

IR-01-24-29907

12 September 2024

Scott

fyi-request-28159-d81180e8@requests.fyi.org.nz

Tēnā koe Scott

Request for information

Thank you for your Official Information Act 1982 (OIA) request on 23 August 2024 in which you asked for the following information:

This request is for documents relating to the participation of Police staff at the recent New Zealand Institute of Intelligence Professionals annual conference 2024.(...)

ONE: For the speeches, addresses, etc made by Director of National Intelligence Dr Dan Wildy, I would like to request copies of all speech notes, talking points and other presentation materials (e.g. PowerPoint slides) he used.

National Manager Analytics and Operations, John O'Reilly

TWO: For the speeches, addresses, etc made by National Manager Analytics and Operations John O'Reilly, I would like to request copies of all speech notes, talking points and other presentation materials (e.g. PowerPoint slides) he used.

THREE: For any other presentations, speeches, talks, addresses etc made by Police staff at this conference I would like to request copies of all speech notes, talking points and other presentation materials used by these staff.

In response to your request, please find attached speech notes used by Dr Dan Wildy and speech notes and a Powerpoint presentation used by John O'Reilly MNZM at the New Zealand Institute of Intelligence Professionals Annual Conference which took place on 22 August 2024.

I trust this information is of assistance.

Yours sincerely



Dan Wildy PhD
Director National Intelligence
New Zealand Police

Ka tangi te titi, ka tangi te kaka, ka tangi hoki ahau

Tihei mauri ora

E te whare - tēnā koe

E te marae Paremata Aotearoa, tēnā koe

E Papatūānuku a Ranginui, tēnā korua

E te re karanga, tēnā koe

E te iwi tonei, tēnā koutou

E mihi nei ki te karanga, e mihi nei matou, ki te reo mahi heihei mahi, ki te reo kaitiakitanga.

Ko Dan toku ingoa

Ko te tiamana o NZ Institute of Intelligence Professionals ahau

Kia ora koutou katoa

Great turn out / acknowledge the land we are on, the people of the land, and the special venue we once again have the opportunity to host our annual conference within. My thanks to Kura Moeahu for representing mana whenua today, and MP Dan Bidois for sponsoring our use of this iconic location.

Welcome guests / senior officials / and members of the intelligence profession. Today's conference agenda has a number of fantastic speakers. We have already heard from the Director General GCSB, Andrew Clark, and will later hear from the Secretary

and Chief Executive of the Dept of the PM and Cabinet – Ben King. We are grateful to both these leaders for making time as leading public sector figures to share their insights and aspirations for our profession with us today.

We also have other key figures from across the public, private, and tertiary sector, sharing their thoughts on the topic of Demystifying Intelligence. To all our speakers and panellists, thank you. We would not have a conference without you and our professional knowledge is, or will be, richer after hearing your collective experiences and perspectives.

Thank you also to KPMG – our naming sponsor for this event and their generous support of this year's NZIIP Conference. KPMG has for many years been a quiet contributor to intelligence in the public sector, with a depth of experience and appreciation for what we do as a profession.

And thank you to the award-winning team from **Fivecast** for their support also, and I encourage everyone to visit their stand to learn a bit more about the company and their open-source solutions.

At last year's conference I noted that we have a **vibrant and growing profession**. This very much remains the case, with the value of intelligence increasingly recognised, resulting in the expansion of intelligence into new areas of the public and private sector.

While public sector growth has recently slowed in line with reductions in public sector spending, the growth in demand for intelligence has not diminished. While spending may be constrained, the value of intelligence continues to be recognised, with continued growth of the sector likely in the coming years.

Our conference today is a case in point. We sold out of tickets in record time, even in a time of austerity, vacancies, and high workloads. Intelligence remains a dynamic career field: one very much in demand by decision makers, as well as one full of passionate professionals.

