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Introduction #1

• Provide **brief intro** to:

  (i) **contemp. foreign or international intelligence liaison** +

  (ii) **how »››› evaluated** +

  (iii) subseq. **taken forward**.

• **Overview = possible:**

  ‣ ‘The term “intelligence liaison” is expansive. It offers synonymy with the interchangeable terms “intelligence cooperation”, “intelligence sharing”, “intelligence pooling”, “intelligence alliance”, “intelligence collaboration”, “intelligence integration”, “intelligence fusion”, “intelligence access” and “intelligence exchange”.’
• General definition of ‘intelligence liaison’ = consists of:

  ‣ *relevant communication, cooperation and linkage between a range of actors*, usually at (but not limited to) the official intelligence agency level, *on intelligence matters* – essentially *exchanging or sharing information*, particularly of *military and/or political value*, and which especially (and purposefully) relates to national (extending to global, via regional) security (threats [also encompassing at their most broad, the full-spectrum of ‘issues-problems-hazards-to-risks’ confronted]).

  ‣ *It also includes: usually secret* (covert and/or clandestine), [(and frequently, although not exclusively - as also included are private and sub-/non-state actor contributions)] *state activity conducted by specialized ‘intelligence’ institutions [(or organisations)] to understand or influence entities.*
Introduction #3

• IL = id. + declared >>> ‘essential nav. tool’

• Helps full-spec. of DEF + SEC (inc. LAW ENF) find directions + pathways forward:

  - e.g. thru contemp. contexts of GSR + during burgeoning MFOs-SpecOps/ SOs.
Introduction #4

• ‘International intelligence liaison’, tech. further divisible:

  (a) **bilateral** – two parties involved;

  (b) **trilateral** – three parties involved;

  (c) **multilateral** – when 4+ parties (inc. ‘hub-and-spokes’); +

  (d) **plurilateral. = bilateral to multilateral, betw. diff. forms parties:**

    - e.g. **EU + the USA** (resp. supranational entity + state)

• Long-standing IIL >>> **grown expon.** in early C.21st.
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IIL core characteristics

• Today = enhanced efforts towards ‘theorising’ IIL

• Improved understandings >>> so better operational-to-strategic use.

• Many ways complex IIL >>> concept. + then eval.

• As follows:

  1. a ‘multi-level perspective’ is adopted;

  2. is a ‘systems approach’ towards its evaluation.
Adopting a **multi-level perspective #1**

- **Soph. appr. to analysis** (‘*what is it?*) + **assess** (‘*so what?, why?* + ‘*what does it mean?*) freq. >>>‘multi-level’.

- Efforts = **most note War Studies** + no except.>>> eval. IIL.

- **Multi-levels = helpful >>> model + theorise IIL**

- **Many aims >>> impr. knowledge + practical guide:**
  
  - e.g. to both operators + to other, higher + strategic-ranging, decision-makers.
Adopting a **multi-level perspective #2**

- 8 diff., yet interrelated, levels of activity + experience = identified.

- Each offer **many diff. insights** >>> subseq. used for **analysis + engineering**

- Range from *‘high’ + ‘macro’* to *‘low’ + ‘micro’*. 
Adopting a multi-level perspective #3

- IIL 8x Levels of activity + experience:
  1. Ideological
  2. Theoretical
  3. Strategic
  4. Policy
  5. Operational
  6. Tactical
  7. Individual (as 'professional')
  8. Personal

- + ack. INT+SEC ‘reach’ concepts >>> ‘under-reach’ + ‘over-reach’

- Overall >>> need realise ‘optimised reach balance(s)’ in INT+SEC enterprises.

