

	RECOMMENDATION	LEAD	UPDATE
1.	The apparent low levels of satisfaction expressed by in-house guards during the consultation carried out as part of this review should be subject to further investigation by SO16.	SO16	Recently increased levels of training, expanded work roles, enhanced rates of pay and new recruitment have all impacted on levels of satisfaction. It is anticipated that improved satisfaction will be measured through a staff survey commissioned by Supt Loxley SO16 to indicate current levels of staff satisfaction.
2.	With immediate effect, Facilities Management and SO16 should work in partnership to put in place a risk management strategy to minimise the potential detrimental impact of Security Industry Authority (SIA) Licensing on the ability to sustain appropriate levels of service across guarding arrangements. The risk management strategy should address the following:	SO16 /FM	SIA licensing is not required for 'in-house' MPS-employed guards at this time. SO16 Professional Training and Development Unit is already delivering training capable of meeting standards if such a requirement is introduced; the necessary classroom-based Conflict Resolution Module can be readily introduced. See also 2e update below.
2a.	Resilience management and contingency planning arrangements should be developed, in line with those suggested in Section 13.6 of the Report (link Recommendation 5).	SO16	New SOPs have been prepared to formalise and update resilience management and contingency planning and are being implemented by SDO's on a building by building basis with critical buildings being the priority.
2b.	Monitoring of retention and measurement of the effectiveness of Recommendations 12 and 13 in retaining staff.	SO16 /FM	The monitoring of the retention of outsourced guards is reported on in a monthly meeting chaired by the Supply Chain Manager and produced in the format of the service providers monthly contract report.
2c.	A budget should be reserved (suggested minimum of 10% of total cost of guarding arrangements) to cover any potential additional expense that the MPS could occur in 2006-7 in order to facilitate a response to any increases in cost for the provision of these services as a consequence of SIA licensing.	SO16 /FM	FM Revenue has increased the 2006/07 budget for inflation purposes. Existing service providers have confirmed that this is sufficient to absorb any increased costs (salaries & training) as a result of SIA Licensing at this time. FM will continue to monitor staff retention and service quality pending the retendering of this service, currently underway. The pay/grading for in house security guards has been revised at a cost of £928.00 per security officer, totaling £64,960.00 additional pay in 2006.
2d.	Monitor the progress and evaluate the findings of the SIA review to assess whether in-house services should remain exempt from licensing.	SO16	Recent formally documented contact with the SIA indicates that they have no plans to require registration or licensing.



	RECOMMENDATION	LEAD	UPDATE
2e.	The MPS should continue to seek Security Industry Authority recognition for in-house guard training through the SO16 Training & Professional Development Unit.	SO16	MPS guard training is already acknowledged (unofficially) by the SIA to meet and exceed their minimum standard for licensing. SO16 Training and Professional Development Unit has developed a structured training package and achieved accreditation as an 'NVQ Centre'; training unit staff are qualified and accredited SIA trainers. Currently 50 guard students are working towards NVQ qualification – likely to be attained by the end of the year.
			SO16 will continue to work with FM partners at NSY to train future guard recruits, using SIA and NVQ status to benchmark future training.
3.	 Facilities Management in partnership with SO16, Directorate of Information, Risk Management and Business Continuity should consider the development of a Building Security Strategy that focuses on building security requirements, including guarding. The proposed strategy should take into account the existing and planned configuration of the estate, evolving operational requirements for physical security and anticipated developments in security technology. The Strategy should also set out the desired position for the security of the MPS estate in terms of the following: Evolving threats and vulnerabilities. Available and emerging access control technologies and how they could be deployed across the MPS Use of physical security technology to support and enhance process and procedures for guarding and access control, possibly obviating or reducing the need for manned guarding at some sites Risk Management criteria for the selection of in-house or outsourced guarding arrangements Management and control arrangements for building security, including guarding (linked to Recommendations 11 and 13) 	SO16 /FM	 Property Services work closely with SO16 turning their requirements into a Building Security strategy that focuses on physical and practical solutions taking into account the Asset Management Strategy. Intelligence-based reports have already been prepared within SO16 dealing with evolving threats and vulnerabilities. These are detailed and documented in the SO16 reports 'Functions and Threats' (Oct '05) and 'Protecting our Assets' (Dec '05) A system exists for monthly reporting of threat levels to the MPS estate by SO to PSD. The human / technology mix is explored as part of the advice and assessment product of SO16 PSU. Other departments within SO16 evaluate emerging technologies.