With respect to our conference theme today – **Demystifying Intelligence**, I thought I would briefly speak to **NZIIP’s roadmap** and what we are doing as an Institute to support this work and to ensure we are never again described by a serving PM as an arcane niche.

This year’s conference theme – Demystifying Intelligence, aligns closely with the overall aims of NZIIP. This includes to advocate, set standards, and provide stewardship for the profession of intelligence within New Zealand.

To do this effectively, we must be open and transparent about what we do and who we are. Despite some obvious restrictions around our ability to discuss sensitive sources and methods, most

of what we do, most of the time, can be talked about. Further, it *should* be talked about.

We’ve long relied on former intelligence professionals and commentators such as General Michael Hayden, Mark Lowenthal, and John Hughes-Wilson to represent us. But the Public and our leaders want current and contemporary understanding of our roles even if we must be nuanced to protect ours and others’ equities.

Intelligence is fundamentally about supporting better decisions through the provision of robust, reliable, balanced, complete, timely, and accurate, insight and foresight. Kingi Tawhiao Pōtatau Te Wherowhero stated this much in the 19th Century, and little has changed in our leaders’ expectations. And the people who *do* intelligence are values-driven, ethical, and law-abiding New Zealanders committed to making New Zealand a safer, more prosperous, place to live. We should therefore feel comfortable, even confident, about seeking opportunities to demystify what we do.

At a time when public trust in institutions is declining, we need to be more open and transparent. We have a good story to tell. The intelligence profession is diverse and contributes to the public good. We contribute to global security, border security, regulatory compliance, economic security, public safety, digital safety, recovery from natural disasters, national advantage in competitive markets, and much more.

Today's conference provides an opportunity to share some of those stories, and more importantly, to discuss how we can share them more broadly. Not only will sharing enhance public trust in the profession of intelligence, but the institutions we support through the advantage we provide to decision makers.

In terms of what NZIIP has been doing, the last twelve months have been busy. Our membership sits at a health 486 paid members, we've held 14 regional and 4 online events averaging 30 attendees per event, we've gained 443 LinkedIn followers since April this year, been present at career expos, and we've launched a much needed new website.

Coming up later this year, our next virtual event is on *Partnerships in Intelligence* with 96 registered attendees already, another virtual event discussing *Intelligence in Emergency Management*, a Writing Course for Intelligence Analysts, and the Annual Awards and AGM on the 21st of November. Work will also commence shortly on the production of a Regulatory Intelligence Primer, building on the work of the foundations laid by the publishing of the Practitioner's Handbook last year, and recognising the growing importance of this field of Intelligence.

Getting to where we are an Institute has not been easy. In the last two years, we have re-branded, delivered a foundational handbook in Intelligence Practice, established a Code of Ethics, launched a fantastic new website, and expanded our events programme. And

all of this has been done by a small group of volunteers on the NZIIP Board. Each and every board member has gone over and above to support the profession on top of incredibly busy day jobs and personal lives. On behalf of all our members and those present today, I'd like to recognise the Board, and our interns, for their selflessness.

Before closing my introduction, I'd like to speak briefly to two points directly relevant to today's discussion.

The first is on professionalism. Recently, I listened to an episode of *Spycast* which included a discussion on the professionalisation of OSINT as a distinct intelligence discipline. The interviewer remarked how some people assume that because they know how to use the internet and stalk people through social media, this effectively meant they could do OSINT. The guest's retort to this was: "just because you can cook, doesn't make you a chef."

Like being a chef, intelligence is a profession. Just because someone can do a little research and analysis, producing a degree of insight, does not make them an intelligence professional. There is far more to it.

Whether a collector, collator, analyst, or leader, we must have an artisan's mindset. One where we want to be masters of our craft, always learning, always honing and developing, taking on feedback,

and improving – action by action, product by product, lesson by lesson.

Being a professional therefore takes time. A short course, a single qualification, does not make someone expert. Training, time in role, time in different roles, serving in different contexts and environments, leads to deep knowledge and deep knowledge distinguishes the professional from the cook.