- cf. A.D.M. Svendsen, Understanding the Globalization of Intelligence (2012), e.g. p.12, etc., + A.D.M. Svendsen, The Professionalization of Intelligence Cooperation (2012)
Advancing a systems approach to evaluation #1

- IIL = far, wide, + deep-ranging phenom.
- Eludes simple, quick + easy characterisation
- Also responds well to eval. both systematically + systemically
  - esp., when taken as ‘whole’, more holistic-extending manners towards comprehensive unpacking.
- Perhaps: ‘[m]ore fundamentally, eight [system(-ic/-atic)] attributes or variables provide useful criteria that can be employed for benchmarking + theory-testing’ purposes
- Inc. >>> better meet management, accountability + oversight aims
- Equally extends to other INT contexts/phenomena to world politics more widely beyond.
Advancing a **systems approach** to evaluation #2

- IIL 8x closely interrelated, systemic attributes or variables:
  1. internal influences/factors;
  2. rationale;
  3. types and forms;
  4. conditions and terms;
  5. trends;
  6. functions;
  7. external influences/factors; +
  8. effects and outcomes.

Advancing a **systems approach** to evaluation #3

- Systemic attributes or variables >>> benefit explored + then harnessed.

- **Valuable** - esp. as overall ‘age of systems’ = readily anticipated into future

- **Serve as ‘analytic filters’: accept + reject at least aspects of the other bodies of theory + approaches consulted.’**

- *Process of theory-testing = effective way of trying to better explain IL, + better answer *why* it occurs.*

- Both **improved analysis + then management of risks experienced + encountered** = equally advanced.
IIL = not only ‘one’ or a ‘single’ system, so…

• Dev. SoS or ‘federation of systems’ approaches equally have relevance.

• Demo. with ref. to the use in INT domains of (amongst others) - e.g.:
  ‣ PMESII - as used by NATO;
  ‣ PESTLE - as employed in EUROPOL;
  ‣ STEEP(L) - as freq. adopted in ‘business INT’ contexts;
  ‣ HSCB + DIME - as both used in the US Military.
International intelligence liaison processes

• IIL + assoc. ‘business’ - activities, interactions, etc = subject to **undergoing many processes**.

• Again, characteristic >>> **diverse guiding + framing theories** = drawn on during eval.
  
    • e.g. inc. evolving ‘**business process management**’ (BPM) approaches.

• Three major IIL processes >>> highlighted:

  (i) ‘regionalisation’;

  (ii) ‘globalisation’; +

  (iii) ‘professionalisation’.
IIL processes #1:
‘Regionalisation’ (a)

- **Incr. wider trends** >>> ‘regionalisation of INT’.

- Perhaps **manifested most notably in Europe** >>>
  at least aspects dev. in other regions:
    - e.g. Asia, Latin America + the Middle East.

- **Longer-ranging trends**, over years - esp.
  post-9/11 - **CTism = main (but not only) driver**.

- Diverse, variously **overlapping arrangements** >>>
evolved.

- Collectively >>> **form of regional INT coverage +
  INT + SEC reach** = in deliv. + prod. of effects +
  outcomes that = generally satisfactory.
IIIL processes #1: ‘Regionalisation’ (b)

- How arrangements + assoc. networks overlap + complement each another = important

- Account for connections, + notably ‘disconnects’, that >>> publicly come to attention.

- Thru strategy/policy-lenses: conclusion still >>> ‘Room for tidying remains’

- Ample scope for future further movements >>> advanced
  - e.g. reinforced: recent terrorist attacks in Paris on 13 November 2015 + Brussels on 22 March 2016, etc.

- When overlaps = better ack., ‘regionalisation of INT’ trends = not alone, also >>> ‘globalised’ realms.
IIL processes #2: ‘Globalisation’ (a)

• ‘Globalisation’ >>> many contested meanings in IIL context.

• Analytical challenge = to adequately cover all dimensions + implics, without >>> more distracted by overwhelming noise.

• My thesis:

  ‣ manifest as a proactive response to familiar general long-term historical trend, recently more rapidly accelerated, of: (i) ‘globalization writ large’ (essent. what we generally understand by the term ‘globalization’…); + (ii) impact of ‘globalization on intelligence’ – most notably the influence of all of globalization’s well-known ‘nasties’, felt esp. post-1989 + after the Cold War…; (iii) ‘globalization of intelligence’, occurring esp. in early C21st + post-9/11 >>> discerned…
IIL processes #2: ‘Globalisation’ (b)

Moreover:

- Arg. = most direct manifest. of ‘INT + globalization’, inc. delv. most deeply into what globalization means for INT, the globalization of intelligence = emerging thru mech. of enhanced IIL, + facil. by devs occurring both within + beyond those arrangements.