	RECOMMENDATION	LEAD	UPDATE
	Process for the ongoing review of security and guarding arrangements (linked to Recommendations 6 and 7).		
4.	The Directorate of Resources should increase the transparency of budget lines for corporate security costs in order to facilitate the process of optimising (using cost benefit analysis) investment in people, process and technology.	FM	Work in connection with physical security measure is now separately identified. Manned guarding costs will show as a separate budget line for budget year 07/08.
5.	SO16 should facilitate local ownership of guarding, by means of the following:	SO16	
5a.	SO16 taking action to ensure that Senior Designated Officers (SDO) and Building Security Officers (BSO) are aware of their responsibilities in relation to guarding and as stipulated in the METSEC code.	SO16	This is already done on appointment and by continuing contact between SO16 PSU and the various SDOs/BSOs.
5b.	 SO16 should ensure compliance with the MPS' expectations for the completion of Form 2110 as part of the self assessment process for physical security, by means of the following: Ensure the availability of advice on physical security Provide guidelines for the completion of Form 2110, particularly with respect to guards and the factors that would highlight the need for change in guarding arrangements Offer recommendations concerning the level of resources for local support of BSOs. 	SO16	Advice on physical security is readily available and routinely given as part of the raison d'etre of SO16 PSU. Guarding is one of the elements of form 2110, which already includes guidance notes (page 2 is devoted to them) The whole document is in the course of a review by SO16 PSU to ensure that all relevant factors are highlighted for consideration by SDOs and BSOs. Recommendations are already made to BSOs on the style and level of local support that should be available.
6.	SO16's Physical Security Unit should work in partnership with BSOs to ensure that up-to-date Statements of Requirements for guarding are available, on a site-by-site basis, by November 2005. The ongoing maintenance of statements of requirements for guarding should be assisted by the following:	SO16	This work has already been completed. An SO16 PSU Security Advisor visited every guarded site ensuring that up- to-date Statements of Requirements were completed. This work is part of an ongoing programme of review and support for each site. If a site does need guarding SO16 as advisors are committed to working with PSD and BSOs to establish appropriate style and effective delivery of guarding.



