

Questions	Answer
<b>General</b>	
That implementing The PSIA 2001 to regulate investigations is no longer on the agenda. Does, or could the SIA look to a workable alternative voluntary scheme for the investigation sector? The view taken to date that using the self-regulatory models provided in membership of the professional bodies would not work. Has the SIA considered whether an independently monitored ICO approved UK GDPR Code of Conduct could provide the fit-for-purpose mechanism with which to meet the much documented and recognised need to regulate the sector?	As you are aware, the provision in the PSIA for the regulation of private investigations has not been switched on/enacted. This means that the SIA has no regulatory role in relation to private investigations. It would therefore not be for the SIA to create a voluntary scheme of regulation for private investigations.  Whether there is voluntary or statutory regulation of private investigations is really an issue for the Home Office, as either would require Ministerial approval.
How will the SIA ensure that in the changing environment of policing, that the security industry has a more impactful and high-profile inclusion in supporting overall security in this country?	The continuing terrorist threat to the UK and other parts of Western Europe has already raised the consciousness of many about how the private security industry can contribute to national security. A springboard for this was through the 'Step Change Summits' organised by Counter Terror (CT) Policing which called for a collective approach by private/public and third sector bodies to work more closely in protecting the interests and people of the UK. We have worked with the industry and law enforcement partners in this arena to develop the Counter Terror ACT E-learning product and the inclusion of CT awareness training within the refreshed licence linked training. In addition, we have funded a seconded placement from the SIA to the National Counter Terrorism Security Office to raise the profile of the industry and develop the CT awareness products. By the end of this year we will have delivered 3 Operation Sentry live exercises intended to highlight the capability and preparedness of private security operatives in dealing with a number of realistic and challenging scenarios. These have been developed along with members of the CTSA cadre and local policing representatives. We have used mainstream and social media channels to promote the image of a professional, well trained, and capable industry to assist in supporting the security of the country. Whilst we work along with the Home Office on the joint recommendations arising from Volume 1 of the Manchester Arena Inquiry we are also in regular meetings with representatives of the Home Office and the Public Accessible Locations team who are developing the detail around the Protect Duty and ensuring that we can feed in relevant content relating to the private security industry.
The security industry is rapidly changing, are we coming to a point where technology can freeze job roles?	We acknowledge that developments in technology and in society are changing the ways in which security services are procured and delivered. Whilst we cannot influence the pace and nature of such changes, we are committed to keeping our regulatory approach under review to ensure that new approaches to delivering private security services are regulated effectively
What plan to protect security services' jobs?	The SIA's role and powers are set out in law. The SIA has no role and no powers in relation to the jobs market.
<b>PAYE</b>	
I'm the director of the Grizzlys Security Services. I am providing door supervisors to the venues like club, pubs, bars, restaurants etc. My question is how can I deal with HMRC regarding payee? Because every week my door supervisors are changed. Also according to law, we must have to do all security checks including vetting. It costs a lot. When I done this, guard didn't turn up. In this regard I loose a lot of money. Please suggest me in this case what I do and how can I deal with the door supervisor?	HMRC are the UK's tax authority. Given the nature of the private security industry, HMRC guidance indicates that the vast majority of licensable individuals supplied by private security businesses should be employees for both the purpose of tax and national insurance contributions, and in relation to benefitting from a contract of employment setting out employment rights. Or if the agency legislation applies, the worker is treated as holding an employment with the agency. The agency is responsible for PAYE and national insurance contribution deductions. This applies for whatever period an operative is engaged. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•1979 referrals received from SIA</li> <li>•237 cases required further intervention by HMRC</li> </ul> We cannot comment on specific cases
