



Ninth Report  
of the

Foreign Affairs Committee  
Private Military Companies

Session 2001–2002

Response of the Secretary of State for  
Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs

*Presented to Parliament  
by the Secretary of State for  
Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs  
by Command of Her Majesty  
October 2002*

**© Crown Copyright 2002**

The text in this document (excluding the Royal Arms and departmental logos) may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium providing that it is reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the document specified.

Any enquiries relating to the copyright in this document should be addressed to The Licensing Division, HMSO, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich, NR3 1BQ. Fax: 01603 723000 or e-mail: [licensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk)

# **NINTH REPORT OF THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

## **PRIVATE MILITARY COMPANIES**

**SESSION 2001–2002**

### **RESPONSE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AND COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS**

1. The Government welcomes this important and thorough report from the Foreign Affairs Committee and has taken careful note of it.
  
2. The Government welcomes the Committee's positive assessment of the Government's Green Paper on "Private Military Companies: Options for Regulation". It notes the Committee's judgement that "such companies have the potential to make a legitimate and valuable contribution to international security. The challenge of regulation is therefore not only to prevent PMCs from inflicting damage, but also to establish how the Government should work with them to maximise the benefits that a properly regulated private military sector can bring" (paragraph 4).
  
3. The Consultation period on the February 2002 Green Paper "Private Military Companies" (PMCs) ended on 12 August. There were a total of 39 responses: 16 from Companies and Trade Associations, 6 from NGOs, 7 from academics, 3 from Members of Parliament and 7 others. A list is attached at Annex A. As part of the Consultation process, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Department for International Development sponsored a Seminar at the Centre for Studies in Security and Diplomacy at the University of Birmingham on 24 June 2002. There was widespread support in responses to the Consultation, including from a number of PMCs, for some regulation. Options proposed ranged from prohibition of all military activity to self-regulation.
  
4. Contributors raised a number of key concerns about policy towards PMCs, including:
  - the risk of damage to legitimate security-related business interests by over-regulation. Some contributors argued against regulation on these grounds, and on the grounds that regulation might be complex and expensive.
  - possible threats to human rights, national sovereignty and development in poor countries from the activities of PMCs
  - lack of transparency and accountability in the sector, including links to other businesses, in particular extractive industries
  
5. Contributors also identified potential benefits from legitimate PMC activity, such as:
  - assistance to weak but legitimate governments in establishing the security needed for development
  - provision of services of direct social and economic benefit, such as de-mining
  - assistance to the UN in peacekeeping
  - protection of legitimate commercial and NGO activity in dangerous areas
  - raising the professional standards of local armed forces
  - economic benefits to UK businesses

6. The Government considers that the case that has been put forward, in particular by the Foreign Affairs Committee, for Regulation of PMCs needs careful further consideration. The Green Paper Consultation and the Committee's Report have made clear that the question of regulation raises complex policy issues. They include:

- the balance of advantage between regulation and allowing companies to conduct legitimate business of economic benefit to the UK without undue hindrance
- whether any activities should be prohibited, and how heavy any regulation should be for those permitted
- the form of any regulation, who should be responsible for it, and how it would be paid for
- defining who and what might be covered
- the compatibility of any regulatory system with EU and International Law
- addressing concerns about the transparency, probity and attitude to human rights of PMCs
- minimising the risk that any regulatory regime would be seen as the UK endorsing undesirable activities.

7. In addition, the Committee, and a number of contributors to the Consultation, have drawn attention to the experience of the United States and other Governments in regulating Private Military Companies. The views and experiences of international institutions such as the United Nations and the European Union are clearly also of importance. The Government therefore proposes to seek further information on these as part of its further consideration of the issues, before taking any view on the way forward.

### *Recommendations*

#### Existing Regulatory Measures

- (a) We conclude that the lack of centrally held information on contracts between Government Departments and private military companies is unacceptable. We recommend that the Government take immediate steps to collect such information and to update it regularly. We further recommend that in its response to this Report the Government publish a comprehensive list of current contracts between Government Departments and private military companies and private security companies, and provides the information requested by the Committee in the Chairman's letter of 18 June to Denis MacShane, which is reproduced in full at page Ev.44 (paragraph 17).**

*The Government agrees with the Committee on the value of such information. Attached at Annex B is a list of current contracts overseas with private military and security companies known to Foreign and Commonwealth Office posts.*

*The Department for International Development (DFID) has no contracts with private military companies. A survey has been undertaken of the DFID offices overseas to see whether any have contracts with private security companies for the provision of post security separate to that provided under FCO contracts. The outcome of the survey is included at Annex B.*

