



Security Industry Authority

SIA Conference: Commitment to Regulation (12 October 2011) – Notes

This document published November 2011



Contents

Introduction

Summary of the Day

Breakout Sessions

Appendix: List of Attendees

Introduction

Notes from SIA Conference: Commitment to Regulation

These summary notes reflect the collated views of those who attended the conference, a list of whom can be found in the appendix.

It is acknowledged that each delegate has a different view and does not necessarily agree with each point, however all views and suggestions have been recorded.

It is noted that the ideas and suggestions recorded do not represent agreements, nor do they represent the view of the SIA. The SIA may disagree or agree with the views and suggestions of the conference.

Summary of the Day

Dave Humphries, Director of Compliance, Intelligence and Communication welcomed delegates to the SIA Conference: Commitment to Regulation. Dave stressed the importance of industry input as we develop plans for the future of regulation for the private security industry.

SIA Chair, Baroness Ruth Henig opened the conference with a speech to delegates. Ruth outlined the achievements of the SIA so far – such as compliance and enforcement activity and excluding unfit individuals from the industry, and the success of the Approved Contractor Scheme – and gave an overview of intentions for the future. The full speech is available on our website.

Website link:

- www.sia.homeoffice.gov.uk/conference

Following Ruth's speech Home Office Minister Lynne Featherstone reinforced Ruth's comments in a video message and said that the conference presented "*a fantastic opportunity for you, the members of the private security industry, to come together to discuss the challenges, and contribute to the shaping of, the future of, your industry*".

An overview of plans for the transition was delivered by Hazel Russell, SIA Director of Transition, in her presentation 'SIA Proposals for the Future'. She explained the key components of future regulation: a new regulatory body outside government, the licensing of businesses, and a register of individuals who are fit and proper to work in the private security industry, underpinned by effective compliance and enforcement.

Website link:

- www.sia.homeoffice.gov.uk/conference

Stephen McCormick, SIA Director of Service Delivery, then spoke on 'Designing Services Fit for the Future'. He said that with future regulation being developed to be business focussed and to achieve reduced burden and cost, there would need to be changes and improvements to service delivery. He described current plans to continue to improve the licensing and customer service, such as website improvements, a better bulk application process, and electronic contact and payment methods.

Website link:

- www.sia.homeoffice.gov.uk/conference

James Kelly, Chief Executive of the British Security Industry Association (BSIA) and Chairman of the Security Regulation Alliance, introduced the Security Alliance's new name the Security Regulation Alliance to the conference. He talked about the history of the Security Regulation Alliance, the aims and objectives of the Alliance, the members and their strategic principles. James told delegates about the progress the Alliance has made to date and what it hopes to achieve in the future.

Alastair Thomas, CCTV Policy Lead, Home Office, discussed surveillance camera systems and the regulation affecting the surveillance camera systems. Alastair discussed the need for regulation and what regulation is proposed for the future.

Ian Thomas, Head of Security and Resilience at the London Organising Committee for Olympic Games (LOCOG), discussed security requirements for the Olympics and Paralympics Games in London 2012. Ian spoke about the key elements of LOCOG's security strategy.

Paul Evans from KPMG, previously Director of Interventions at the Serious and Organised Crime Agency (SOCA), discussed organised crime. Paul talked about the diversity of organised crime, from narcotics to mass marketing fraud initiatives. He also spoke about techniques that can be used to tackle organised crime, and how SOCA can share data with other government agencies.

Website link:

- www.soca.gov.uk

Bill Butler, Chief Executive of the SIA, closed the conference by thanking the day's speakers and drawing out the key messages.

Bill highlighted that there was still general support for where the SIA is going but there was some concern about how and why. Bill told delegates that now – from a position of strength, when regulation is working – is the time for regulation and the way the SIA regulates to move on. The risks the industry and the regulator face are significantly different to those that the regulatory regime was introduced to address in 2001. There is terrorism, technology, there is greater importance for the industry to be reliable in a new environment where the police are dependent on the standards of the industry, and there is a role in terms of helping to tackle organised crime. Bill also reflected on Stephen McCormick's assessment of the current system, the length of time it takes applicants to apply for a licence and the cost of posting the application forms (over £300,000 a year). The biggest change, Bill told delegates, is that there will no longer be a renewal cycle for licences, which means the number of people who go through the application system will be halved. Bill told delegates that proposed changes are in the interest of the industry: they reduce costs and allow the regulator to focus on standards within the industry.