That is not to say that someone new to the profession is not professional. What it means is that a commitment to the trade, craft, and ethics of intelligence, with a view to upholding those standards, remaining curious at all times, and being committed to learning at every stage of one's career is what makes someone a professional.

The second point is that if we want to be trusted as a profession, the public must see us as both competent and ethical. NZIIP seeks to contribute to both, offering a fundamentals handbook and ethical code of practice, while also offering training and professional development opportunities. But it requires an all of profession effort.

Today we will here from Antonia Butler on what the NZIC is doing with respect to open and transparent engagement. NZ Police too has been more transparent about who we are and what we do, publishing our National Intelligence Operating Model online and

speaking to key community stakeholders to dispel negative preconceptions of what intelligence is. Police Intel's approach to OIA responses is also forward leaning, often engaging with the requestor directly to determine how we can best support their query, signalling that we are aiming for maximum transparency, while still protecting our equities.

NZIIP certainly has a part to play as advocate for the profession to enhance public trust and confidence. This we will do through our new website and steady improvements in our social media presence to be more visible. But ultimately, it will require an all of profession effort to be more transparent and to tell our stories well, if we want to be widely viewed as competent and ethical.

Demystifying Intelligence is not the job of one organisation or entity, nor will it happen overnight – certainly not in a world where trust is in short supply and misconceptions of intelligence abound. Demystifying Intelligence is a shared responsibility and it will require years to successfully achieve and maintain.

That's enough from me.

Thank you.

Enjoy the conference.

CLOSING

Notes on speakers

Thank you again to all our speakers, panellists, and MCs. This year's conference has traversed a subject critical to the health and success of the Intelligence profession and we are grateful for your contribution.

I would also like to thank all those operating behind the scenes to make today a success. First and foremost, Jack Seabrook for leading the work to make today happen, as well as Josinta Tillet and Matthew Hall who helped coordinate speakers and connecting us with several panellists. Likewise, thank you to Lisa Fong for putting NZIIP in contact with the right people in the NZIC.

To Laila Abada for leading the interns' production of the programme, conference bags, website copy and fliers thank you, and to the interns themselves who do so much for a profession they aspire to be part of in the future.

In terms of location, my thanks to Tara Terry and Cameron Lim from Parliamentary Services.

Special mention must go to Donna McQuaid. Donna has been an absolute revelation for NZIIP this year, championing the website, conference administration, enhancing our public profile, enabling virtual events – basically doing it all to make NZIIP more relevant, accessible, and successful.

Before we close, I'd like to remind everyone of the upcoming NZIIP Annual Awards and AGM on 21 November. Everyday people from across the profession do incredible things in service to New Zealand and New Zealanders. Most of this goes unremarked in the public domain, which is largely how we like it, but as we know, doesn't always set us up for success. The Annual Awards, therefore provide the opportunity for us to celebrate the achievements of our peers and to recognise the best of what we have achieved and contributed in the past 12 months. And for those concerned about their last names or faces being exposed, we have categories and procedures in place to allow for both public and discrete awards to be won.

With respect to the AGM, we are always looking for new people to join the NZIIP Board and will have a number of key positions available later this year. If you're interested, please reach out to me personally, anyone you know on the Board, or through the website.

Finally, thank you all for your time today. It has been a pleasure to catch up with so many colleagues from across the profession. Have a wonderful evening and safe travels home.

NZIIP Fellows Lecture 2024 – John O'Reilly

'Trust, Confidence and Credibility; some important traits for an Intelligence Professional'

Introduction

Kia Ora Tatou

(Thank for introduction)

I have framed this lecture around the qualities of trust, confidence and credibility in the context of demystifying the profession of intelligence. I have chosen these three specific qualities because I consider them to be important enabling factors that promote a greater understanding of what we do. We cannot achieve any of our intelligence outputs without the support of decision makers, our intelligence and non-intelligence colleagues as well as external partners. Initiatives or processes that promote the understanding and demystify the intelligence function through trusted, confidential and credible relationships leads to long term, positive and functional outcomes. This is especially important when working on an operation or activity that involves multiple agencies.