*It has not been possible in the time available to collect similar information for the Ministry of Defence given the very broad spectrum of activities, including logistics support, training, maintenance, catering and accommodation for which the Ministry of Defence lets contracts. Such contracts are let by all three Services for all types of deployment, from UN mandated peace support, peacekeeping and enforcement, to exercises and training. Considerable work would be required to define and identify the contracts which might fall under the Committee's request.*

- (b) We recommend that the Government, as it considers national regulatory measures, also develop a new draft international convention to regulate PMCs which might replace the existing UN Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries (paragraph 25).**

*The Government agrees that the UN Convention is unlikely to provide a workable basis for regulation, but does not believe that there is any realistic prospect of developing a replacement for the time being. The Government will continue to develop UK policy.*

- (c) We recommend that, in considering options for regulation, the Government examine carefully the United States government's regime for regulating and monitoring the activities of private military companies (paragraph 28).**

*The Government notes that the Green Paper draws attention to the United States legislation, and will examine the experience of the United States and other governments, such as South Africa, in more detail as consideration of the issues continues.*

- (d) We recommend that the Government work with European partners towards including the services provided by PMCs in the existing EU Code of Conduct for Arms Exports (paragraph 30).**

*The Government agrees that there will be value in promoting a common EU approach to PMCs. It will initiate consultation with EU partners and report to the Committee.*

The debate on Private Military Companies

- (e) We recommend that, before bringing forward legislation to regulate PMCs, the Government consider how to deal with the possible involvement of these companies in the overthrow of established states (paragraph 50).**

*The Government will consider this.*

- (f) Although the services provided by PMCs will not by themselves solve underlying problems in unstable countries, we conclude that the employment of professional, responsible and well regulated PMCs could, in some circumstances, contribute to the establishment or maintenance of relative stability, under which lasting solutions to such problems might be worked out. We further conclude that PMCs may have a legitimate role to play in helping weak governments to secure revenue streams, for example by protecting border points and highways (paragraph 67).**

*The Government agrees that PMCs have the potential in some circumstances to play a positive role.*

- (g) We recommend that the Government prohibit private military or security companies from using names similar to those of British regiments or fighting units, or from the use of any emblem, symbol or distinctive item of uniform similar to those of the British armed forces (paragraph 71).**

*The Government considers that there is a case for prohibiting private military companies from adopting names, logos or other appearances that imitate those of the Armed Forces.*

Potential benefits of a regulated private military sector

- (h) We conclude that the Government should consider carefully whether the greater use of PMCs in UK humanitarian and peace support operations might help to reduce military over-stretch (paragraph 101).**

*The Ministry of Defence let contracts with private companies where appropriate to support a wide variety of deployed commitments, including peacekeeping and humanitarian operations. These contracts are primarily for logistical support, including troop deployment, food supply and maintenance of accommodation and equipment. The availability of reputable companies to provide such support means that the UK may be in a better position than might otherwise be the case to respond positively to requests to take part in such operations.*

*The Government sees no difficulty of principle in private companies offering support to humanitarian or peacekeeping missions directly to the UN or to other international bodies that mandate or co-ordinate such missions. But when the UN formally requests the Government to contribute to such operations, it does so in the expectation that the front-line tasks will be undertaken by the UK's Armed Forces, with their known skills and experience. The Government would therefore not consider it appropriate for the UK to agree to undertake such tasks and then, as it were, to sub contract them to private companies. If the existence of other commitments meant that the Armed Forces were not able to undertake new peacekeeping or other humanitarian operations themselves, the Government considers that it would be preferable to decline the mission at the outset.*

Options for Regulation

- (i) We conclude that an outright ban on all military activity abroad by private military companies would be counterproductive (paragraph 102).**

*The Government agrees.*

- (j) Though the Green Paper argues that “the distinction between combat and non-combat activities is often artificial,” we conclude that such a distinction can and should be drawn for the purposes of regulation. We do not underestimate the difficulties inherent in this process (paragraph 107).**

*The Government agrees that a workable distinction would be an important element of any regulatory regime in spite of the difficulty of drawing one up.*

- (k) We recommend that private military companies be expressly prohibited from direct participation in armed combat operations, and that firearms should only be carried — and if necessary, used — by company employees for purposes of training or self-defence (paragraph 108).**

*The Government will consider this carefully. As the Committee says, “PMCs may have a legitimate role in helping weak governments to secure revenue streams, for example by protecting border points and highways” (paragraph 67). This may require the use of firearms.*

- (l) We recommend that the Government give very careful consideration to imposing a ban on all recruitment by PMCs for combat operations and other activities, which are illegal under United Kingdom law. We further recommend that the Government consider the practicality of a complete ban on recruitment for such activities of United Kingdom citizens by overseas-based or offshore PMCs (paragraph 114).**