Bill talked about the pace of change this time last year when it was thought that the SIA might be abolished, and the SIA and the industry did not know what the future of regulation was going to be. Bill told delegates that the pace of change needs to be measured and the industry echoed that it must not be rushed. There is now a clear vision for the proposed new regulatory regime. Bill told the conference that although dependent on the legislative timescale there are things that the SIA can and will seek to do in advance of formal legislation including the modernising of systems for licensing.

Bill welcomed colleagues from the Scottish and Northern Ireland governments, who are a key part of the thinking and discussions to date, and encouraged delegates who work across boundaries in the UK, in Scotland and in Northern Ireland to engage with the governments there to make sure their views are reflected in the decisions being made.

Bill closed the conference by reflecting on the passion and interest in the industry to get regulation of the private security industry right. Bill encouraged delegates to keep talking to the SIA and asked delegates to keep talking to their staff. Bill talked about the future of regulation roadshows that are talking place across the UK. They are designed to keep individual licence holders informed. He asked delegates to encourage their staff to attend one of these roadshows to allay any uncertainty amongst individuals working in the industry.

Breakout Sessions

Delegates were given the opportunity to attend one of two breakout discussion sessions: 'ACS and the Future of the Hallmark' or 'Individual Applications: the Challenge for Employers'.

ACS and the Future of the Hallmark

'The Approved Contractor Scheme and the Future of the Hallmark' was chaired by ACS Assistant Director Andrew Shephard and Quality Assurance Manager Jody Parker. They set out plans for approved contractors to automatically qualify for the new business licence, and for the current Approved Contractor Scheme to continue at least until compulsory business licensing is established. Delegates at the session agreed that the continuation of a hallmark scheme was crucial, in order to differentiate between the quality mark and the compulsory business licence. They called for acknowledgement of ACS membership within business licensing criteria, a continued licence dispensation scheme, and for all public sector contracts to be awarded to ACS contractors.

Delegate comments

- As the SIA is leading the debate you may be shaping it where you want it to go. It's a Catch 22 situation because there's nobody else to lead the debate. The SIA has to make sure the debate isn't coloured.
- I echo the above sentiments. A regulator is responsible for compliance; for a regulator to be involved in raising standards is very unusual and it is likely that the industry will develop a hallmark scheme. The option of the regulator owning an approval scheme is not consistent with the Blueprint. Options one and two sit squarely with lighter touch regulation.
- The reason one adopts quality standards is to affect buyer behaviour and is why clients see ACS as a way of themselves differentiating from the competition. Is government association giving the scheme more client reassurance?
- What we mustn't do is lose the ACS or its equivalent altogether. There are 711 of us in a sector of about 4,000 companies and if we lose it we will go back to a situation where quality companies are not differentiated. We must maintain the ACS but recognise the difficulties and that it is not appropriate for the regulator to own and maintain the scheme.
- We work with local authorities; they see the ACS as due diligence and it is built into tenders. With the costs of the business licensing and the ACS, if the ACS is managed by a trade association will we then have to pay to join that association running the scheme? British Standards and the regulator could have oversight of the scheme to avoid this as it will price out many ACS members if they have to pay to be part of an association as well.
- The business licensing criteria should be set at a level beneath the ACS level. Are we going to end up with two costs (business licensing and the ACS)? It could be a backward step for companies.
- The Scottish public sector are keen to work together to get accreditation for the industry and are working with the Association of British Insurers to drive costs down for compliant companies.

