

MEETING NOTES
PSO GUIDELINE COMMITTEE
JANUARY 29, 2009
CONFERENCE CALL – 11:00 am to 12:00 pm EST.

1. Welcome and Call to Order

Standards & Guidelines Commission Liaison Mr. Steve Bucklin called the meeting of the PSO Guideline Committee to order at 11:00 am EST. and welcomed the participants.

2. Roll Call

Ms. Sue Carioti of ASIS staff took roll. The attendance list is appended as Attachment I.

3. Approve Agenda

Liaison Bucklin called for any proposed modifications to the agenda and being none, the agenda was approved.

4. Approve Meeting Notes

Liaison Bucklin called for any proposed modifications to the PSO Meeting Notes of 6/4/08, and being none, the notes were approved.

5. Discussion of Comments Second Public Review Comments

Liaison Bucklin provided an update to the Committee regarding the initiative of the Job Analysis Validation Study. He stated there has been extensive discussion on the 48-hr. training guidance which remains a contentious topic. As a result, a presentation regarding a job analysis study was brought forth to the ASIS Foundation. He noted the job analysis study may create classifications and levels around training hours, and may be conducted by the Professional Examination Services. Liaison Bucklin noted the study would strengthen the PSO Guideline. If funded, the ASIS Foundation requests publication of the PSO Guideline be held pending study results.

Liaison Bucklin next opened for discussion of comments, referencing the PSO Guideline 2nd Public Review comments compilation dated 12/23/08, the PDF file “Cliff Ingber Comments”, and the PSO Guideline draft dated 10/31/08. It was noted various commenters from different organizations submitted many duplicate comments for consideration. The PSO Committee deliberated each of the comments with the following resolutions (based on the commenter’s proposed change):

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Discussion Points/Consensus</u>	<u>Resolution</u>
No. 1	Section 11.0, Table 1	Discussion ensued regarding the proposed change to the Pre-assignment, Post-Assignment and Annual Training row. The Committee resolved to add the phrase “according to manufacturer’s recommendations” to the provided text as follows: “Establishing a requirement for private security officer training (orientation/pre-assignment; on-the-job; ongoing/refreshers/annual courses, to include periodic documented training according to manufacturers’ recommendations on lethal weapons, tactics and techniques.)”	Agree, with modification
No. 2	Section 2.0, Table 2	Discussion ensued regarding the proposed change to the Drug Screening requirement and the Committee determined that the necessary language is already established in the guideline.	Disagree
No. 3	Section 3.0, page 7	Discussion ensued relative to the makeup of the ASIS Standards and Guidelines Commission and the Committee determined that the makeup is appropriate to the scope of the guideline.	Disagree
No. 4	Section 7.0, paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5	Discussion ensued regarding the comment that the provisions of the Scope should be more substantive. The Committee noted that no proposed change was submitted and determined that the existing text was sufficient.	Disagree
No. 5	Section 7.0	Discussion ensued regarding the proposal to change "intended to set forth minimum criteria" to "intended to set forth meaningful standards". The Committee determined that the existing text is appropriate for the document as it is a guideline and not a standard.	Disagree
No. 6	Section 7.0	Discussion ensued regarding the comment that meaningful standards should be binding. The Committee noted that ASIS is not a regulatory body with the ability to enforce requirements.	Disagree
No. 7	Section 7.0	Discussion ensued regarding the comment that standards put forth should be more detailed and specific. The Committee determined that the existing scope is appropriate for the document as it is a guideline and not a standard.	Disagree
No. 8 - 13	Section 7.0	Discussion ensued regarding the suggestion that the client site should be the key factor in determining a minimum standard, with the suggested text change from "minimum" to "encouraged if deemed appropriate by a Director of Security". The Committee determined that the existing text is appropriate for the document as it is a guideline and not a standard.	Disagree
No. 14	Section 8.0	Discussion ensued regarding the suggested change from "offers minimum criteria" to "offers meaningful standards". The Committee determined that the existing text is appropriate for the document as it is a guideline and not a standard.	Disagree
No. 15 - 17	Section 9.0	Discussion ensued regarding the suggestion that the client site should be the key factor in determining a minimum standard, with the suggested text change from "minimum" to "encouraged if deemed appropriate by a Director of Security". The Committee again determined that the existing text is appropriate for the document as it is a guideline and not a standard.	Disagree