*The Government will consider this recommendation. It might be possible to address the issue as part of a regulatory regime. The question of the relation of any regulatory regime to existing UK law such as the 1870 Foreign Enlistment Act would require careful consideration.*

- (m) We recommend that, to prevent the inappropriate use of knowledge gained through employment in the British armed forces, the Government examine whether restrictions should be placed on former British service personnel who wish to move into related activity in the private sector, such as a ‘cooling off’ period similar to that which applies to former civil servants and government advisers (paragraph 115).**

*The principles governing the acceptance of business appointments by officers of the Crown Service after leaving the Services are already covered in the Queen’s Regulations for each of the three Services. The regulations state that “before accepting, within two years of leaving the Service, an offer of employment, all officers must obtain the approval of the Ministry of Defence. An officer of or above the rank of Rear-Admiral, Major-General or Air Vice Marshal must obtain approval to take up any paid employment whether or not with a defence contractor or foreign government”. This procedure is necessary to ensure that when an officer accepts outside employment there should not be cause for suspicion of impropriety.*

- (n) We recommend that each contract for a military/security operation overseas should be subject to a separate licence, with the exception of companies engaged in the provision of non-contentious services for whom the Government considers a general licence would suffice (paragraph 123).**

*The Government will consider this. Any regulatory regime would need to strike a balance between covering what needs to be covered, and avoiding unnecessary burdens on the private sector.*

- (o) We recommend that the Government consider carefully how to ensure that a licensing regime allows companies to operate with the necessary speed without compromising the effectiveness of the vetting process (paragraph 124).**

*The Government agrees that this would be a key issue for any regulatory regime.*

- (p) Despite private military companies’ concerns about client confidentiality, we conclude that the need to ensure that the sector is properly regulated overrides the private interests of PMCs and their clients (paragraph 126).**

*For any regulatory regime to be successful disclosure would be necessary, but a balance would need to be struck between the need for informed decision making and client confidentiality.*

- (q) We recommend that the Government should consider whether exemptions to the project-specific licensing procedure described above should apply with respect to contracts with trusted organizations of which the United Kingdom is a member, such as NATO, the United Nations or the European Union and with responsible governments (paragraph 129).**

*The Government agrees that this could be a useful component of any regulatory regime. It would reduce the regulatory burden, and encourage legitimate business.*

- (r) We recommend that private military and security companies be required to obtain a general licence before undertaking any permitted military/security activities overseas (paragraph 134).**

*The Government will consider this recommendation.*

- (s) We recommend that, as part of the application procedure for registration, private military companies be required to disclose to the Government in some detail the company structures, the experience of permanent personnel, recruitment policies, and other relevant information (paragraph 135).**

*The Government will consider carefully the information disclosure that would be necessary for an effective regime.*

- (t) We conclude that a voluntary code is insufficient to regulate the private military industry, because it would not enable the Government to prevent the activities of disreputable companies which were detrimental to the United Kingdom's interests (paragraph 137).**

*The Government notes this conclusion, and notes that some private military companies have also suggested a voluntary code. It considers that it would in any case be in the interests of reputable private military companies to draw up a voluntary code of conduct. Adherence to this code could become a factor in any decisions taken under a regulatory regime.*

- (u) Given the costs inherent in regulating the private sector to perform the tasks discussed in this Report, we recommend that the Government weigh these costs carefully against the option of developing a publicly funded armed service cadre to provide on a commercial basis the tasks currently being undertaken by PMCs (paragraph 141).**

*The Government will consider this. There would be risks inherent in setting up an operation which might be seen as amounting to a publicly owned PMC.*

- (v) We conclude that improving controls over the trafficking and brokering of arms would curb some of the most damaging activities of private military companies. We further conclude that, because of improved international intelligence cooperation since the terrorist attacks of 11 September, policing such controls should be possible. We recommend that the Government apply extra-territorial jurisdiction to the brokering and trafficking of arms at the earliest opportunity (paragraph 149).**

*The Export Control Act 2002 contains a new general power allowing controls to be imposed on trafficking and brokering in arms and other sensitive equipment. Controls may be imposed under the Act in relation to trafficking and brokering activities carried out by persons in the UK or by any UK person overseas.*

*The Government has proposed to use the new Act to control trafficking and brokering in military equipment to any destination, where any relevant part of the activity takes place in the United Kingdom. The Government has also proposed to use the new power extra-territorially to control trafficking and brokering in military equipment to embargoed destinations, and trafficking and brokering in equipment used for torture (the export of which is already banned) and in long-range missiles to any destination. Trafficking and brokering of this latter kind is subject to widespread international condemnation and the Government believes that UK persons living overseas may reasonably be expected to know that such activities would be likely to constitute an offence.*