What steps are the SIA taking in relation to companies providing 'pop up' or 'cash in hand' services?	Cash in hand is often associated with false claims of self-employment. There is a dedicated team at HMRC that the SIA are working with in relation to false self-employment. Intelligence relating to such instances can be reported to the SIA via our website. <a href="https://www.services.sia.homeoffice.gov.uk/Pages/Report-Illegal-Activity.aspx">https://www.services.sia.homeoffice.gov.uk/Pages/Report-Illegal-Activity.aspx</a>
I would like to know why almost three years ago our company was FORCED to make ALL our staff PAYE? No exceptions. We were told by the end of 2019 ALL ACS accredited companies and the indeed the industry would be ridding itself of sub-contractors. This has not happened, even remotely, and as a result has affected our potential to earn and staff retention.	There has never been a deadline set for every company to have the operatives they deploy on PAYE. However, HMRC are the UK's tax authority. Given the nature of the private security industry, HMRC guidance indicates that the vast majority of licensable individuals supplied by private security businesses should be employees for both the purpose of tax and national insurance contributions, and in relation to benefitting from a contract of employment setting out employment rights. Or if the agency legislation applies, the worker is treated as holding an employment with the agency. The agency is responsible for PAYE and national insurance contribution deductions.  ACS assessor's have had awareness raising sessions from HMRC technical specialists on self employment and the agency legislation with improvement needs being raised in relation to indicator 4.2.1. The SIA works in partnership with HMRC in order to work towards creating a level playing field. This partnership has so far resulted in; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•A focus on both ACS and non ACS companies</li> <li>•The SIA referring 1979 companies to HMRC</li> <li>•Of these 237 companies required further intervention by HMRC</li> <li>•2500 operatives now PAYE who were previously self employed protecting their rights and benefits</li> <li>•UK plc benefits through the protection of £70m+ revenue</li> </ul>
<b>Licensing</b>	
Are there still plans to bring private investigation under the SIA licensing umbrella?	There are no plans at this time to bring private investigation under the SIA licensing umbrella.
<b>Training &amp; Skills</b>	
How can Car Park Services Ltd become a centre of excellence for Vehicle Immobilisation	The SIA recommends that any private security business look at the ACS as a means of improving its standards and its standing. However, we are unable to comment on how a particular company might become a centre of excellence.
<b>Customer support</b>	
Have the delays in responding to applicants been resolved?	We typically respond to around 55% of the service requests we receive from individual customers within 5 working days of receipt, and almost all (approx. 95%) service requests from businesses are responded to within 2 working days. We did see a slight dip in our response times earlier in the year, though this was due to an unprecedented high volume of queries (circa 5,000 per week) relating to two unique situations; the first being the reopening of the night-time economy following the end of the pandemic lockdown, and the second being our launch of new top-up training requirements which came into effect 1st October. While the volume of service requests has remained at a sustained high level throughout the year, response times only dropped slightly around April/May before quickly returning to levels similar to those at the end of last year.
<b>Enforcement</b>	
Improved enforcement of entry level standards is required if there is to be meaningful industry improvement. Does the SIA have plans to improve enforcement?  t	The SIA has developed a refreshed strategy for Compliance, Supervision and Enforcement (subject of 2 breakout sessions at Conference). There is a clear intention, supported by the SIA Board and Executive, to increase our presence and visibility through an expanded programme of risk led supervision and inspection work in areas of high footfall and Publicly Accessible Locations. We are very aware of the observations made by the Chair of the Manchester Arena Inquiry in relation to the 'low' number of persons involved in regulatory activity and we seek to significantly improve that position. However, we will also look for opportunities to work more collegially with other law enforcement and regulatory bodies to ensure that we can offer best value whilst ensuring that our collective expertise and resources are pooled where appropriate to contribute to public safety. We are now regulating a more mature industry which has had nearly 2 decades to ensure that they are aware of and adhere to obligations arising from the Private Security Industry Act 2001. We operate on an enforcement continuum and whilst we will always adhere to the Regulators Code, we will see a shift towards earlier intervention, more extensive use of formal sanctions and an increased level of prosecution where serious harm is identified.