- The key thing for an ACS-type scheme is that it has the ability to encompass the technological side of the industry, such as access control systems. We would be missing a trick to stick to just licensable manned guarding. The scope of the ACS could/should be wider, especially if separated from the regulator.
- I fully endorse the above comment; include the legal use of CCTV under the Data Protection Act. The reputation of CCTV is low and is a dead cert to win there.
- Financial aspects of a company need more investigation, part of the business licensing not the ACS. It's not always about how much something costs but about risk and protection.
- The development of all members of staff (including back office staff) and all of the industry need to be involved in a voluntary standards scheme.
- I work in training and the night time economy, how far do you go with micro businesses and business licensing? Do local pubs with one doorman have to have a licence? I think there may be a big loophole created, especially in the south west where the current rules are not always understood.
- The definition of a security operative needs to be very clear.
- All UK public sector contracts should be linked to the ACS (not just in Scotland), the regulator needs to help push on this and it will be even more important once business licensing is in place.
- In 12-14 years the margin pressures have not changed: the big companies can undercut on price due to economies of scale and the non-compliant companies with no overheads can undercut on price.
- What do we want from the hallmark? The Merlin (DWP) standard is about what qualifications you can provide.
- The hallmark has more of a requirement when business licensing is in place as there is the potential for approval to be devalued with lots of companies with less than 10 employees operating as a group.
- The Scottish Government policy is to require ACS approval for all public sector contracts. Without it there is no ability to differentiate. In the new regulatory regime with business licensing criteria comparable to that of the ACS there could be a future situation where government contracts then ask for business licensing not ACS. It may or may not be the case.
- Some say that there is a possible reduction in standards with business licensing but companies should take reassurance that that's not the case.
- The Security Alliance may have a role in coming forward to take a view or a role in the future of the scheme. It is for the industry not the regulator to take this forward, and the ACS Strategy & Standards Group could merge with an industry group.

Questions

1. Will there be a period where business licensing and ACS accreditation are both needed and paid for? Is the cost of both more or less than the current costs?

This depends on the costs of the business licensing scheme. Direct costs should be less, the whole regime is open to consultation and it is up to the industry not the regulator on the future of the voluntary ACS scheme and whether you want or need it.

2. Is business licensing going to be subject to a company audit?

If the requirement for business licensing is conformance to British Standards then you will have to have a BS certificate and therefore an audit. The ACS already incorporates these standards; for those who are not an approved contractor that would be extra and it is another cost benefit of having the ACS accreditation.

3. Will security consultancy services be subject to business licensing and will they be able to become an approved contractor?

It will depend on whether there is a market for those services but there are currently no plans to introduce regulation to new sectors before the new regulatory regime is in place.

4. What will be the motivation for businesses to join the ACS if they are a licensed business?

It may be that you would like ACS membership to reduce the costs of business licensing. That could be a benefit, that you get concessions in relation to compliance and business licensing costs.

5. Property management companies such as CBRE need to be involved because they also have staff who do security roles, such as caretakers, concierge, and receptionists.

The question is whether they are undertaking licensable roles, if so business licensing will be applicable. We are highly dependent on intelligence from the industry; compliance will be one of our biggest challenges with business licensing.

6. Why hasn't the rest of the UK taken Scotland's lead to insist on ACS approval for all public sector contracts?

I would recommend taking that question to your MP.

Individual Applications: The Challenge for Employers

'Individual Applications, the Challenge for Employers' was delivered by Assistant Director of Customer Service and Quality Improvement Christy Hopkins. He explained that individual applications would be primarily the responsibility of businesses, with applications submitted through an employer or Mediated Access Partner, being e-enabled to ensure reduced burden and duplication. Applications would only be for new entrants, renewals would be replaced by a regular subscription, and a revocation and suspension process would remain in place. In feedback, delegates stressed the importance of maintaining public safety through regular criminal record checks. They also said that as plans developed they would want clarification on how the qualifications upload and checking process would work.

Questions

1. Where do criminality checks sit within this process, as there will be no renewal, how will the criminality of those renewing be checked?

The criminality check would be something the regulator would do. Our planning assumption is that the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB), Access Northern Ireland and Disclosure Scotland would have continuous updates, the regulator would check the criminal record on application and if it changes that information will be provided back to the regulator. The reason we have the renewal cycle currently is because we needed a structure that allows us to check someone's criminal record formally at reasonable periods.

2. Are there any plans in place for future regulation of the electronics industry?

Our plan is not to extend the scope of regulation to new sectors at this time. There are no plans at present to extend into new sectors or new activities.

