



S12 – Security Guarding Industry Leadership Group

Minutes of Vetting, Data Sharing and Digitisation workstream meeting held on the 28th November 2025 commencing at 1pm UK time.

Location: Video Conference Call (Teams)

Workstream Chair: Paul Evans, CEO, Carlisle Security

Workstream Attendees: Paul Fullwood, S12 Chief of Staff
Kevin Hannaford, Managing Director, Gallinet
Sam Butcher, Business Director, OCS
Courtney Morton, Owner, CWSR
Mark Wallace, Director, Kingdom
David Kendall, Operations Director, GSTS
Susanne Parker, Director of Business Operations, Securigroup
Jane Eden, Assistant Director HR & Compliance, SGS
Cassie Watson, Head of Product, Deploi
Tom Pickersgill, CEO, Deploi

Proposed Agenda

- Introductions, housekeeping and 'Workstream Code of Conduct'
- Workstream aspiration & draft key workstream objectives
- What do we need to do next to drive / support workstream objectives?
- Any risks, blockers and/or opportunities
- Actions & monthly reporting/milestones
- AOB / Next Steps

1. Introductions, housekeeping and 'Workstream Code of Conduct'

The meeting was declared open by the Chair at 1pm and all those in attendance were welcomed to the first Vetting, Data Sharing and Digitisation workstream meeting. During the opening remarks the Chair commented that all workstream members had been sent a 'Workstream Code of Conduct' and that the meeting will be held in accordance with that code.

The Chair invited all members to introduce themselves and outline their interest in the workstream.

2. Workstream aspiration & draft key workstream objectives

The Chair stated that we would seek to discuss the ambition of this workstream as we went through the hour, and that we would need to agree some measures of success to sit alongside the workstream going forward.



3. What do we need to do next to drive / support workstream objectives?

- **Vetting Process Challenges and Opportunities:** The Chair led a comprehensive discussion with participants including Mark Wallace, Kevin Hannaford, Jane Eden, Cassie, David Kendall, and Susanne Parker on the current challenges, inconsistencies, and potential improvements in the security industry's vetting processes, focusing on standardisation, centralisation, and risk mitigation.
 - **Inconsistency in Vetting Standards:** Kevin Hannaford highlighted the lack of consistency across companies in applying the BS7858 vetting standard, noting that technology and industry practices have evolved since the last revision in 2019, resulting in confusion and inefficiency when staff move between employers.
 - **Centralised Vetting Database Proposal:** Jane Eden proposed the creation of a centralised database where companies could upload and access vetting records, allowing for gap analysis and reducing redundant work, with each company retaining responsibility for right to work and credit checks while sharing core vetting data.
 - **Tiered Vetting and Risk Mitigation:** Cassie Watston and Mark Wallace discussed the need for a more dynamic, risk-based approach to vetting, suggesting that different roles require different levels of scrutiny, while David Kendall cautioned that a tiered system must not undermine overall security by underestimating risks in lower-profile roles.
 - **Cost and Responsibility Considerations:** The Chair and Paul Fullwood emphasized the importance of understanding the costs and liabilities associated with vetting, suggesting that data on industry-wide vetting expenditure be collected to inform discussions with regulators and to evaluate the benefits of centralisation or outsourcing.
 - **International and Legislative Comparisons:** Kevin Hannaford and others raised the point that countries like Ireland have more uniformed and legislated vetting processes, prompting the group to consider lessons from devolved states and other sectors, and to explore whether similar legislative frameworks could be adopted in the UK.
- **Digitisation and Data Sharing Initiatives:** The group, including the Chair, Susanne Parker, Tom Pickersgill, and others, explored the potential for digitising vetting records, SIA licenses, and employment data, aiming to streamline onboarding, enable continuous monitoring, and enhance industry-wide data sharing while addressing GDPR and stakeholder concerns.
 - **Digital Vetting Passport Concept:** Participants discussed the idea of a digital 'passport' for security personnel, where vetted status and supporting documents could be securely shared with new employers, reducing duplication and expediting onboarding, with Jane Eden and Tom Pickersgill referencing previous industry attempts and current technology solutions.
 - **Integration with SIA License and HMRC:** Susanne Parker and The Chair suggested linking digital vetting records to the SIA license and integrating with HMRC and PAYE systems, which would facilitate compliance with right to work, working time regulations, and tax obligations, and help address issues such as cash-in-hand employment.



- **Continuous Monitoring and Data Collaboration:** Tom Pickersgill emphasised the value of continuous monitoring of personnel beyond initial vetting, while Susanne Parker advocated for expanding shared data to include training records and site-specific requirements, enabling real-time validation and reducing administrative burden.
- **GDPR and Data Management Concerns:** The Chair and others acknowledged the need to ensure data privacy and compliance with GDPR when sharing personal and employment data across organisations and with regulators, highlighting the importance of robust data management and stakeholder buy-in.
- **Stakeholder Engagement and Next Steps:** The Chair and Paul Fullwood outlined actions to involve additional stakeholders such as the BSIA, SIA's head of digital transformation, HMRC, and buyers, and set expectations for future meetings to define measures of success and ensure the work stream delivers actionable outcomes.
 - **Identifying Additional Stakeholders:** The group agreed to invite representatives from the BSIA, SIA digital transformation, HMRC, and potentially buyers to future meetings, recognising the need for broader input and expertise to advance the work stream's objectives.
 - **Defining Success Metrics:** The Chair requested that participants consider both quantitative and qualitative measures of success for the work stream, with the intention of establishing clear goals and tracking progress over the coming months.
 - **Action Items and Meeting Logistics:** The Chair committed to circulating meeting minutes and action items, encouraged participants to nominate relevant colleagues for future sessions, and announced plans for a follow-up meeting and an industry webinar after the upcoming ministerial briefing.

4. Actions & Monthly Reporting / Milestones

- **Engagement with SIA Digital Transformation:** Invite Phil Urquhart (Chief Digital and Data Officer at SIA) to attend the next group meeting to discuss digitisation of the SIA license card and related initiatives. (Paul Evans)
- **Engagement with BSIA:** Invite the BSIA (British Security Industry Association), specifically John McCaskill, to participate in this group to discuss their potential role in industry vetting solutions. (Paul Evans, Paul Fullwood)
- **Vetting Cost Data Collection:** Obtain and share data on the collective annual spend on vetting activities by the top 30 companies, leveraging Adrian White's ongoing data collection efforts. (Paul Fullwood)
- **Research on Devolved States Vetting Legislation:** Investigate vetting legislation and practices in devolved states (e.g., Ireland, Northern Ireland) to identify best practices and potential improvements for the UK security industry. (ALL)
- **Exploration of Centralised Vetting Database:** Explore the feasibility of creating a centralised database for vetting records, including mechanisms for company participation and data updates. (ALL)
- **Identification of Additional Stakeholders:** Identify and suggest additional stakeholders (e.g., HMRC, buyers, other relevant parties) who should be invited to participate in this work stream. (ALL)



- **Definition of Success Measures:** Define and agree on clear measures of success for the work stream to assess progress over 6, 12, 18, and 24 months. (ALL)

5. The meeting was closed by the Chair at 2pm