*The Government expects that the Export Control Act and the new controls to be introduced under it, including those on arms trafficking and brokering, will come into force during the second half of 2003.*



- (w) We recommend that any prospective regulatory regime for private military companies be co-ordinated with the Government's existing export controls, to ensure that arms used by a PMC in fulfilment of a contract do not remain in a country subject to embargo (paragraph 150).**

*The Government agrees that a degree of co-ordination with existing export controls would be desirable. However any regulatory regime for PMCs would not absolve them from the provisions of arms export control legislation, including the observance of arms embargoes.*

- (x) We recommend that the Government consider establishing an informal appraisal and complaints mechanism, which would operate through consultations between UK officials in posts and the organizations operating alongside PMCs in the field (paragraph 153).**

*The Government would expect posts to report on the operations of PMCs as necessary as part of their normal business, and pass on any complaints. But any regulatory regime should include a formal complaints procedure.*

- (y) We recommend that the Government establish as an integral part of any regulatory system an appropriate monitoring and evaluation regime, and make full co-operation with that regime a condition of the granting of licences to PMCs (paragraph 157).**

*The Government will consider this.*

- (z) We conclude that procedures similar to those for Parliamentary scrutiny of arms export licences should apply to any regulation of PMCs, with prior parliamentary scrutiny being applied to any licence applications that might involve PMCs in provision of armed combat services (paragraph 160).**

*The Government agrees that scrutiny procedures for any regulatory regime should be consistent with those for arms export licences.*

- (aa) We recommend that the Government consider very carefully how to ensure that the benefits of permitting a regulated private military sector to operate from the United Kingdom are not outweighed by the costs of establishing and maintaining a regime for their regulation (paragraph 163).**

*The Government considers that the balance between the costs of a regulatory regime and the costs and benefits of the activities of PMCs lies at the heart of the issue.*

## Annexes

A: List of responses to the Consultation on the Green Paper

B: List of current contracts between Government Departments and private military/security companies reported by FCO and DFID posts as at 21 October 2002.

**A LIST OF RESPONSES TO THE CONSULTATION ON THE GREEN PAPER**

Rt Hon Bernard Jenkin MP  
Rt Hon Bruce George MP and Simon H Cooper  
Rt Hon Menzies Campbell QC MP  
Armor Group Services Limited  
Association of Police and Public Service Providers  
Blue Sky Strategy Consulting Limited  
Control Risks Group  
Defence Manufacturers Association  
EOD Solutions  
Gurkha International  
Hart Group  
Inkerman Group Limited  
International Peace Operation Association  
Joint Security Industry Council  
RMZ Limited  
Rubicon International Services Limited  
Sandline International  
Strategic Consulting International  
Society British Aerospace Manufacturers  
British Red Cross  
Campaign Against Arms Trade  
Centre for Democracy and Development  
International Alert  
International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement  
United Nations Association for Great Britain and Northern Ireland  
Christopher Kinsey MSc (Econ), Department International Politics, University College Wales  
Dr Elke Krahnemann, Harvard University  
Major Wilson, Major Kite, Major Dangerfield, Major Robinson and Major Henry Cummins,  
Royal Military College of Science, University of Cranfield  
RAND Europe  
Royal United Services Institute for Defence Studies  
Christopher Spearin, Centre for International and Security Studies, University of Toronto  
Josh Arnold-Forster  
Mark Briggins  
John Champneys  
Brian Johnson-Thomas  
David Isenberg  
Christopher Spearin  
Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

**LIST OF CURRENT CONTRACTS WITH PRIVATE MILITARY/SECURITY COMPANIES, REPORTED BY FCO AND DFID POSTS AS OF 21 OCTOBER 2002**