3. Will the cost of the initial application reduce in relation to the annual current costs?

We can make no commitments about costs because we are not yet at that level of detail. Currently we have an application fee that is set at £245 that applicants pay whether granted or refused. In the future we are talking about splitting the fee into an application fee and a subscription fee. All applicants would pay the application fee whether their application is granted or refused. Applicants who have had their application granted would then need to pay the subscription fee, and pay the subscription fee on an ongoing twelve month basis. Because we are splitting the costs down the expectation is that the initial application fee would be less than £245 but that has to be modelled.

4. Has any thought been given to the training and investment costs for the Mediated Access Partners (MAPs)?

We are currently working with potential MAPs. This is at quite an early stage but quality assurance is very much a part of the work we doing. We have to understand the costs: there will be development costs that need to be absorbed and we expect there will be a transaction cost. It is yet to be determined whether all the transaction cost or part of it will be paid by the individual or to what extent the regulator would pay. That's the kind of assessment we need to make.

5a. How many MAPs are you anticipating there being?

Initially one. We are currently undertaking work on who the initial MAP could be, and then we would like to get to the point of a pilot or trial. Once we have run that trial we need to review whether we need to extend mediated access to other providers.

5b. Is that the Post Office?

The Post Office is one of the organisations we are talking to at the moment, but there are a range of potential providers. We are assessing what our requirements are and what each of those organisations can provide.

6a. Are individuals still going to be expected to complete an accredited qualification in the future?

Yes, individuals will have to demonstrate competence by completing an accredited qualification.

6b. How will that process [of verifying qualifications] be managed between Awarding Organisations and either the regulator or the Mediated Access Partner, there is a risk because certificates can be forged?

Currently, when an application comes through to us, one of the checks we do is that the individual has the qualification. The applicant enters the information on the application form but we do not rely solely on that information, we verify their qualification by checking on the qualifications database. Our planning assumption is that this would be one of the initial checks the company or MAP would carry out. The change will be bringing access to the qualifications database further down the process chain. What the awarding organisations do will not change, it is who is checking the database that changes.

7. There is going to be a burden or a cost shift to businesses, and the MAP won't be registering the individual without a fee. Will consideration be given to the cost of the initial registration being significantly reduced to take account of that factor?

Our commitment is that the overall burden remains at the least the same or is reduced in terms of the whole of regulation. I have discussed duplication in the current system; by removing that duplication we can reduce burden. In terms of mediated access there will be a transaction cost, which in theory could be paid by the individual to the MAP, what we're looking at is to what extent the regulator would be able to absorb some or all of that transaction cost. It has been considered in a business case but we are not making an immediate assumption that that cost will be borne entirely by the individual. One of the key drivers for these changes is about reducing the amount of processing the regulator is doing and the amount of cost incurred by the regulator. We believe all of the improvements that we're describing today take cost out of the application process, and because we are a cost neutral organisation that cost saving will be passed on, where we can, to the industry.

8. With the current process the licence has been issued on the basis that all the criteria have been met; we only employ someone if they have a licence. Would the employer be required to carry out checks at the application stage? I can understand if it is a brand new employee but if it is a subscription would we need to carry out the checks?

The expectation is that for those licensed at the point that we cut over to the individual registration their existing licence would passport into that arrangement and that only when they reach the point of expiry of that licence will they drop into the subscription model. We will have already done, as the regulator, those checks for that individual and in effect they will then be subject to the ongoing checks that anyone registered in the future regime will be subject to. The five year point I mentioned in my presentation would be to update the photograph and re-issue the token. We will still be running our revocation, suspension and intelligence gathering processes.

9. You are pushing a huge amount of the administrative work and checks on to the businesses so the cost of the licensing process to businesses is not just the cheque that they write to you but also the cost of what they are doing in-house. One thing you might want to think of doing is if there is a cost that the MAPs that you use that

as a proxy for the amount of cost that is going to be pushed to businesses and use that to work out what the actual cost for this process will be for businesses in the new regime.

We have a piece of work to do about the impact and the burden on businesses. Some businesses in the current regime already vet their employees and they are paying the SIA to duplicate those checks. Licensed businesses will have to prove they are a fit and proper business and able to carry out those checks. We will be able to remove the ability to process individual applications from businesses so it will be possible to continue to be business licensed without having the ability to register your employees.

