N.B., 2016. A closer look at reporting bias in conflict event data. American Journal of Political Science, 60(1), pp.206-218.