Post	Name of Company	Type of Work in which Company engaged	Cost for FY 2001-2002	Duration of Contract	Value of Contract over its full life (where applicable/available)
Abidjan Cote d'Ivoire	SPS – Guards	Provide security guards, alarm systems and rapid response teams	£53,600	Renewed Annually	£65,700 per year
Abuja Nigeria	Servtrust Ltd (Prudential Guards)	Provide security guards. Includes Kaduna	£240,000	Renewed Annually	£489,622 (1999 - 2002)
Accra Ghana	Safetech	Provide a rapid response team should a panic or fire alarm sound in the British High Commission or residences	£22,000 plus instalment	Renewed Annually	£36,000 per year
Ahmedabad India	Group 4	Provide security guards	£180	Open ended (Since January 2002)	£60 a month
Almaty Kazakhstan	Group 4 Securitas,	Provide 2 guards for out-house visa/consular section; alarms for residences; rapid response teams as back up Also visa/consular section fees delivery services to local bank	£50,000 (including provision of equipment)	Open ended	
Amsterdam The Netherlands	Pre Ned Beveiliging	Provide security guards during office hours	£50,000	Open ended (Since November 2000)	
Antananarivo Madagascar	Vesta	Provide security guards for British Embassy and residences	£8,738	Renewed Annually	
Asuncion Paraguay	Boqueron SA	Provide local security guards	£15,612.54	April 2001 - end 2003	£964.82 per month
Athens Greece	Wackenhut	Provide security guards for British Embassy and official residences	£231,840	Sept 2000 - Sept 2005	£456,000
	Wackenhut	Provide counter-surveillance	£172,490	Sept 2000 - March 2003	£432,955
	Wackenhut	Patrol staff accommodation	£114,382	June 2000 - Dec 2002	£271,662

<b>Post</b>	<b>Name of Company</b>	<b>Type of Work in which Company engaged</b>	<b>Cost for FY 2001–2002</b>	<b>Duration of Contract</b>	<b>Value of Contract over its full life (where applicable/available)</b>
Bamako Mali	AMM	Provide guards at Embassy and Residence	£9,540	Renewed Annually	£11,714 per year
Baku Azerbaijan	Group 4	Provide additional security at functions and for leave cover; trial 911 service-patrolling residences, liaising with police and staff etc.	£230.52 £276.32	6-30 Nov 2001 1-31 Dec 2001	
	SS EAST		£90.42	13-15 March 2002	
Bangkok Thailand	Property Care Services	Provide night guards for one residence	£2,100.00	Renewed Annually	
Belmopan Belize	KBH Security Systems and Services Ltd	Provide a manned guard system to deter theft, trespass and vandalism	£30,000	January 2002 (but continues to operate on a monthly basis)	£2,500 per month
Berlin Germany	Securitas	Provide guards for main British Embassy building	£132,000	1 April 2002 – 31 March 2003	
Bogota Colombia	Honor & Laurel	Provide guards for British Embassy buildings	£9,316	Hire when necessary	
	Defence Systems Colombia	Provide drivers and bodyguards	£4,060		
Bombay India	Guard 4	Provide security guards for offices in Goa and Ahmedabad	£1,500	January 2002	
Bridgetown Barbados	J.E Security Systems and Services	Provide security monitoring services and maintain security systems at official residences	£11,963.31	One year	£11,963.31
	Quality Security Services	Provide security guards outside working hours and recording equipment at British High Commissions and offices	£47,460.26	One year	£47,460.26

<b>Post</b>	<b>Name of Company</b>	<b>Type of Work in which Company engaged</b>	<b>Cost for FY 2001–2002</b>	<b>Duration of Contract</b>	<b>Value of Contract over its full life (where applicable/available)</b>
Brussels Belgium	Group 4 Securitas	Provide goods, including roving foot patrol at front of building and garage	£45-50,000	Renewed Annually	
Buenos Aires Argentina	Prosegur	Provide guards for temporary residence	£7,000	18 months	£1,208.9 per month
	Prosegur	Embassy security	£2,305	Open ended	£363 per month
	Patino	Provide guards for residence	£6,428	18 months	£1,148 per month
	Daniel Perez	Provide street guards	£342	Open ended	£62 per month
	Jose Brusa	Provide street guards	£600	Open ended	£107 per month
	Eduardo Soto	Provide street guards	£336	4 years	£60 per month
Bucharest Romania	A Del Valle	Provide street guards	£759	Open ended	£136 per month
	IMM Security	Provide security guards for the official residences of two MOD Service personnel working in Romania	£1,648	Open ended (Since Sep 2001)	£2,800 per year
	Business Synergy	Provide additional security guard for the Embassy compound	£1,314	Open ended (Since June 2001)	£2,600 per year
Budapest Hungary	In-Kal Security	Provide private security guards for British Embassy and, occasionally at the Ambassador's residence	£16,244	Renewed Annually	
	GHY Ltd	Provide security for Embassy building	£17,445	Open ended	