10. I am concerned about how easy it is to forge documents. How are you going to maintain a standard for checking identity documents amongst businesses and MAPs?

We are not removing the regulator's ability to verify identity documents, what we are saying is that identity documents will be verified by the regulator on a risk assessed basis. I accept the fact that our risk assessment has to be spot on to get that right. The easy option would be for everything to come to the regulator, but that costs a lot. The vast majority of applicants do not submit fraudulent documentation. The regulator will retain its capacity to check documents, where there is a risk we can take in physical documents to verify them, but we will not do this for everyone. The work we are undertaking with potential Mediated Access Partners involves ensuring they have the hardware to check the validity of documents; we expect this to be built into the solution.

11. Are we talking about the point of the Private Security Industry Act 2001 which was to improve public safety or are we talking about managing the expectations of costs?

The key objective of the regulator stays the same. The reason we are here is public protection, and fundamentally the aim is still the same but the challenges and risks have changed. We think the way we can meet that objective can be done in a better way.

12. I work for an organisation that employs 650 part-time security staff. They all work for another employer but work for us on specific events. Are we going to be expected to become one of your 4,000 licensed businesses and be responsible for those employees, or will that revert back to their other employers?

We understand that a key feature of this industry is that people work for multiple employers and sometimes in multiple sectors; as such we want to create a solution that allows individuals to be linked to multiple businesses, potentially 'primary employers' and 'secondary employers'. It needs to be resolved as to who is responsible for processing that individual: we accept that it is an issue. We would expect employers to maintain links to individuals they employ.

13. The individual would be passing their responsibility for keeping their record up to date to the employer; in this type of situation it seems the individual should be keeping the register up to date.

We are not saying that there will not be the potential for the individual to update the register. However, an individual will work for the majority of the time, or consider themselves to be primarily employed by, one company. I would expect in that situation that they would want the link to be with that employer. If they work for other employers on a part-time basis it does not mean that those companies would have to maintain the register on behalf of that individual, because that interaction would still exist with the main employer. This is a level of detail that we need to work out in terms of multiple links to multiple employers.

14. If an individual is banned or suspended all the companies that individual works for should be made aware.

The employer would choose to link themselves to that individual. We are not changing the fact that the responsibility remains with the company that deploys that individual to check the register and satisfy themselves that the individual has a valid licence and is able to work.

15. If an individual does not have an employer or doesn't trust the Mediated Access Partner there is no alternative method for them to apply as an individual; it is forcing them to use the MAP.

The employer and the Mediated Access Partner are the only two application routes available to a new individual applicant.

16. Most applicants for a security role have a licence; the vast majority are not asking for a job and then applying for a licence.

This is why we understand the need to have that mediated access provision. We expect that the vast majority of applications will go through businesses. We do not think it is cost effective for the regulator to maintain the licence application process for what is a relatively small number when there is the MAP route.

17. Will private security companies become MAPs?

Initially, we will have one supplier as the national Mediated Access Partner. Something we have considered is other groups becoming MAPs and originally we thought about businesses choosing to process applications on behalf of people they do not employ. That's a potential, an opportunity, but we need to look at its viability in the future.

18. Will you reduce burden and bureaucracy on training providers in terms of training providers checking the individuals' identification documents?

There is a question we need to ask about the level of assurance the checks give compared to the burden. We have three points of identity verification when the application is being processed, which gives a significant level of assurance. We are currently looking at whether this is over assurance, and if it is required. It is a question in play for us, but we need to be sure risk is not increased.

19. Why couldn't training providers do the job of individual registration or awarding organisations, and reduce burden on businesses?

When working on the mediated access provision we looked at the range of options, including training providers. They are still on the list of potential MAPs, they have not been discounted. We decided to choose a national network because we want to move quickly to test whether the MAP provision is viable but we certainly haven't ruled out the possibility of opening up to other types of organisation or business, particularly where there is an overlap with the current process.

20. There is a transient population in the security industry; people move on very quickly. I think it's unrealistic for you to expect businesses to keep a check on the movements of staff. The businesses will register people and only a small proportion of people that will stay with one employer.

