



17 December 2025

Ref: OIA-2025/26-0323

Tēnā koe [REDACTED],

**Official Information Act request relating to the security clearance for Jevon McSkimming as Deputy Commissioner of Police**

Thank you for your request made under the Official Information Act (the Act), received by the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC) on 14 November 2025. You requested:

*“The request concerns DPMC’s role in Protective Security Requirements (PSR) policy, security-clearance settings, and its interactions with NZSIS, NZ Police, and the Public Service Commission in relation to the appointment of Jevon McSkimming as Deputy Commissioner of Police.*

*DPMC will appreciate the information sought is extensive but this must be balanced against the high level of public interest in this matter.*

*The information sought is [Numbering added]:*

- [1] All documents, briefings, emails or internal notes held by DPMC that reference the security clearance level required for the Deputy Commissioner of Police position;*
- [2] The rationale behind requiring that clearance level;*
- [3] Any risk assessments or threat assessments relevant to determining the clearance requirement;*
- [4] Any reviews or reconsiderations of clearance settings for senior police leadership roles;*
- [5] All information relating to DPMC monitoring or assessment of Police’s compliance with PSR obligations;*
- [6] All correspondence between DPMC and NZSIS relating to clearance settings for senior Police roles;*
- [7] Any issues or concerns raised by NZSIS regarding the completeness or adequacy of information provided by Police during sponsorship of Mr McSkimming;*
- [8] Any briefings DPMC received or requested from NZSIS about vetting policy, process or risk factors relevant to the McSkimming matter;*
- [9] All communications between DPMC and the PSC that relate to the PSC’s handling of the Deputy Commissioner appointment process;*
- [10] Any internal DPMC communications prepared after the release of the IPCA report or the independent PSC review (Dean KC) referencing McSkimming;*
- [11] All material provided by DPMC to Ministers relating to matters related to McSkimming in relation to the IPCA report or the PSC review.”*

We wrote to you on 28 November 2025 advising you that your request as it related to to the relevant 2023 Cabinet Appointments and Honours Committee paper together with parts 2, 3, and 4 of your request had been transferred to the Public Service Commission Te Kawa

Mataaho (PSC). Part 7 of your request was transferred to the New Zealand Security Intelligence Service (NZSIS).

On 9 December 2025, we wrote to you extending the time limits for response by 7 working days, to 23 December 2025. The additional time was needed to complete consultations before a final decision was made on your request. I am now in a position to respond.

### Information being released

Please find attached emails and one attachment identified as relevant to your request as set out in the table below.

Item	Date	Document description	Decision
Item 1	7/11/2025	Draft comms material - IPCA report release <i>Attachment:</i> NZSIS – draft communications material – IPCA report	Release with some information withheld under: s6(a) s9(2)(a) s9(2)(g)(i)
Item 2	11/11/2025	FW: Release of the IPCA report	Release with some information withheld under: s6(a) s9(2)(g)(i)
Item 3	12/11/2025	FW: IPCA report - questions to NZSIS	Release with some information withheld under: s6(a) s9(2)(a)

As noted in the table above and on the documents themselves, some information has been withheld under the following sections of the Act:

- section 6(a), to protect the security or defence of New Zealand or the international relations of the Government of New Zealand.
- section 9(2)(a), to protect the privacy of individuals.
- section 9(2)(g)(i), to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the free and frank expression of opinion.

### Information withheld in full

The following documents have been identified in scope of your request, which I have decided to withhold in full.