Post	Name of Company	Type of Work in which Company engaged	Cost for FY 2001-2002	Duration of Contract	Value of Contract over its full life (where applicable/available)
Cairo Egypt	Group 4	Provide basic training for local guards	£12,000	24 February 2002	£12,000
				28 February 2002 3 March 2002	
				27 February 2002	£12,000
				2 March 2002 6 March 2002	
Canberra Australia	Websters	For the recovery of NOTTINGHAM: Established a security checkpoint for vehicles and patrol perimeter fence	100,000 AUD	2 months	100,000 AUD
	Chubb	Check persons who enter the High Commission grounds and Consular section		No formal contract	
Cape Town South Africa	ADT Security & Secureco	Guarding response alarm control	£48,727.70	Renewed Annually	
Caracas Venezuela	Guardipro	Provide guard guards for official residence	£48,120	Renewed Annually	
	Wackenhut	Provide guards for offices	£26,916	Renewed Annually	
Chennai India	Force 1	Provide guards for office and residences	£10,490.21	Renewed Annually (Since 1 July 2001)	
Colombo Sri Lanka	Monaro Ltd	Provide security guards for 18 residential properties	£28,000	Renewed Annually (Since 1 July 2002)	

<b>Post</b>	<b>Name of Company</b>	<b>Type of Work in which Company engaged</b>	<b>Cost for FY 2001–2002</b>	<b>Duration of Contract</b>	<b>Value of Contract over its full life (where applicable/available)</b>
Copenhagen Denmark	Amllet Sikring A/S	Installed digital colour CCTV surveillance system	£38,000	5 years	£42,200 (subscription fee of £70 per month paid over period of 5 years; includes 24 hour emergency service and annual overhaul of CCTV system)
	Falck Securitas	Installed intruder and smoke alarms in all properties. Annual service.	£7,500	Renewed Annually	
		Provided panic alarm system: rental and annual service	£340	Renewed Annually	
Dar Es Salaam Tanzania	Ultimate Security	Provide security guards for official properties	£95,000	Ends 2004	£770,000
Dakar Senegal	Societe Senegalaise de securite	Provide guards for 2 residential properties	£520 (per month)	One year	£6,000 per year
	Eagle	Provide guards for 2 residential properties, part of British Embassy compound and UK based staff housing	£1,100 (per month)	26 November 2001 - 5 April 2002	£5,000 per year
Dili East Timor	Chubb Protective Services Security	Provide security guards for British Embassy and Ambassador's residence	\$30,000	Open ended	
Doha Qatar	ISC Group Gulf Ltd	Provide Security Guards for British Embassy: duties include monitoring security cameras, searching bags and patrolling compound	£37,531.37	July 1999 - August 2003	£151,115.76

<b>Post</b>	<b>Name of Company</b>	<b>Type of Work in which Company engaged</b>	<b>Cost for FY 2001–2002</b>	<b>Duration of Contract</b>	<b>Value of Contract over its full life (where applicable/available)</b>
Dublin Ireland	The Corps of Commissionaires	Provide security guards to control entry into British Embassy and patrol compound during normal working hours	£32,000	Renewed Annually (Since Sept 2001)	
	ATONE Security	Installed and maintain alarm systems in British Embassy occupied properties and man alarm control stations		Renewed Annually	£135,000
	Corps of Commissionaires	Provide 24 hour 1 man presence at the intended new residence	£7,500 (per month)	Monthly	£15,000
Durban South Africa	ADT Security & Chubb Alarms	Monitor alarm system at office premises	£162.25	Renewed Annually	
	KOKOM Security	Maintain contract electric fencing at 2 residential properties	£644.10		
	ADT Security	Provide security guards at office premises	£7,492.37		
Dusseldorf Germany	Kotter GmbH, Security	Provide 2 security guards for office during working hours only: control entry to visa section and check visitors as they enter the building	£60,300	Open ended (since 1 November 1998)	£195,000
Gaborone Botswana	Automated Security (PTY) Ltd	Provide rapid response teams	£1,660	Renewed Annually (Since 2000)	£4,735
	Scimitar Security	Provide security staff for offices and residences	£30,292	1 July 1999 - 30 Nov 2002	£105,397
Georgetown Guyana	Securicor Guyana Ltd	Provide 24 hour unarmed guarding services at British High Commission and UK staff residences	£140,598	Renewed Annually	
	MMC Security Force	Provide patrol unit which makes routine checks of perimeter offices and residences and acts as response in case of an emergency	£22,625	Renewed Annually	
Goa India	Group 4	Provide security guards	£195	Open ended (Since January 2002)	£65 per month