No. 18 - 20	Section 11.0	Discussion ensued regarding the comments to remove the word "minimum" from the second sentence : "One of the main goals of the Private Security Officer Selection and Training Guideline is to develop and encourage adoption of minimum national criteria for the selection and training of all private security officers, be they proprietary or contract.". The Committee noted that the Guideline is designed to provide minimum recommended requirements for a level of competency and companies are encouraged to exceed these minimum requirements.	Disagree
No. 21	Section 11.0, paragraph 2, line 1	Discussion ensued regarding the suggested change of text from "minimum" to "encouraged if deemed appropriate by a Director of Security". The Committee determined that the existing text is appropriate for the document as it is a guideline and not a standard.	Disagree
No. 22, 24 and 26	Section 11.0, paragraph 2, line 1	Discussion ensued relative to the suggested removal of the sentence "They are also required to be able to work closely and effectively with public safety personnel.", because "security officers are not security consultants". The Committee determined that the clarity of the comment was insufficient to effect the proposed change.	Disagree
No. 23 and 25	Section 11.0, paragraph 2, line 1	Discussion ensued regarding the suggested change of text from "minimum" to "encouraged if deemed appropriate by a Director of Security". The Committee noted that the Guideline is deemed to provide minimum recommended requirements for a level of competency and companies are encouraged to exceed these minimum requirements.	Disagree
No. 27 – 30	Section 11.0	Discussion ensued relative to deletion of the sentence: "The ability of US companies to protect the nations critical infrastructure largely depends on private security officers.". The Committee determined that the existing text quotes a U.S. Government document and resolved to add a reference to the Bibliography for the relevant document.	Disagree
No. 31	Section 11.1, Table 1	Discussion ensued relative to the suggested development of modal code based on best practices. The Committee determined that a change could not be effected based on the lack of example or proposed text.	Disagree
No. 32	Section 11.1, Table 2	Discussion ensued regarding verification of the education requirement and the Committee determined that the present language of the Guideline is appropriate to obtaining verification.	Disagree
No. 33	Section 11.2, paragraph 1, line 2	Discussion ensued regarding the proposal to change "minimum criteria" to "meaningful standards". The Committee determined that the existing text is appropriate for the document as it is a guideline and not a standard.	Disagree
No. 34	Section 11.2, Table 2	Discussion ensued regarding the proposed change to General Requirements relative to minimum age and determined that the proposed change conflicts with existing regulatory requirements.	Disagree
No. 35 – 46	Section 11.2, Table 2	Discussion ensued regarding each specific increase in the Table 2 criteria. The Committee noted that the Guideline is deemed to provide minimum recommended requirements for a level of competency and companies are encouraged to exceed these minimum requirements.	Disagree

The Committee agreed to continue comment review at the next meeting with comment No. 47.

6. Open Discussion

Liaison Bucklin next moved the discussion to Action Items.

7. Action Items

- ASIS Staff to update draft and compilation for distribution to the Committee in advance of the next meeting.
- Dennis Blass will provide a document reference for a U.S. Government document that contains the content found in paragraph 3 of section 11.0.

8. Next Meeting

The Committee resolved to meet on Tuesday, February 24, 2009 at 11:00 am EST.

9. Adjournment

Liaison Bucklin adjourned the meeting at 12:00 pm EST.

Submitted by:

Jeanette Donovan

Coordinator, Standards and Guidelines

ASIS International

[Original Signed by:]

Antitrust Risk Notice: As a reminder, participation in standard and guideline committees involves the potential for antitrust concerns or risks. To avoid such concerns and risks, participants should carefully observe the "ASIS Standards Development Procedures". In addition, sensitive discussion topics such as price, specific contractual terms, etc., should be avoided. Any participant having concerns or questions regarding sensitive discussion topics should consult with their company's legal counsel, the Committee leadership or ASIS staff.

Early Patent Disclosure Notice: ASIS follows ANSI's patent policy where disclosure of relevant patented inventions at the earliest possible time in the standards development process is encouraged. Neither ASIS, the Committee, nor its Chair ensure the accuracy or completeness of any disclosure or whether any disclosure is of a patent that in fact may be essential for the use of standards under development.

Attachment I

PSO GUIDELINE COMMITTEE 1-29-09 MEETING ATTENDANCE

Steven Bucklin (Liaison)	Glenbrook Security Services, Inc.
Dennis Blass	Security Engineers, University of Alabama
Bernard Greenawalt	Securitas Security Services USA
Richard McClintock	Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center
Vince Ruffolo	A&R Security
Jeffrey Slotnick	Setracon, Inc.
Alan Zajic	Security Consultant

ASIS Staff Present

Sue Carioti, Director, Standards & Guidelines

Aivelis Opicka, Manager, Standards & Guidelines

Jeanette Donovan, Coordinator, Standards & Guidelines