The requirement to educate and promote an understanding of the intelligence function is ongoing, and will never stop. The reason for this is straightforward. You will always encounter new colleagues, decision makers, partners or members of the public who have no or limited exposure to the intelligence function and what it can do for them. It is our role to guide them and give them the information to enable them to contribute to what we do in a constructive manner.

I am sure you have all experienced situations where people are dismissive or slightly disparaging about meeting someone involved with the intelligence function. References to spying and over the top secrecy are commonplace and underline the importance of investing time to educate and demystify what we do.

The best way of promoting the clear understanding of the intelligence function is when it is done in a professional, unsensational manner. There are many misconceptions about the topic of intelligence and these are best dispelled through genuine and honest professional dialogue.

One of the best complements you can pay someone in a work context is that they are 'a professional'. However, there is a difference between 'being a professional' and 'being professional'. 'Being a professional' implies education, training and skills. 'Being professional' has a wider gambit. In addition to skills and expertise, it implies respect. Respect by, and importantly being respectful of, your colleagues, managers and decision makers. An additional implication is an expectation to act ethically and that you will complete a task to the best of your ability or available resources. It is in this wider context of 'being professional' that I will discuss promoting the understanding or demystification of the intelligence function through the application of the qualities of trust, confidence and credibility and how it contributes to positive inter-agency outcomes.

Trust – Whakawhirinaki

The first quality I will discuss is trust. Trust can be defined as 'a firm belief in the reliability, truth, or ability of someone or something'. When I started working at NZ Police four years ago I quickly registered that 'policing by consent' underpinned by 'public trust and confidence' are a fundamental and important tenets for the organisation.

Businessman Kevin Plank describes a successful brand as being built on trust and that 'trust is built in drops and lost in buckets'. Trust in the intelligence function, including yourselves as intelligence professionals, is the same. Trust is built up incrementally overtime and can be eroded very quickly if our decision makers and the wider public do not consider us to be reliable or truthful.

Trust is underpinned by the qualities of: dependability, honesty, humility, being approachable and authentic as well as having an ability to listen, to be respectful and not to betray or belittle information given to us confidentially.

The trust quality of being approachable is an important trait associated with enhancing understanding of the intelligence function. Being approachable means people feel comfortable asking questions about the function, or an incident or situation that potentially has intelligence sensitivities or implications.

I personally learned the importance of trust in the context of intelligence when I served for four years in an Infantry Battalion; an infantry battalion is a fighting Army unit comprising 500-600 soldiers and it largely self-sufficient. Along with fighting soldiers it has dedicated medical, transport, catering, administrative and intelligence sections. All these functions heavily rely on one another; no individual function is more important than another. During the four years with the 2/1 RNZIR I deployed overseas three times into some challenging threats environments around the Asia/Pacific region. Having trusted and functional connections across the whole 600 person unit enabled the intelligence function to quickly tap into relevant threat information and insights to successfully support our commanders and soldiers to achieve our collective mission.

Intelligence is a team sport, not an end unto itself.

The benefits of having trusted relationships with our colleagues and partners, through enhanced levels of understanding of what we do and what we need (usually information and data), are many fold. They include ensuring the intelligence function is involved with any planning early, it is informed early of factors that inform situational awareness of activity or key events, as well as being able to utilise our intelligence connections and networks to effect sector wide intelligence and non-intelligence effects and benefits.

Implicit with these qualities of trust is the expectation to act in an ethical manner. NZIIP has a Code of Ethics that emphasises the special trust placed in our role by the public, decision makers, and the profession itself. To quote from the **NZIIP Code of Ethics:**

'The public place a high degree of trust in the professionals who work in this sector, expecting their activities to be lawful and to contribute to public safety and wellbeing. There is an expectation that intelligence activities will be conducted only when necessary, with effective use of resources, respect for privacy, proportionality, and accountability for mistakes and failures.'