	RECOMMENDATION	LEAD	UPDATE
6a.	 SO16's Physical Security Unit should develop the Physical Security Log (Form 2110) to ensure the following: Clarity about the criteria to be applied to building security assessment amongst all participants in the process. The regular review of statements of operational requirements for guarding. Additional reviews are triggered and outcomes logged following any change to the function and occupancy of respective sites. 	SO16	Building Security Assessment is addressed in the current '360 degree' review of form 2110 Statements of operational requirements for guarding are already the subject of regular review. This occurs at least every six months as BSOs review guarding in response to any variation in the general threat environment, a specific threat or change in asset vulnerability. The Physical Security Log already ensures that this is done. The review of the document currently taking place will retain this important feature.
6b.	The assessment BSOs undertake to complete the Physical Security Log (Form 2110) for their respective buildings should inform a review of the guarding requirements and site assignment instructions.	SO16	SO16 and BSO regular six-monthly review and assessment necessarily includes guarding considerations.
6c.	The working relationships between BSOs, Physical Security Unit, Directorate of Information and Property Services should be reinforced to enable BSOs to be notified in a timely manner about any changes in building assets, occupancy or programmes of work that might impact on the requirement for physical security arrangements, including guarding.	SO16	 This is a challenging area given the many changes of occupancy and development programmes for guarded sites. The Corporate Risk Management Group is charged with monitoring the Critical Building List and facilitates the working relationship between BSOs, PSU, Dol and PSD. This list and the status of buildings within it is reviewed every 6 months as part of the documented for 2110 procedure. All BSOs and SDOs are informed of any change to the status of their building. There is a mechanism within the Corporate Risk Management Group a fast track response to any
7.	SO16's Physical Security Unit should conduct immediate assessments of physical security arrangements at select sites (see 15.1, 15.2) to ensure the appropriate balance of guards, technology and process are deployed, in particular assessing the need for guarding at these sites. Physical Security Unit (PSU) should inform the Outsourcing Programme of the results of this assessment. This assessment and review process should be facilitated by undertaking the following:	SO16	significant change in perceived asset vulnerability. An SO16 PSU Security Advisor is to be assigned specifically to guarding. The style and level of security for select sites is already the subject of the regular review (form 2110) SO16 Security Advisor John Ruff has completed the assessment and review of select sites. The results have already been reported to SIR as part of this project and have informed their report

	RECOMMENDATION	LEAD	UPDATE
7a.	Review of the need for manned guarding at all buildings on the current critical building list, with the exception of New Scotland Yard (~30), to ensure guarding continues to be necessary and, where required, is appropriately staffed and tasked (in progress – PSU due to complete end August 2005).	SO16	SO16 Security Advisor John Ruff has completed this review. The results have already been reported to SIR as part of this project and have informed their report
7b.	Review of the manned guarding deployments at non-critical buildings (~14) to ensure the deployment is necessary (in progress – PSU due to complete end August 2005).	SO16	SO16 Security Advisor John Ruff has completed this review. The results have already been reported to SIR as part of this project and have informed their report.
7c.	Review of the reports on Form 2110 recently submitted by SDOs in order to assess the comments regarding security guards at their respective locations (work in progress – PSU due to complete end August 2005).	SO16	This work is ongoing as part of the current review of form 2110 and its associated procedures. Any product of the review will be incorporated into continuing guard training.
7d.	Review of the Form 2110 template to ensure its content is adequate regarding the subject of security guards (Links to Recommendation 5).	SO16	A review of form 2110 is already underway (see update recommendation 6.)
8.	 Facilities Management, working in partnership with SO16 as appropriate, should engage in outreach activities to keep informed of developments in the security and guarding arenas in order to advise on measures to support the retention of guards (linked to Recommendation 13). This could be facilitated by the following: Offering competitive remuneration packages as informed by the annual benchmarking of Guards' salary levels and terms and conditions. Monitoring other trends in the security industry market place, including the advent of SIA Licensing in March 2006. 	SO16 /FM	Since the SIR a pay increase has been agreed for in-house security staff. Supply Chain management within PSD is putting ion place a review and monitoring process for trends in the security industry market place, including the impact of SIA licensing.
9.	Facilities Management, working in partnership with SO16, should co-ordinate measures to enhance and reinforce the status of all security guards, facilitate staff retention and achieve consistency and quality of service delivery through investment in guards by the following means:	SO16 /FM	SO16 Professional Training and Development Unit has designed a two-day course for Senior Security Officers to develop staff skills in Attendance management, Staff Discipline, PDRs, Team Building and Leadership. It is anticipated this training will evolve to address emerging need.