We do not think it is an excessive burden for business because we expect private security businesses to keep up to date with their employees' movements and addresses. Once an employee moves away from that business, either out of the industry or to another business, then it is for the employer to break the link between them and the employee. While in the employ of that business it is reasonable that the employer maintains the records.

21. One of the characteristics you get in the industry is the bulk transfer of employees from one employer to another if contracts end. Have you given any consideration to that gap between employers and what might happen to the individual?

We have not thought about that yet, this is the detail we need to get into next. What we have been working on this week is how the payment structure would work for ongoing subscription payments in steady state, and working out who is responsible for that payment, for example is it easier for it to be the employer or easier for it to be the individual?

22. A criminal conviction during the three year renewal cycle of the licence is not checked during the three years you have the licence, currently the renewal system only picks up convictions on renewal.

The ongoing subscription would not work unless we had continuous update from the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB), Access Northern Ireland and Disclosure Scotland. The key here is that we have a three year cycle for exactly the reason you described, so we have a point at which we can check. The continuous criminality updating would ensure that once the check has been done at the point of application, if it changes we get that information pushed straight to us. With that process the ongoing subscription can work and would provide much better information than we can now, we would not be reliant on intelligence or the individual telling us about their criminal history.

23. Some smaller door supervision companies may go out of businesses because door supervisors decide to go self-employed and work straight to the bar or club owner.

There is a view that the prevalence of the self-employment status is rife in the door supervision sector already, and there are questions as to what extent that is appropriate. This is one area we think business licensing will assist with, we are helping to ensure that those that should be formally employed are and the self-employment status isn't abused. It is worth noting that if a door supervisor is self-employed, they still need to hold an SIA licence.

24. It seems like you are re-inventing the wheel, the system you have for individuals at the moment works.

We feel that we have a system that broadly works but there are flaws. The industry continues to evolve and the risks and issues change over time. If we stayed the same we would end up going backwards. What we have to do is re-align ourselves to meet the ongoing risks while not pretending that we can keep loading burden on the industry. Business registration is the way forward but what we have to do is put the responsibility on the businesses to take responsibility for individual registration.

25. What's going to happen to licensed premises who employ door supervisors, it's quite complicated and legislated at the moment?

There are no plans to change that.

Appendix: List of Attendees

Company	Name
A19 Skills	Alex O'Brien
A19 Skills	Chris O'Brien
Abbey Security Services Ltd	Pauline Whitaker-Bethel
Access Training (South West) Ltd	Natasha Michell
Access Training (South West) Ltd	Gerald Banks
ACPOS	Jackie Gilfillan
Advance Security	Richard Bailey
Advance Security	Chris Fieldhouse
Advance Security	David Marchio
Advance Security	Tony Amor
Advance Security	Stuart Wright
Advance Security	Mark Grant
Advance Security	Donna Alexander
Aim Awards	Linda Wyatt
Aim Awards	Deborah Marsh
Aim Awards	Jackie Elliot
Akita Security	Philip Williams
BIIAB	Cathie Smith
Billcroft Associates	Alan Eccles
BKS Security	Bryan Maddern
Broadland Guarding Services Ltd	Frank Adamson
BSIA	James Kelly
Buckinghamshire New University	Angela Vernon-Lawson

Company	Name
C.UK Security Services	Rog Hatlem
Camerawatch	Paul Mackie
Capricorn Security	William Robinson
Cardinal Security	Amy Metcalfe
Cardinal Security	Debbie Burrows
Cardinal Security	Bryn Taylor
CEOP	Peter Davies
Charnwood Training Group	Michael Boulton
Charnwood Training Group	Tom Boulton
Cole Security Services Ltd	Anthony Critchley
Constant Security Services	Sarah Lee
Department of Justice Northern Ireland	Clare Brady
Department of Justice Northern Ireland	Steven McCourt
Doyle Consultants	Paula Ducker
Doyle Consultants	Tracy Craft
Edexcel	Joe Butler
EDI	Caroline Smith
EDI	Peter Kirkham
G4S Cash Solutions	Robert Brassington
G4S Cash Solutions	Joy Sewell
G4S Secure Solutions	Deborah McCabe
G4S Secure Solutions	Donna Allan
GMB	Dave Gigg
Griffin Protective Solutions UK Ltd	Graham Stanley
GSL Dardan	Mark Duffy