As an aside, I recently attending an Army reunion at Christchurch. I know an Army reunion sounds cliché, but amongst the positive energy of catching up and storytelling, was a discussion with some colleagues where we recalled a complex operation to secure and detain a group of East Timorese militia members who had been violently threatening and taxing defenceless villagers. Upon the successful resolution of this operation the intelligence function was encouraged to unlawfully question the captured detainees. This encouragement was resisted, despite pressure being applied, and the detainees were handed over to the Police and sent to Dili. The thing that struck me about this conversation was not the fact that this complex operation was very successful and was very well executed, but the conversation recalled 24 years after the event how the intelligence function was trusted and acted in an ethical manner.

Confidence - Whakamanawa

The second **quality I will talk about** is confidence, specifically public and organisational confidence. Public and organisational confidence can be defined as '**the feeling** or belief that the public, or an organisation, can have faith in, or rely on someone or something'. This means the public or organisation believe that **the intelligence function** will undertake their role within the bounds of the law, appropriate direction and the resources available. Importantly, in order for the public or an organisation to have faith that the intelligence function will do what they believe to be correct, they need **to broadly understand** what the intelligence function does. This highlights the importance of demystifying what we do as intelligence professionals. This doesn't mean that you reveal sensitive information or compromise operational activity. It means that the intelligence function needs to ensure that the public and their supported organisations broadly understand what intelligence is,

how they function and what are the limitations of their role. NZIIP as well as government organisations which have an intelligence remit or function, all have a responsibility to regularly educate both the public and the wider central and local government sectors.

Sometimes the intelligence products we author include a 'confidence statement'. A confidence statement is usually a judgement about the scope, breadth and quality of information used to inform an assessment. This allows the decision maker or reader to gain a sense about an analyst's confidence in an assessment, or highlight sections of the assessment where there is lesser degree of confidence than other sections. Normally an intelligence function will not release an assessment where it includes a low confidence statement supporting its key judgements. This situation would normally see the unbiased re-tasking of collection of information to increase levels of confidence to inform key judgements prior a report is released. The exception to this is unfolding time critical incident where an assessment needs to be made to inform the initial response. In this situation the shortcomings of the information (a confidence statement) is made clear at the time. My own rule of thumb for a critical incident is that usually 50 percent of the information you initially receive is incorrect; the challenge is working out which 50 percent, especially in the mis/dis-information rich environment we live in. A flow of corroborated factually correct information usually takes 30 minutes or longer depending on the situation.

Variations of the word 'confidence' in an intelligence context are the related terms of 'in confidence' and 'confidential'. These have the meaning that someone is confiding in you or the information being conveyed has privacy, commercial or intelligence sensitivities. Part of the wider education of the public, or within your organisation, about intelligence matters is that sensitive information will be carefully managed and the sources of the information will be protected. This education is important so that people know that they can trust the intelligence function to keep the source safe.

Credibility - Whaimana

The last quality I will discuss is **credibility**. Credibility can be defined variously as: being capable of being believed, **worthy of confidence**, reliable and worthy of other people's trust. You can see that this quality of credibility has a large overlap with the previous two qualities of trust and confidence.

Sometimes you encounter the term 'acting on credible intelligence'. This infers that a decision maker is acting on intelligence where there is a high level of confidence that the information and the analysis is correct. A recent example of the use of this term was from the Canadian Government when it publically stated that had "very credible intelligence that causes us to be deeply concerned" when referring to the assassination of a Sikh activist in Canada.

There is also a cumulative perception component associated with credibility. Organisational teams' academic **Dr Mindy Hall** describes this as 'every action or perceived inaction shapes credibility'.