Date	Title or description of document	Withheld under sections
3/11/2025	<i>DPMC Briefing:</i> Government Response to the IPCA Report on Police Handling of Complaints against Jevon McSkimming	Withheld under s6(a) s9(2)(g)(i) s9(2)(h)
11/11/2025	Talking points for the Attorney-General for Cabinet item	Withhold in full under: s6(c) s9(2)(f)(ii) s9(2)(f)(iv) s9(2)(g)(i) s9(2)(h)

As noted in the table above, these documents have been withheld under the following sections of the Act:

- section 6(a), to protect the security or defence of New Zealand or the international relations of the Government of New Zealand.
- section 6(c), to protect the maintenance of the law, including the prevention, investigation, and detection of offences, and the right to a fair trial.
- section 9(2)(f)(ii), to maintain collective and individual ministerial responsibility.
- section 9(2)(f)(iv), to maintain the confidentiality of advice tendered by or to Ministers and officials.
- section 9(2)(g)(i), to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the free and frank expression of opinion.
- section 9(2)(h), to maintain legal professional privilege.

In addition to the documents listed above, there is some email correspondence identified as having some relevance to your request. These are emails with other agencies as part of the drafting of the DPMC briefing of 3/11/2025.

- section 6(a), to protect the security or defence of New Zealand or the international relations of the Government of New Zealand.
- section 9(2)(g)(i), to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the free and frank expression of opinion.
- section 9(2)(h), to maintain legal professional privilege.

The only other information held by DPMC identified as relevant to your request is a briefing provided by the DPMC's Policy Advisory Group to the Prime Minister. These briefings are provided to the Prime Minister in confidence to support him in his role as leader of the Government and chair of Cabinet. These briefings are withheld in their entirety under the following sections of the Act:

- section 9(2)(f)(ii), to maintain collective and individual ministerial responsibility
- section 9(2)(f)(iv), to maintain the confidentiality of advice tendered by or to Ministers and officials
- section 9(2)(g)(i), to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the free and frank expression of opinion
- section 9(2)(h), to maintain legal professional privilege

Where section 9 of the Act applies, in making my decision, I have considered the public interest considerations in section 9(1) of the Act. No public interest has been identified that would be sufficient to outweigh the reasons for withholding that information.

You have the right to ask the Ombudsman to investigate and review my decision under section 28(3) of the Act.

Nāku noa, nā



Janine Smith  
**Deputy Chief Executive, Policy and Delivery Unit**

**From:** Matt Torbit [DPMC] <Matt.Torbit@dpmc.govt.nz>

**Sent:** Friday, 7 November 2025 4:08 PM

**To:** s9(2)(a): PM's Office

s9(2)(a): Minister of Police's office

s9(2)(a): Minister for the Public Service's office Liesle Theron [DPMC] <Liesle.Theron@dpmc.govt.nz>

**Subject:** Draft comms material - IPCA report release

~~IN CONFIDENCE~~ UNCLASSIFIED

Afternoon everyone,

To round everything out before we go into the weekend, attached are the most current drafts communications material regarding next week's IPCA report release. Note, these documents are all draft and will continue to be amended and updated.

Attached is:

- The Government response press release and questions and answers – note, stand-up scripts are being developed, and Crown Law advice will continue to be sought as wording evolves.
- The IPCA draft press release.
- The New Zealand Police press release – questions and answers are still being developed.
- The Public Service Commission press release and questions and answers.
- New Zealand Security Intelligence Service questions and answers.

Matt

---

[Note: the only attachment to this email relevant to your request is the NZSIS draft communications material]

## NZSIS – draft communications material – IPCA report

### Overarching NZSIS public narrative

Police granted Jevon McSkimming a National Security clearance in 2020 and further clearance in 2023 on the recommendation of NZSIS, following a vetting process conducted by NZSIS. The IPCA did not have access to Mr McSkimming's vetting file, as by law information obtained through the vetting process can only be used for the purpose of the clearance assessment, another clearance assessment or counter-intelligence purposes.

The sole purpose of the National Security clearance process is to determine an individual's suitability to access classified information. It is not a substitute for an employing agency's own recruitment, human resource management or security processes.