	RECOMMENDATION	LEAD	UPDATE
9a.	Formulation of a generic job description supported by a competency framework for security guards (possibly based on the existing job description for in-house guards), including consideration of expansion of the role of guards, for example, by assigning them the responsibility for lock-down checks.	SO16 /FM	Job descriptions exist and work is in progress to match these to the MPs competency framework
9b.	A review of the training requirements for guards, including their initial training provision, attainment of NVQ Level 2 qualifications, the need for site-specific training and their ongoing need for security awareness education.		All guards meet the current SLA having undertaken a basic security training course approved by SITO as per BS7499. Additionally, under the SIA licensing, MPS contract guards have attained training to service industry standards. Training standards & attainment are currently reported to the supply chain manager via monthly meetings.
9c.	Implementation of professional development reviews in line with the personal development review system.	SO16 /FM	PDR processes are in place for in house guards. Various processes exist for outsourced guards and work is planned to consolidate these into an appropriate framework for the next generation of FM outsource contracts (post April 2007).
9d.	Consideration of the need to provide guards with appropriate individual recognition and rewards for exemplary performance and/or innovations concerning service delivery.	SO16 /FM	As for 9c.
9e.	The adoption of measures to ensure that all guards at MPS sites, both in-house and contracted, interface seamlessly with the MPS environment.	SO16 /FM	Training has led to improvements in the briefing of in-house security staff and their ability to input into the MPS intelligence network. Such improvements for contract staff remains work in progress.
10.	 Facilities Management in consultation with SO16 should consider enhancement of quality assurance arrangements for guarding with the following: Additional resources should be made available, equivalent to at least one full time member of staff at Band P level, in order to increase the frequency of intrusion testing and enable ad- hoc spot-checks All sites should be visited at least every 6 to 8 weeks, and be subject to random spot checks as appropriate in response to complaints and reported security incidents, especially while service improvements are being delivered. 	FM	Additional resources not required as frequency of intrusion testing has been increased in line with recommendations, by the current staff member at Band 'P' level. This has saved the projected additional estimated salary of £26,500 & annual corporate overhead and pension costs.



	RECOMMENDATION	LEAD	UPDATE
11.	 Facilities Management in consultation with SO16 should establish an accountability framework within the MPS security arena to ensure that service delivery is in accordance with the MPS's defined operational requirements for guarding services. To support this, decisions are required concerning the following: The ownership of physical security and guarding, including responsibility for championship for security throughout the MPS The responsibility for the delivery of guarding services. To avoid conflicts of interest, these two functions should not be held by the same individual or business group. 	SO16 /FM	SO16 have begun to engage with PSD, DPS, Dol and Corporate Risk management to establish a clear accountability and risk based decision making framework for the delivery of operational requirements for both physical security and manned guarding. This is initially focusing on those buildings on the critical buildings list.
12.	In the interim period before new contractual arrangements are established in January 2007, Facilities Management should take immediate action to implement the short-term service improvements outlined in Section 14.1 of the report for all contracted guarding arrangements. Progress with the proposed improvements should be monitored on behalf of the corporate owner of physical security.	FM	The monitoring of the retention of outsourced guards is reported on, on a monthly meeting chaired by the Supply Chain Manager and produced in the format of the service providers monthly contract report. Day-to-Day Management Increased management control is exercised over the MPS contract guarding services function, including day-to-day management by way of monthly supplier management meeting, intrusion test remedial action follow up and encouraging end user participation via the Building Security Officer in reporting any guarding issues. The review of site assignment instructions are undertaken annually by the service provider in consultation with the end user representative, or sooner in the event of a change in building use and/or occupation where SO16 would also be involved in the process. Service Monitoring Performance monitoring is robustly managed by supply chain management in the form of management information provided on a monthly basis by the service provider. This information is