<b>Post</b>	<b>Name of Company</b>	<b>Type of Work in which Company engaged</b>	<b>Cost for FY 2001–2002</b>	<b>Duration of Contract</b>	<b>Value of Contract over its full life (where applicable/available)</b>
Guatemala City Guatemala	Wackenhut de Guatemala	Provide goods for Embassy and residential properties	£33,104	Open ended	
	Proteccion Electronica	Provide rapid response to alarms from private residential accommodation	£2,607	Open ended	
	Seproce	Provide guards at reception and parking area	£5,777	Open ended	
Harare Zimbabwe	Time Security Securitas	Provide 24 hour guarding service of properties, 1 day guard and 2 night guards	£56,217.27	Open ended	
Helsinki Finland	Falck Security	Carry out general security duties, patrol embassy, check bags, etc.	£28,931.75	1 October 2001 - 31 March 2003	£86,795
Hong Kong China	Securicor-Guarding	Provide guards for British Consulate General, British Council and FCO Procurement Building	£268,867	16 months	£358,489
	Securicor-cash delivery service	Delivery of cash receipts from BN(O) passports and visas to banks	£4,828	16 months	£6,305
Honiara Soloman Islands	Kings Corp Security	Provide security guards at official residences	£17,000	Open ended	
Islamabad Pakistan	Phoenix Security Service (pvt) Ltd	Provide static guard force with responsibility for guarding the British High Commission offices, High Commissioner's residence and staff accommodation (on and off compound). Also provide 4 guards as quick reaction force.	£128,979	No formal contract	
Jakarta Indonesia	Teknodev	Provide day and night security guards for British Embassy, Consulate and Ambassador's residence	£107,021	Renewed Annually	£107,021
	Arla	Provide night security guards at official residences			

<b>Post</b>	<b>Name of Company</b>	<b>Type of Work in which Company engaged</b>	<b>Cost for FY 2001–2002</b>	<b>Duration of Contract</b>	<b>Value of Contract over its full life (where applicable/available)</b>
Johannesburg South Africa	ADT Security	Provide guarding response alarm control	£2,200	Renewed Annually	
Kampala Uganda	Armour Group/ APS	Provide quick reaction force (personal/rapid response); perimeter guards and surveillance at site of new British High Commission building	£148,080	Renewed Annually	
			£33,096	Renewed Annually	
			£7,776	Renewed Annually	
Karachi Pakistan	Phoenix Armour (PVT) Pakistan	Provide 24 hour guarding of compound; escorts for all staff vehicles; 2 mobile response teams; movement of cash	£89,942.39	Renewed Annually (since 1993)	
Kiev Ukraine	Group 4 Securitas	Provide guards for Visa section/escort duties to bank	£24,066	Reviewed Annually (since 1999)	£72,198
	Group 4 Securitas	Provide guards for Ambassador's residence		Temporary	
Kigali Rwanda	KK Security	Provide guards for 4 UK based staff houses and British Embassy; search vehicles/visitors when entering compound (FCO and DFID)	£48,145.87	Open ended	£48,145.87
Kingston Jamaica	Marksman	Provide guards for British High Commission and official residence	£135,000	Renewed Annually	£135,000 per year
Kinshasa Democratic Republic of Congo	Defence Services Africa (DSA)	Provide British Security Officer/Manager to run Locally Engaged Embassy security guards (30)	£50,000	Open ended	£66,300
		Provide rapid reaction teams for residence		Open ended	\$100 per month
Kuala Lumpur Malaysia	Semai Hikmat Guard Force	Provide 1 guard for daily security cover at Immigration Attache's home	£8,680 (paid for by Home Office)	Open ended Contracted on month by month basis	

Post	Name of Company	Type of Work in which Company engaged	Cost for FY 2001-2002	Duration of Contract	Value of Contract over its full life (where applicable/available)
Lagos Nigeria	Servtrust Ltd	Provide 196 local guards on a three shift, 24 hour basis, at all offices and residential accommodation	£381,300	31 March 1999 - 31 March 2002	£1,200,000
	Amour Group	Provide Chief Security Officer to oversee 4 UK based security staff	£49,932	July 2002 - July 2003	
	Armour Group	Provide 4 UK recruited security staff who guard premises on a 24 hour basis	£175,164	July 2002 - July 2003	
Lilongwe Malawi	Securicor	Provide 24 hour guarding of residential properties; maintenance of panic buttons in houses and associated rapid response service; relief guards for British High Commission office compound	£19,266	One year	£20,000
Lima Peru	Forza SA	Provide security guards for residence compound	£9,115	Renewed Annually (expires 20 March 2003)	£13,021 (British Embassy pay 70%, other residents pay 30%)
Lisbon Portugal	Securitas	Provide guards for British Embassy (working hours only)	£35,000	Renewed Annually (Since 1995)	Approximately £245,000
Ljubljana Slovenia	Sintal Zoro	Provide security guard for British Embassy on daily basis Fit and maintain security alarms	£15,308.68	Open ended (since 1993) Contract began February 2002	£137,000
Luanda Angola	Copebe Security Service Angola	Provide security guards to protect Embassy compound and UK based staff housing	£137,000	One year	£137,000
Madras India	Group 4 Force 1	Provide security guards for the office and residences Provide guard duties for the office and residential accommodations	£7,495.32 £10,490.21	Renewed Annually (Since 1 September 2001)	