Company	Name
Guarding UK Ltd	Peter Rees
Highfield Awarding Body for Compliance	Jason Sprenger
Highfield Awarding Body for Compliance	Chris Daniel
Home Office	Will Grant
Home Office	John Cairncross
Home Office	Kate Mosley
Home Office	Alastair Thomas
Home Office (Drug and Alcohol)	Andrew Parsons
ICTS UK Ltd	Charlie Cleverly
Independent Contractor Security Ltd	Tony Cockcroft
Independent Contractor Security Ltd	Fay Carguillo
Infologue	Bobby Logue
Information Commissioner's Office	Michele Harmer
Information Commissioner's Office	Judith Jones
Interr	Wayne Tait
Interr	Terry Burton
IPSA	Justin Bentley
ISOQAR	Steve Stubley
Izon Security Ltd	Paul Cameron
Izon Security Ltd	Charles Millar
Jomu Ltd	Gillian Jones
JS Facilities Group Ltd	Jon Schofield
JS Facilities Group Ltd	John Search
Key Security (UK) Ltd	Kieran Montgomery
KPMG	Paul Evans

Company	Name
Laser Learning Awards	Steve Babbidge
Legion Security	Emma Wise
LOCOG	Ian Thomas
Morning Advertiser	Tony Halstead
Munnelly Security Services	Gary McPartland
National Doorwatch	Ian Fox
National Open College Network	David Hutchinson
National Open College Network	David Mitchell
NEC Group	Gary Masters
NSI	Kay Aitkin
NSI	Jeffrey Little
NSL Ltd	Kenneth Hanslip
OCS Group UK Ltd	Shaun Cowlan
OCS Group UK Ltd	Howard Austin
Optimum Security Ltd	Victor Oleksandrenko
PD Ports	Denis Murphy
PDM Training and Consultancy	Kerry Thompson
Perpetuity Research & Consultancy International Ltd	Charlotte Lawson
Post Office Ltd Cash Services	Keith Henderson
Post Office Ltd Cash Services	Tracy Bond
Post Office Ltd Cash Services	Philip Furness
Post Office Ltd Cash Services	Marcia Bourne
Remploy	Richard Williams
Resource (United Kingdom) Limited	Andie Fessey
Rugby Football Union	Alex Dunn

Company	Name
Securitas Security Services	Stephen Beaven
Securitas Security Services	John Turner
Security Management Today	Brian Sims
Sheffield International Venues Ltd	Rachael Pyecroft
Sheffield International Venues Ltd	Andy Bridger
Shergroup Security	Chris Bell
SIA	Bill Butler
SIA	Ruth Henig
SIA	Bill Matthews
SIA	Robin Dahlberg
SIA	Linda Sharpe
SIA	Hazel Russell
SIA	Stephen McCormick
SIA	Dave Humphries
SIA	Robert Buxton
SIA	Andrew Shephard
SIA	Christy Hopkins
SIA	Siana Bretherton
SIA	Elizabeth Ashley
SIA	Amy Cope
SIA	Jody Parker
SIA	Cassie Howe
SIA	Imogen Hayat
Skills for Security	David Greer
Sodexo	Jane Farrell

Company	Name
SPS Security Ltd	James Smedley
SPS Security Ltd	David Bannister
SSAIB	Lynn Watts-Plumpkin
STM Security	Terry Ketley
Strathclyde Police	DC Paulette Kupsch
Strathclyde Police	DS Gillian Gardner
Tavcom Training	Kevin Matthew
The Protector Group Ltd	Derrick Halliwell
The Scottish Executive	John Nicholson
The Security Institute	Nick Evans
The Security Watchdog	Lynda Moore
The Wellcome Trust	Dawn Wise
Threshold Security Ltd	Richard Newman
Turner Facilities Management	George Jenkin
University of Plymouth Students Union	Dean Toney
University of Sheffield	Alastair Wilson
Valley Watch	Cyril Deeming
VSG	Carolyn Murdin
Walford Security Ltd	Ron Blake
World Association of Professional Investigators	Tony Smith
World Association of Professional Investigators	Beverly Flynn