Factors taken into account in determining someone's suitability to hold a National Security clearance include their loyalty to New Zealand, their personal relationships and conduct, their financial situation, any drug and alcohol or mental health issues, criminal behaviour and associations with particular groups. The level of scrutiny a vetting candidate is subject to depends on the level of clearance. For the highest clearances this includes a comprehensive disclosure and interview process, information from referees (including the candidate's manager and colleagues) financial and social media checks, and searches against NZSIS' own intelligence holdings.

NZSIS make a recommendation to a sponsoring agency about an individual's suitability to hold a clearance and whether any risk needs to be managed. Once a National Security clearance is granted by a sponsoring agency, individuals have clear obligations to report to that agency any information which may be relevant to their ongoing suitability to hold a clearance, and to enable any risks to be managed. Sponsoring agencies also have responsibilities to ensure their clearance holders adhere to the obligations of holding that clearance.

NZSIS cannot continually monitor all national security clearance holders to identify new or previously unknown risks. Should new relevant information come to its attention, including for example from the sponsoring agency, consideration will be given to any impact that might have on an individual's ongoing clearance.

Minister Collins has asked the Director-General of Security, Andrew Hampton, to provide her with an assurance about the thoroughness of the vetting process for Mr McSkimming, noting the limitations on NZSIS' ability to disclose vetting information.

The Director-General has reviewed this case and taken advice from experts within NZSIS. He considers that NZSIS' processes and final recommendation were appropriate, taking into consideration the information NZSIS had access to, or that it could have lawfully and reasonably obtained, at the time. Those processes included verifying information obtained from Mr McSkimming with referees. The Director-General is satisfied the vetting process was conducted thoroughly and appropriately.

Prior to the IPCA review, NZSIS had already commenced a review of its policy settings for National Security clearances. This is part of its continuous improvement of vetting processes, and in response to the evolving security threatscape. Any relevant information from the IPCA's investigation will be taken into account during this review.

ENDS

**Talking points for Minister from NZSIS – National Security vetting**

- The sole purpose of the National Security clearance process is to determine an individual's suitability to access classified information. It is not a substitute for an employing agency's own processes, including recruitment or human resource management
- I have sought an assurance from the Director-General of Security about the thoroughness of the vetting process for Mr McSkimming, noting the legal limitations on NZSIS' ability to disclose vetting information. The Director-General has reviewed the file himself, and provided me with that assurance.
- The NZSIS takes security vetting seriously and they are very good at it. Particularly at higher clearance levels the vetting process is deep and at times intrusive, which is just how it should be.
- There are clear expectations on security clearance holders to report any information which may be relevant to their ongoing suitability to hold a clearance. This is about their personal responsibility.
- NZSIS cannot continually monitor all national security clearance holders to identify new or previously unknown risks. They do of course consider any new information that comes to their attention, including from the sponsoring agency of a clearance holder.
- The NZSIS had already commenced a review of its policy settings for National Security clearances prior to the IPCA report being published. I welcome this review, which will take into account any relevant information from the IPCA's report.
- If you want more details of what a national security clearance involves then you should talk to the NZSIS – this is an operational process for them.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

**From:** Ben King [DPMC] <Ben.King@dpmc.govt.nz>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 11 November 2025 7:27 pm  
**To:** ELT [DPMC] <DPMCELT@dpmc.govt.nz>  
**Subject:** FW: Release of the IPCA report

~~IN-CONFIDENCE~~ UNCLASSIFIED

s9(2)(g)(i)