	RECOMMENDATION	LEAD	UPDATE
			matched against the current service level agreement for compliance. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are currently being developed for inclusion in the tendering process.
			Compliance Checking A schedule of regular unannounced intrusion visits has been undertaken by Property Services (PS) Facilities Management (FM), checking for compliance with the METSEC code & for contractual compliance against current Site Assignment Instructions (SIA) & the Service Level Agreement (SLA). Any issues identified locally would be followed up by an ad-hoc spot check. Relevant feedback regarding performance is forwarded in a timely manner to contract managers both from intrusion visits & monthly supply chain management meetings.
			Oversight of Training and Professional Development of Staff Responsibility for identification of training needs rests with the main service provider supported by supply chain management who raise issues of non-performance, changes in business requirements and any changes in perceived threats.
			Responsibility for professional development rests with the main service provider again supported by supply chain management. Monitoring of training delivered is viewed via the monthly supply chain management meetings, the contractor providing management information in report form.
13.	Facilities Management and SO16 should agree who has the respective lead responsibilities for delivery of both contracted and in-house guarding services. The identified leads should work in partnership to achieve the following during the interim period	SO16 /FM	The respective lead responsibilities for contracted guarding services rests with Property Services and the in-house guarding services lead as SO16.
	 before January 2007: Co-ordination of guarding arrangements Sharing of good practice 		 The Property Services/SO16 partnership is further being enhanced to achieve the aims stated below before January 2007: Co-ordination of guarding arrangements



	RECOMMENDATION	LEAD	UPDATE
	 Development of a suite of key performance indicators, in accordance with the guidance provided in section 13.4 of the report, that can be applied consistently across all guarding arrangements Improved resilience through contingency planning and the maintenance of sufficient numbers of staff. 		 Sharing of good practice Development of a suite of KPIs to be applied consistently across all guarding arrangements Improved resilience through contingency planning & retention of sufficient staff numbers
14.	Facilities Management should ensure transparency in the following areas at the inception stage of any guarding arrangement:	FM	Facilities Management tendering preliminaries are underway and recommendations 14a – 14d are to be incorporated in the outsource process.
14a.	Information concerning KPIs should be declared to potential contractors at the start of the tendering process in order for the contractors to demonstrate that they are able to deliver in these areas.	FM	KPIs are being determined and will be declared to potential contractors at the start of the bidding process.
14b.	At the start of the tendering process, potential contractors should provide visibility of the following cost elements in relation to guarding services: • management and supervisory overheads • costs of recruitment• • training • uniform and equipment costs• • staff remuneration.	FM	Contractors will be required to provide visibility of cost elements in relation to guarding services
14c.	Contractors should be required to demonstrate their ability to manage any MPS vetting requirements for guards and should be informed about the likely timescales involved in gaining clearance for applicants.	FM	Contractors will be required to demonstrate their ability to manage any MPS vetting requirements and informed of timescales involved in the clearance process.
14d.	Preferred bidders should be advised of good practice on how to facilitate the vetting process.	FM	Preferred bidders will be advised of good practice on how to facilitate vetting.
15.	 From January 2007, the proposed 'Head of Security Services' within Facilities Management, should: Have oversight of all guarding arrangements and report to the corporate owner for physical security. Co-ordinate resilience management and contingency planning arrangements for guarding. 	FM	This post is subject to ongoing consultation and definition of requirements.



	RECOMMENDATION	LEAD	UPDATE
16.	 The Director of the Outsourcing Programme should ensure the following level of participation in, and scope of, the decision-making process for guarding arrangements: Representatives from SO16 (PSU), Risk Management Group and Corporate Planning are involved in the decision-making and planning associated with the outsourcing programme for guarding. Dissemination of information to above-mentioned stakeholders about the progress of the outsourcing programme, particularly in the areas relating directly to building security and guarding. Above-mentioned stakeholders are involved in the decision-making concerning the scope of guarding provision under the proposed facilities management arrangements. The implications of guarding arrangements not to be catered for under the auspices of Facilities Management are clarified in terms of service provision, resilience management, costs, recruitment and selection of guards and any TUPE implications. 	FM	The outsource programme is supported by an Outsource Action Group which includes reps from Risk Management and Corporate Planning. This group meets monthly and receives all information about outsource programmes and associated decisions. Detailed specification of the guarding requirements is about to commence and SO16 will be invited to participate as appropriate.