Essentially, the credibility of the intelligence function is judged by the way we act or don't act. Over time, the public and decision makers make a judgement about how much they trust the function based on what we get right, and importantly, how we are seen to be accountable for any errors in assessment or predictive analysis.

There is also an ethical component associated with being credible. WW2 Army Counter Intelligence Sergeant, and later US Secretary of State, Dr Henry Kissinger describes credibility in **terms of 'the important thing is to do the right thing. Then credibility will follow'**. This statement highlights the close linkage between credibility and intelligence ethics. This is especially important when pressure is placed on an intelligence professional to be all knowing, or potentially situate an intelligence assessment to conform to a convenient narrative that it not supported by applied analysis. It is okay for an intelligence professional to say 'I do not know the answer to that question'. It is also important that decision makers trust their intelligence function to give them credible assessments and intelligence, and that they are not swayed by pressure to please a decision maker or because the intelligence does not support their plans or strategy.

Collaboration – Pāhekoheko – the inter-agency effect

Trust, confidence, and **credibility** also are important factors that support functional inter-agency operations and activity; essentially supporting a systemic approach to intelligence collaboration.

There is nothing better than a well-coordinated inter-agency operation. This is where agencies have a collective clarity of purpose, all agencies are all informed; there is functional coordination and communication between contributing groups, agencies play to their strengths, organisational leads have appropriate resources and approvals to contribute as well as the ability to put aside organisational rivalries to achieve a mission or outcome. Essentially, having the right people with approval to use resources in the room to make progress and get things done.

Conversely, there is nothing worse than a poorly coordinated inter-agency operation. This is a situation where agencies do their own thing without regard for the desired end state, relevant information is not shared with partner agencies, egos undermine mutual trust and confidence and a sense of 'form over substance' is prevalent at inter-agency meetings.

Trust, confidence and credibility are important components in creating a positive culture for an interagency team. This is underpinned by a clarity of purpose including understanding who is the lead agency is, and how do we best support them. Sometimes there is a requirement to constructively support and educate the lead agency about what the intelligence function/community can do to help them to solve or mitigate their problem.

One of the best examples of inter-agency collaboration I can recall relates to a six year long hostage case involving a New Zealand citizen held captive in the Middle East. This was one of the most complex intelligence challenges I have encountered in my career. The complexity of this MFAT led task, essentially to positively identify the hostage and their location in order for plan and prepare

recovery options, meant that a number of New Zealand agencies needed to coordinate and focus the intelligence effort to support both strategic and operational understanding and decision making.

After a period of 'storming and norming' agencies supported MFAT in a manner that allowed the sum of all the intelligence parts to be fused together to create a multi-agency agreed upon assessment of the current situation and to inform decisions about creating operational options.

Each of the supporting intelligence agencies met on a regular basis, communicated in a free and frank manner and acted in way that enhanced mutual trust and confidence in order to create credible intelligence products. Regular communication and coordination around agreeing on priorities to support the lead agency activity was also a hallmark of this inter-agency group.

I would like to acknowledge a number of people in this room worked with on this case. Your efforts created a standard of what very good looks like. Your collaborative efforts also created functional processes that have been applied to subsequent complex inter-agency issues as well as forging functional cross agency networks that remain alive and well today. I am proud to have worked with you and be part of a team that worked on this complex case.

In another previous role at Defence it was my responsibility to draft orders and gain the approvals to undertake sensitive intelligence collection operations in an inter-agencies context. Many of these requests meant that Defence was carrying most of the risk involved. This situation meant that Defence had to confirm the lawful basis to undertake the task, confirm if we had an appropriate capability to do the job and highlight the risks, consequences and mitigations if we supported the inter-agency request. Essentially, is it lawful, can we do it and should we do it. It was my role to walk the documentation through to the Chief of Defence Force to seek their approval for the activity to occur. If it was lawful and we had an appropriate capability, the conversation centred on the risks and confirming that the potential intelligence gained was worth the effort. A significant factor of this discussion with a Chief Executive equivalent was considering 'what is the best for New

Zealand?'. It is this mindset of 'what is the best for New Zealand' that helps provide clarity around how we should act in support of collaborative efforts across the intelligence and security sectors.