Best regards  
Ben

---

**From:** Brian Roche <[Brian.Roche@publicservice.govt.nz](mailto:Brian.Roche@publicservice.govt.nz)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 11 November 2025 7:00 pm  
**To:** Andrew Bridgman <[andrew.bridgman@ot.govt.nz](mailto:andrew.bridgman@ot.govt.nz)>; ^EXT:Andrew Clark  
s6(a) <[REDACTED]@gcsb.govt.nz>; Andrew Coster <[andrew.coster@sia.govt.nz](mailto:andrew.coster@sia.govt.nz)>; ^EXT:Andrew  
Hampton s6(a) <[REDACTED]@nzsis.govt.nz>; Kibblewhite, Andrew  
<[Andrew.kibblewhite@justice.govt.nz](mailto:Andrew.kibblewhite@justice.govt.nz)>; ^EXT: Audrey Sonerson  
<[Audrey.Sonerson@health.govt.nz](mailto:Audrey.Sonerson@health.govt.nz)>; ^Mfat: Bede Corry <[Bede.corry@mfat.govt.nz](mailto:Bede.corry@mfat.govt.nz)>; Ben King  
[DPMC] <[Ben.King@dpmc.govt.nz](mailto:Ben.King@dpmc.govt.nz)>; Brad Ward <[brad.ward@hud.govt.nz](mailto:brad.ward@hud.govt.nz)>; Brian Roche  
<[Brian.Roche@publicservice.govt.nz](mailto:Brian.Roche@publicservice.govt.nz)>; ^Defense: Brook Barrington  
<[Brook.Barrington@defence.govt.nz](mailto:Brook.Barrington@defence.govt.nz)>; ^EXT:Christine Stevenson  
<[christine.stevenson@customs.govt.nz](mailto:christine.stevenson@customs.govt.nz)>; Dave Gawn <[dave.gawn@nema.govt.nz](mailto:dave.gawn@nema.govt.nz)>; Dave  
Samuels <[samud@tpk.govt.nz](mailto:samud@tpk.govt.nz)>; Debbie Power <[debbie.power006@msd.govt.nz](mailto:debbie.power006@msd.govt.nz)>; Ellen  
MacGregor-Reid <[ellen.macgregor-reid@education.govt.nz](mailto:ellen.macgregor-reid@education.govt.nz)>; ^Linz: Gaye Searancke  
<[GSearancke@linz.govt.nz](mailto:GSearancke@linz.govt.nz)>; Gerardine Clifford-Lidstone <[gerardine.clifford-lidstone@mpp.govt.nz](mailto:gerardine.clifford-lidstone@mpp.govt.nz)>; ^Regulation: Grainne Moss <[Grainne.Moss@regulation.govt.nz](mailto:Grainne.Moss@regulation.govt.nz)>;  
^PublicService: Heather Baggott <[heather.baggott@publicservice.govt.nz](mailto:heather.baggott@publicservice.govt.nz)>; Iain Rennie [TSY]  
<[iain.ennie@treasury.govt.nz](mailto:iain.ennie@treasury.govt.nz)>; ^MFE: James Palmer <[james.palmer@mfe.govt.nz](mailto:james.palmer@mfe.govt.nz)>;  
LIGHTFOOT, Jeremy (PONEKE) <[jeremy.lightfoot@corrections.govt.nz](mailto:jeremy.lightfoot@corrections.govt.nz)>; Smith, Justine  
<[justine.smith@whakatau.govt.nz](mailto:justine.smith@whakatau.govt.nz)>; Karen Chang <[karen.chang@sfo.govt.nz](mailto:karen.chang@sfo.govt.nz)>; Kellie Coombes  
<[kellie.coombes@women.govt.nz](mailto:kellie.coombes@women.govt.nz)>; Mac Leauanae <[mac.leauanae@mch.govt.nz](mailto:mac.leauanae@mch.govt.nz)>; Mary Craig  
<[mary.craig@stats.govt.nz](mailto:mary.craig@stats.govt.nz)>; Megan Main <[megan.main@acc.co.nz](mailto:megan.main@acc.co.nz)>; Mervin Singham  
<[mervin.singham@ethniccommunities.govt.nz](mailto:mervin.singham@ethniccommunities.govt.nz)>; Nicholas Pole <[Nicholas.Pole@ero.govt.nz](mailto:Nicholas.Pole@ero.govt.nz)>;  
Paul James <[paul.james@dia.govt.nz](mailto:paul.james@dia.govt.nz)>; Paula Tesoriero <[paula.tesoriero001@whaikaha.govt.nz](mailto:paula.tesoriero001@whaikaha.govt.nz)>;  
Penny Nelson <[pnelson@doc.govt.nz](mailto:pnelson@doc.govt.nz)>; ^NZTE: Peter Chrisp <[peter.chrisp@nzte.govt.nz](mailto:peter.chrisp@nzte.govt.nz)>; Peter  
Mersi <[peter.mersi@ird.govt.nz](mailto:peter.mersi@ird.govt.nz)>; Ray Smith <[ray.smith@mpi.govt.nz](mailto:ray.smith@mpi.govt.nz)>; ^Police: Richard  
Chambers <[Richard.Chambers@police.govt.nz](mailto:Richard.Chambers@police.govt.nz)>; ^Transport: Ruth Fairhall  
<[R.Fairhall@transport.govt.nz](mailto:R.Fairhall@transport.govt.nz)>; ^MBIE: Suzanne Stew <[Suzanne.Stew@mbie.govt.nz](mailto:Suzanne.Stew@mbie.govt.nz)>; ^NZDF:

Tony Davies <[TONY.DAVIES@NZDF.mil.nz](mailto:TONY.DAVIES@NZDF.mil.nz)>; ^CrownLaw: Una Jagose  
<[una.jagose@crownlaw.govt.nz](mailto:una.jagose@crownlaw.govt.nz)>

**Subject:** Release of the IPCA report

Kia ora koutou

I wanted to keep you up to date with announcements by Ministers related to matters around Jevon McSkimming and NZ Police.

The IPCA has released their report into Police handling of complaints against Jevon McSkimming. Ministers have made a statement here:

<https://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/damning-ipca-report-prompts-oversight-move>.

These matters go to the heart of public trust and confidence and appropriate conduct in the public sector. As such, the report will receive a lot of publicity and scrutiny, and there are implications for a number of individuals and organisations. There are also system implications, and one of these relates to our role in Police statutory appointments. We have already made a number of changes as a result of our independent review, as you will see in my statement: [Independent review of Deputy Commissioner of Police appointment process - Te Kawa Mataaho Public Service Commission](#) .

As I am sure you will respect, this is a challenging time as we work our way through what it means going forward.

Thanks  
Brian

.....  
Confidentiality notice: This email may be confidential or legally privileged. If you have received it by mistake, please tell the sender immediately by reply, remove this email and the reply from your system, and don't act on it in any other way. Ngā mihi.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

From: Matt Torbit [DPMC] <[Matt.Torbit@dpmc.govt.nz](mailto:Matt.Torbit@dpmc.govt.nz)>

Sent: Wednesday, 12 November 2025 2:52 PM

To: s9(2)(a): PM's Office

s9(2)(a): Minister for the Public Service's office

s9(2)(a): Minister of Police's office

Cc: Liesle Theron [DPMC] <[Liesle.Theron@dpmc.govt.nz](mailto:Liesle.Theron@dpmc.govt.nz)>

Subject: FW: IPCA report - questions to NZSIS

Hi all - FYI

---

From: s6(a) <[s6\(a\)@nzic.govt.nz](mailto:s6(a)@nzic.govt.nz)>

Sent: Wednesday, 12 November 2025 1:24 pm

To: Matt Torbit [DPMC] <[Matt.Torbit@dpmc.govt.nz](mailto:Matt.Torbit@dpmc.govt.nz)>; ^PS: Gabrielle Wilson

<[Gabrielle.Wilson@publicservice.govt.nz](mailto:Gabrielle.Wilson@publicservice.govt.nz)>; TREVETT, Claire <[claire.trevett@police.govt.nz](mailto:claire.trevett@police.govt.nz)>; Grahame Armstrong

<[grahame.armstrong@publicservice.govt.nz](mailto:grahame.armstrong@publicservice.govt.nz)>

Subject: FW: IPCA report - questions to NZSIS

Hi all,

Our final response is below – a slightly tweaked version of what you’ve previously seen.

s6(a)

**Response to NZ Herald - attribute to a spokesperson for the NZSIS:**

New Zealand Police granted Jevon McSkimming a national security clearance in 2020 and a further clearance in 2023 on the recommendation of NZSIS, following a national security vetting process conducted by NZSIS.