- Process inc. factors - e.g. ‘INT + SEC reach dynamics’ … + developments extending beyond merely the regionalization of intelligence processes, inc. overlapping with ‘glocalization’ (where ‘local’ + ‘global’ messily connect)…

- Not only been largely an ‘Anglo-American’ story >>> other countries across World = simult. involved.
IIL processes #3: ‘Professionalisation’ (a)

- Perhaps most controversial = claim that ‘a process along the lines of “professionalization” >>> identified effectively’ viz. IIL.

- Arg. ‘both structural + cultural dimensions = clearly involved during “professionalization”’;

- = empirically observed within the domain of IIL, + when exam. the INT-related contexts beyond.
IIL processes #3: ‘Professionalisation’ (b)

- Contemporary IIL = shaped by some interesting, debate-provoking trends >>> deserving of further analysis + consid.
  - e.g. through employment of more specific case studies.

- Overarching: **striking effectively balanced conditions** of ‘optimised (INT+SEC) reach’ in INT enterprises (missions + operations), inc. liaison = key.
Conclusions #1

• **Many different criteria** >>> deployed relating to IIL.

• Also **relevant to wider INT + assoc. enterprises, + their subseq. eval.**

• **Further analytical distinctions = helpful for management + governance** - e.g.:

  1. **What are the differences between ‘information’ + ‘intelligence’;**
  2. **the type(s) of intelligence involved – SIGINT, HUMINT, OSINT, etc.;**
  3. **the different forms intelligence can take** – is it ‘raw’ or ‘finished’ + ‘processed’ intelligence, ‘single-source’ or ‘all-source’, analysis (‘what is it?’) or assessment (UK) + estimate (US) (‘what does it mean?’) product?
  4. **(a) purpose:** what is it needed for – ‘strategy’ and ‘policy’ or ‘tactical’ + ‘operational’ purposes? + **(b) Relevance:** Thereby, is it operationally-viable, actionable + ‘serious’ intelligence, or is it more ‘sanitized’ intelligence, in order to better protect sources + methods, for strategic + decision-making purposes?;
Conclusions #2

• Further analytical distinctions, continued…

5. **how is the intelligence access, sharing or exchange occurring** – is it ad hoc (conducted on a ‘need to know’ basis) or more regularized + institutionalized (conducted on a ‘need to share and pool’/’use’ basis), formal or informal?

6. **when is the intelligence access, sharing or exchange taking place** – for instance, is it **a priori** (before events, in an attempt to pre-empt + prevent them) or **post facto** (in the context of post-event investigations); +

7. **where is the intelligence access, sharing or exchange taking place** – for example, is it in an organization at headquarters level, more in the field in ‘operational commands’, + is the location equipped with ‘Sensitive Compartmentalized Information Facilities’ (SCIFs), if such distinctions exist (e.g., in the NATO context)?

• **Specific details soon >>> acquire enhanced importance**

• Clearly **many challenges** concerning IIL exist.
Conclusions #3

- **Essential IIL** persists overall for enabling DEF + SEC (inc. LAW ENF.) practs >>> most viably accomplish grander strategic ends + missions.

- Ideally >>> realised as successfully as possible
  - e.g. in incr. globalised env.s work + engage.

- Allows suff. scope for IIL to act as - even powerful - agent for change in world politics.

- Yet again **necessity concentrates minds + efforts.**
  - esp. as overarching IIL = ‘complex co-existence plurality’ mix - e.g. of ‘hard(er)’ interests +/- to ‘soft(er)’ values + norms

- Overall, IIL = closely assoc. with ‘realist’ thru ‘idealist’/‘lib.inter.’ to ‘critical constructivist’ approaches, with **exact balances + details varying by case.**
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