

**Minutes of meeting held 01 September 2011
SIA HQ, 90 High Holborn, London**

Present: See appendix 1

Apologies: See appendix 1

Chair: Andrew Shephard

Secretary: Jody Parker

Opening

Topic	Owner
<p>Andrew Shephard (AS) welcomed delegates including new members from Sec-Tech and from Alpha Omega Securities.</p> <p>Apologies were noted.</p> <p>There were no matters arising from the previous meeting (19 May 2011).</p>	

Future of Industry Regulation

Topic	Owner
<p>SIA Service Delivery Director Stephen McCormick updated the group on progress towards the implementation of a new regulatory regime. Proposals including introduction of business licensing with individual registration, a new regulatory body, new powers and sanctions and retention of the SIA brand, had been submitted to ministers for review.</p> <p>The proposals reflect underlying principles including a focus on areas of greatest risk and a significant transfer of responsibility to the industry.</p> <p>The group was assured that there will be a process (through mediated access partners) for individuals, e.g. self-employed, to apply for registration without direct employer involvement.</p> <p>The group expressed concern at the uncertainty around costs which lead to difficulties with business planning. Steve assured the group that a principle was to reduce the overall direct costs of regulation and that some further detail should be available in the impact assessment which is due in 2012.</p>	

How approved contractors gain a business licence

Topic	Owner
<p>The SIA intends that approved contractors gain a business licence as smoothly and quickly as possible. From a date potentially in 2013 all approved contractors will need to meet amended terms and conditions which will cover business licence criteria. Once business licensing is launched approved contractors will hold both a business licence and an ACS certificate. In due course the business licence would become mandatory and but ACS would remain voluntary.</p> <p>Formal consultation (Impact Assessment) is expected in 2012 and will be the opportunity for all stakeholders to formally submit their feedback on the proposals.</p> <p>The group suggested that once this approach is more widely published it could cause a surge of interest and applications for ACS.</p> <p>The group asked for a clear definition of what the SIA means by a “business” in the context of business licensing. The proposal covers any business that deploys individuals providing designated security services under contract to a third party. This would cover businesses providing bundled services as well as specialist security suppliers.</p> <p>The group agreed that the transitional timeline for approved contractors to achieve a business licence was broadly feasible but that a major communications exercise would be required to ensure that those businesses which are not ACS are aware of the new requirements.</p> <p>A concern was also raised about the creep of more and more complexity into the regulatory regime and it was suggested that the new regime should ensure the simplest approach possible for individual registration.</p> <p>Action: SIA to feed this point regarding additional complexity into the SIA Executive.</p>	<p>SIA</p>

Training discussion paper

Topic	Owner
<p>Jody Parker briefed the group on the training discussion paper that had been circulated. This was written in response to a recommendation made as part of the 2010 annual review and put on hold during the transition planning. Given that the ACS now has some stability, it was suggested that the standard could be more ambitious in terms of management, refresher and continuing professional development.</p> <p>Various points were raised by the group:</p> <p><i>The industry appears to be engaging more with training in general, some of which may be due to ACS.</i></p> <p><i>We could specify a minimum number of hours of annual training, rather than content.</i></p>	

Topic	Owner
<p><i>We could conduct a research exercise to establish benchmarks for training (this data may already be held by experts such as Prof Martin Gill).</i></p> <p><i>Basic induction training is often not specifically recognised and recorded by approved contractors.</i></p> <p><i>Some wary of introducing additional costs, particularly at the moment. It's not an ideal time for radical change</i></p> <p><i>There is a significant variance by sector.</i></p> <p><i>Clients are often the driving force behind additional training, but many are not really concerned.</i></p> <p><i>Level of staff training is a unique commercial differentiator that security businesses should be using anyway to position themselves in the market.</i></p> <p><i>The changes suggested in the discussion paper do not pose any challenges for a good company. Any company that is not doing these things is on the brink of offering an unethical commercial advantage through reduced costs.</i></p> <p><i>There is a half-way house of filling up the good practice boxes to better recognise and facilitate improvements.</i></p> <p>Jody thanked the group for the valued input. It was decided that this topic would benefit from further submissions from the Group.</p> <p>Action point: group members to submit additional feedback on proposals either verbally or written to Jody Parker.</p>	<p>SSG</p>

Update on door supervision sub-group meeting

Topic	Owner
<p>Jody Parker gave an update on the main points that were discussed at the August sub-group meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revision of door supervision marketing literature to better reflect the industry • Use of armbands and supplier information • Police recognition of door supervision and ACS 	

ACS Security buyer review

Topic	Owner
<p>ACS Quality Assurance Manager Naina Chouhan briefed the group on some research into the extent to which buyers are specifying ACS. Naina explained that we are starting to build a useful picture of buying habits but to develop something more comprehensive we need more input from approved contractors about who is and isn't specifying ACS. We recognise that these data may be commercially sensitive and any data submitted to us will not be passed onto to any party outside the SIA.</p> <p>Action point: Group members to consider what information they can pass to the SIA about who is and isn't specifying ACS.</p> <p>Action point: SIA to investigate the opportunity for the SIA to lobby government (central and local) regarding the government specification of ACS</p>	<p>SSG</p> <p>SIA</p>

Next round of ACS forums

Topic	Owner
<p>Andrew Shephard presented the proposed agenda for the next round of ACS forums starting in Bristol in October. Although the agenda for this round is nearly complete, the SIA would appreciate input and direction from the SSG about the content of future forums and encouraged the group to submit ideas. Andrew also noted that members of the Group who are not approved contractors are welcome to attend a forum.</p> <p>Action point: SSG to consider ideas and speakers for ACS forums.</p>	<p>SSG</p>

Appendix 1: List of Attendees

Organisation	Name	Apologies
Alpha Omega	Ken Lawton	
Alsecure Ltd	Dawn Barry & Heather Angell	
Axis Security Group	Dave Daulby	
BSI	Peter Pitts	
BSIA	David Evans	
Camberford Law	David Ottewill	Apologies
CCAS	Tony Brackmanski	
G4S Cash	David Harris	
G4S Secure Solutions	Simon Coke	Apologies
Home Office	Kate Moseley	Apologies
Inkerman Group	Simon Imbert	
IPSA	Justin Bentley	
Lincolnshire Police	Ken Meanwell	
MITIE	Andy May	Apologies
Sec-Tech	Andy Redhead & Bob Morrison	
Securigroup	Russel Kerr	Apologies
SIA Board	Linda Sharpe	
SIA	Jody Parker	
SIA	Andrew Shephard	
SIA	Naina Chouhan	
Skills for Security	David Greer	
Sodexo	Simon Pears	
The Post Office	Keith Henderson	
The Security Institute	Mike Bluestone	
The Shield	Stuart Kedward	Apologies
UK Security Facilities	Tony Clarke	Apologies



UKCMA	Mark Harding	
Visual Verification	Chris Connors	
Wilson James	Stuart Lowden	Apologies