By law, information obtained through the vetting process can only be used for the purpose of the clearance assessment, another clearance assessment or counter-intelligence purposes (S220, Intelligence and Security Act 2017). The level of clearance granted is not usually disclosed publicly for national security reasons.

The sole purpose of the national security clearance process is to determine an individual’s suitability to access classified information. In particular, it focuses on identifying vulnerabilities that could be exploited and whether these can be mitigated. It is important to note that a national security clearance is not a substitute for an employing agency’s own recruitment, human resource management or security processes.

Factors taken into account in determining someone’s suitability to hold a national security clearance include their loyalty to New Zealand, their personal relationships and conduct, their financial situation, any drug and alcohol or mental health issues, criminal behaviour and associations with particular groups. The level of scrutiny a vetting candidate is subject to depends on the level of clearance. For the highest clearances this includes a comprehensive disclosure and interview process, information from referees (including the candidate’s manager and colleagues), financial and social media checks, and searches against NZSIS’ own intelligence holdings.

NZSIS makes a recommendation to a sponsoring agency about an individual’s suitability to hold a clearance and whether any risk needs to be managed. Once a national security clearance is granted by a sponsoring agency, individuals have clear obligations to report to that agency any information which may be relevant to their ongoing suitability to hold a clearance, and to enable any risks to be managed. Sponsoring agencies also have responsibilities to ensure their clearance holders adhere to the obligations of holding a clearance.

NZSIS cannot continually monitor all national security clearance holders to identify new or previously unknown risks. Should new, relevant information come to its attention, including for example from the sponsoring agency, NZSIS considers any impact that might have on an individual’s ongoing clearance.

Minister Collins has asked NZSIS Director-General Andrew Hampton to provide her with an assurance about the thoroughness of the vetting process for Mr McSkimming, noting the limitations on NZSIS' ability to disclose vetting information.

The Director-General has reviewed this file and taken advice from experts within NZSIS. He considers that NZSIS' processes and final recommendation were appropriate, taking into consideration the information NZSIS had access to, or that it could have lawfully and reasonably obtained at the time. Those processes included verifying information obtained from Mr McSkimming with referees. The Director-General is satisfied the vetting process was conducted thoroughly and appropriately.

Prior to the IPCA report, NZSIS had already commenced a review of its policy settings for national security clearances. This is part of its continuous improvement of vetting processes, and in response to the evolving security threatscape. Any relevant information from the IPCA's report will be taken into account during this review.

**END**

---

**From:** s6(a)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 12 November 2025 12:10 PM  
**To:** 'Matt Torbit [DPMC]' <[Matt.Torbit@dpmc.govt.nz](mailto:Matt.Torbit@dpmc.govt.nz)>; ^PS: Gabrielle Wilson <[Gabrielle.Wilson@publicservice.govt.nz](mailto:Gabrielle.Wilson@publicservice.govt.nz)>; TREVETT, Claire <[claire.trevett@police.govt.nz](mailto:claire.trevett@police.govt.nz)>; Grahame Armstrong <[grahame.armstrong@publicservice.govt.nz](mailto:grahame.armstrong@publicservice.govt.nz)>  
**Cc:** Media <[media@nzic.govt.nz](mailto:media@nzic.govt.nz)>  
**Subject:** FW: IPCA report - questions to NZSIS

Hi all,

For awareness NZSIS has received the following questions from s9(2)(a) /NZ Herald. He has also approached our Minister's office (Min Collins)

We will copy you in on our final response before it goes.

s6(a)

Morena,

I have questions about vetting in relation to Jevon McSkimming.