<b>ACS</b>	

Can the SIA do more to promote ACS approved companies with buyers?	<p>We are doing all the following things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•new Buyers' leaflet</li> <li>•informal conversations with specific security buyers, starting 29 November</li> <li>•holding events specifically for buyers of security 10/23 Feb 22</li> <li>•working with Crown Commercial to see if they will include ACS in their new tendering framework for manned guarding from 2023</li> <li>•working with the Combined Industry Theft Scheme to promote the importance of asking for approved contractors when procuring for security services</li> <li>•attending a lot of external events in 2022, part of which is to speak to buyers of security and educate them on ACS:</li> </ul> <p>Global Security Event - 15/16/17 March 22  Facilities Event - 5/6/7 April 22  IFSEC International - 17/18/19 May 22  Security Expo - 27/28 Sept 22</p> <p>Once we have recruited the Senior Manager Industry Engagement we expect to do a lot more work with industry. Buyers of security will be integral to this.</p>
Why is it that SIA approved contractors are scrutinised when other security firms non ACS approved get away with breaking rules and bad management and nothing is ever done	<p>Our purpose is to protect the public through effective regulation of the private security industry and work with partners to raise standards across the sector. In doing so we are bound to comply with the Regulators Code and adhere to the principles of good regulation which are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Regulatory activities should be carried out in a way which is accountable, transparent, proportionate, and consistent.</li> <li>•Regulatory activity should be targeted only at cases in which action is needed.</li> </ul> <p>Our compliance, supervision and enforcement activities are intelligence and risk led. We respond to incoming intelligence and that may relate to approved contractors but equally may relate to those who are not accredited through the scheme. We do not select our case work based on company status, purely on the risk to public safety inherent in the circumstances. By way of an example in our joint work with HMRC of the recent 99 Intelligence Reports/Dislosures exchanged there were 53, over 50% which related to non-approved contractors. To ensure that we continue to target where the greatest harm is present, we are reliant on the quantity and quality of intelligence we receive.</p> <p>89% of businesses successfully prosecuted by the SIA in the last 12 months have been non approved contractors</p>
<b>Manchester Arena Inquiry</b>	
With the issue of the first volume of the Manchester Inquiry report, are there plans to update the PSIA given that it hasn't been effectively updated since its inception?	<p>The SIA's role regulating private security is to implement the legislative regime that the Home Office and Parliament requires of it. This means that, whilst the SIA can make recommendations and proposals to improve standards in security and keeps under review the operation of the legislation, the ultimate decisions on changes to the regime are for, and taken by Home Office, and for legislation changes, Parliament.</p> <p>The SIA has been working in liaison with officials in the Home Office across these policy areas. Important to highlight that SIA can put its views and proposals to the Home Office, and the Devolved Governments in Scotland and Northern Ireland, it will ultimately be for them to make decisions on the future of private security regulation and any legislative change.</p> <p>The two recommendations from the inquiry are matters relating to the regulatory regime the SIA supervises: Monitored Recommendation 7 (MR7): "The requirement that only those monitoring CCTV under a contract for services need to hold an SIA licence should be reviewed."</p> <p>Monitored Recommendation 8 (MR8): "Consideration should be given to whether contractors who carried out security services should be required to be licensed.</p> <p>The SIA has reviewed the requirement and agrees in principle with the recommendation that the requirement that only those monitoring CCTV under a contract for services need to hold an SIA licence should change. It has informed the Home Office of this. This would require legislative change. The SIA is working with the Home Office through a Joint Working Group on more detailed proposals and its implications MR8: Licensing contractors that carry out security services The SIA understands and supports the underlying drive and assurance on public safety that the recommendation is seeking to address. The SIA and Home Office have been working through how this recommendation would work in practice, its consequences, and how it might be affected by the Protect Duty being developed and finalised by the Home Office.</p>
<b>Communications</b>	
With the rest of the Industry calling our staff Officers, why does the SIA insist on calling them Guards?	<p>In our communications, we generally talk about security 'operatives'. When we are referring specifically to holders of a Security Guard licence, we refer to them as Security Guards.</p>