Conclusion

I will conclude this brief lecture by highlighting the importance of educating both the public and our decision makers **about** the intelligence function. Essentially reducing people's misconceptions of intelligence. This intelligence understanding includes the **ongoing requirement** to impart knowledge about what we do, why we do it, the legal safeguards in place as well as the ethical standards we hold ourselves accountable to. We have highlighted how trust is hard earned and easily lost. Trust is also underpinned by being both humble and approachable. This allows people and colleagues to reach out for assistance as well as to understand what we do. This materially helps us to do our job; sometimes these people bring us the missing piece of the intelligence puzzle. Public and organisational confidence in the intelligence function is heavily shaped by perceptions of the lawfulness and proportionality of our work, including how we safeguard the people we serve and the information we protect. I also have touched upon credibility. This credibility factor was described in the context of our work being continually judged and its important linkage to ethical imperatives, and not being pressurised to conform to convenient narratives. The **qualities** of trust, confidence and credibility also form a solid bedrock upon which multiple agencies collaborate together as a system to do 'the best for New Zealand'.

Thank you for your attention and I hope some of the ideas I have conveyed resonate with you.

Happy to field questions.

Kia Ora.



New Zealand
**Institute of Intelligence
Professionals**



Trust, Confidence and Credibility - some important traits for an Intelligence Professional

NZIIP Fellows Lecture 2024 – John O'Reilly, MNZM

Introduction

Trust - Confidence - Credibility

Demystifying Intelligence

Being a professional and being professional

The 'inter-agency effect'



Trust

Trust can be defined as ‘a firm belief in the reliability, truth, or ability of someone or something

‘Trust is built in drops and lost in buckets’

- Kevin Plank - Businessman

Trust is underpinned by being dependable, honest, humble, being approachable and authentic as well as having an ability to listen, to be respectful and not to betray or belittle information given to us confidentially.

NZIIP Code of Ethics

‘The public place a high degree of trust in the professionals who work in this sector, expecting their activities to be lawful and to contribute to public safety and wellbeing. There is an expectation that intelligence activities will be conducted only when necessary, with effective use of resources, respect for privacy, proportionality, and accountability for mistakes and failures.’



Confidence

Public and organisational confidence can be defined as ‘the feeling or belief that the public, or an organisation, can have faith in, or rely on someone or something’

The belief that the intelligence function will undertake their role within the bounds of the law, appropriate direction and the resources available.

The public or your organisation need to broadly understand what the intelligence function does.

Credibility

Credibility can be defined variously as: being capable of being believed, worthy of confidence, reliable and worthy of other people's trust.

‘Every action or perceived inaction shapes credibility’

Dr Mindy Hall - Organisational teams’ academic

‘... the important thing is to do the right thing. Then credibility will follow’

Dr Henry Kissinger - US Secretary of State (ex Counter Intelligence Sgt US Army)

Inter-agency Collaboration

Trust, confidence, and credibility also are important factors that support functional inter-agency operations and activity; essentially supporting a systemic approach to intelligence collaboration.

Trust, confidence and credibility are important components in creating a positive culture for an interagency team.

‘What is the best for New Zealand?’

Conclusion

Demystifying and educating both the public and our decision makers about the intelligence function is important

This education is an ongoing responsibility

The qualities of trust, confidence and credibility form the bedrock for inter-agency collaboration





New Zealand
**Institute of Intelligence
Professionals**



Questions?

NZIIP Fellows Lecture 2024 – John O'Reilly, MNZM



New Zealand
**Institute of Intelligence
Professionals**



Trust, Confidence and Credibility - some important traits for an Intelligence Professional

NZIIP Fellows Lecture 2024 – John O'Reilly, MNZM