As you will appreciate, there is a high degree of public interest in this matter which - I submit - will require the Service to adopt a forthright approach to meet.

It would be appreciated if answers could be provided today, as early as possible. Feel free to call and chat through practicalities.

1. What level(s) of national-security clearance did Mr Jevon McSkimming hold while employed by New Zealand Police, and on what dates were those clearances granted, renewed, suspended, or cancelled?
2. Which specific Protective Security Requirements (PSR) standards or NZSIS vetting tiers applied to his 2020 and 2023 clearance processes? Did those clearances involve a Top Secret or higher level under the PSR?
3. Who was the sponsoring agency security officer and which organisation (Police / PSC / DPMC) acted as the vetting authority liaison?

4. What information was Mr McSkimming required to disclose in his 2020 and 2023 vetting questionnaires and interviews regarding personal relationships, potential conflicts of interest, or exposure to coercion or compromise?
5. Did he disclose a past personal relationship with a Police employee or any related allegations? If so, how did NZSIS assess that disclosure in its risk evaluation and mitigation advice to the sponsoring agency?
6. If not, did NZSIS subsequently become aware of the relationship or associated allegations through other channels? If NZSIS was not informed of the relationship or allegations until after 2024, does it consider that a breach of agencies' reporting obligations under the PSR or the Protective Security Circular?
7. Was any adverse or conditional advice given to Police, the Public Service Commission, or any Minister about integrity or reputational risk?
8. Following Mr McSkimming's resignation this year and the criminal conviction in relation to objectionable content, has NZSIS initiated any post-incident review of its earlier vetting decisions? And if so, what was the outcome?
9. Has NZSIS amended its vetting guidance to the Police or PSC in light of this case, or in the case of Michael Forbes?
10. Were any internal security-risk ratings or incident reports updated for McSkimming before his resignation?

s9(2)(a)

NZ Herald

s9(2)(a)

---

**From:** s6(a)

**Sent:** Tuesday, 11 November 2025 4:03 PM

**To:** 'Matt Torbit [DPMC]' <[Matt.Torbit@dpmc.govt.nz](mailto:Matt.Torbit@dpmc.govt.nz)>; ^PS: Gabrielle Wilson <[Gabrielle.Wilson@publicservice.govt.nz](mailto:Gabrielle.Wilson@publicservice.govt.nz)>; TREVETT, Claire <[claire.trevett@police.govt.nz](mailto:claire.trevett@police.govt.nz)>; Grahame Armstrong <[grahame.armstrong@publicservice.govt.nz](mailto:grahame.armstrong@publicservice.govt.nz)>

**Subject:** RE: IPCA report - draft comms material

NZSIS narrative is attached, noting this will inform responses as required and is not necessarily in itself a media statement.

Also noting tight legal restrictions on information gained during the vetting process.

s6(a)

---

**From:** Matt Torbit [DPMC] <[Matt.Torbit@dpmc.govt.nz](mailto:Matt.Torbit@dpmc.govt.nz)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, 11 November 2025 2:08 PM

**To:** ^PS: Gabrielle Wilson <[Gabrielle.Wilson@publicservice.govt.nz](mailto:Gabrielle.Wilson@publicservice.govt.nz)>; TREVETT, Claire <[claire.trevett@police.govt.nz](mailto:claire.trevett@police.govt.nz)>; s6(a) <[s6\(a\)@nzic.govt.nz](mailto:s6(a)@nzic.govt.nz)>

**Subject:** IPCA report - draft comms material

~~IN CONFIDENCE UNCLASSIFIED~~

Hey folks – in the spirit of no surprises, can you all share your draft press releases with each other (noting the NZSIS will not issue a PR, rather react to any questions).

Matt

---

The information contained in this email message is for the attention of the intended recipient only and is not necessarily the official view or communication of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, copy or distribute this message or the information in it. If you have received this message in error, please destroy the email and notify the sender immediately.