<b>Post</b>	<b>Name of Company</b>	<b>Type of Work in which Company engaged</b>	<b>Cost for FY 2001–2002</b>	<b>Duration of Contract</b>	<b>Value of Contract over its full life (where applicable/available)</b>
Madrid Spain	Securitas S.A	Gate guarding/reception	£58,989	Monthly	£5,639.50 per month
	Securitas S.A	Entrance guarding/reception	£10,991	Annual	£12,738 per year
	Securitas S.A	Gate guarding/reception	£74,538.64	3 months	
	Trablisa	Gate guard/reception	£4,716.67	Daily	£31.01 per day
	Securitas S.A	Gate guarding/reception	£5,935	Every 15 days	£593.52 per 15 days
	Seguridad Tauros SA	Gate guarding/reception	£6,225	Monthly	£1,246 per month
	Seguridad Integral Canaria	Gate guarding/reception	£6,230	Monthly	£1,241 per month
	Securitas S.A	Gate guarding/reception	£6,230	Monthly	£1,246 per month
	Manila Philippines	Soliman Security Services Inc.	Provide guards for British Embassy and residences of UK based staff	£92,720.65	Five years
Maputo Mozambique	Wackenhut Mocambique Ida	Provide monitoring and rapid response service with panic buttons at British High Commission and staff residences	US\$7,581.60	Three months	
	Wackenhut Mocambique Ida	Patrol compound area for period of 3 months	US\$614.25 (per month)	Short term contract	
Marseilles France	Securite Industrielle	Provide a security guard	£2,255.44 So far in 2002	8 October 2001 - 7 May 2002	£11,377
Maseru Lesotho	Security Unlimited Ltd	Provide security guards and rapid response teams at 4 official properties	£30,142	Renewed Annually	

<b>Post</b>	<b>Name of Company</b>	<b>Type of Work in which Company engaged</b>	<b>Cost for FY 2001–2002</b>	<b>Duration of Contract</b>	<b>Value of Contract over its full life (where applicable/available)</b>
Mbabane Swaziland	Guard Alert Security	Monitor alarms, with back up by sister company Radio Link	£10,898	1995	£80-90,000
Mexico City Mexico	Intercom	Provide guards for British Embassy and Residence and alarm systems in some residential properties	£67,698.27	Renewed Annually	
Montreal Canada	Chubb Security Systems	Provide, maintain and monitor home intrusion and fire detection systems at DCG's residence	£243 (per month)	Monthly	
Moscow Russia	Nortel Security CJSC	Provide perimeter security guards for British Embassy and residence	£198,340	Two years	£460,000
Nairobi Kenya	Securicor	Property guarding, controlling access to the assignment and ensuring perimeter fences, lighting, razor and electric fences are all sound	£347,317 (British High Commission; DFID; British Council and British Army Training Liaison)	Renewed Annually (June 2000)	
	Security Guard Services	Property guarding, controlling access to the assignment and ensuring perimeter fences, lighting, razor and electric fences are all sound	£33,120	No Contract	
	Riley Security	One property guarding, controlling access to the assignment and ensuring perimeter fences, lighting, razor and electric fences are all sound	£5,975 (DFID)	No Contract	
	Ultimate Security	Rapid response teams that can be summoned by occupants of British High Commission and DFID residences or in motor vehicles	£15,120 (British High Commission and DFID)	No formal contract	
New Delhi India	Group 4	Provide security guards for post hirings and to manage the visa queue at the office of the British High Commission	£7,495.32	Ended 1 July 2001	
	Force 1	Provide guards at DFID office and residential properties of UK appointed staff	£99,500	3 years	£298,500
		Provide security guards	£10,490.21	Renewed Annually	

Post	Name of Company	Type of Work in which Company engaged	Cost for FY 2001-2002	Duration of Contract	Value of Contract over its full life (where applicable/available)
Oslo Norway	Norsk Sikkerhets Service	Provide vehicle & person entry control to consular/visa office and general patrols around British Embassy and Residence	£30,000	Sept 2001 Renewed every 3 months	
Ottawa Canada	Riviera Security Services Inc.	Provide security officers for office of British High Commission	£14,557	Renewed Annually	
Panama City Panama	Grupo Especializada de Seguridad e Investigaciones, S.A.	Provide security guards and security services for HMA residence	£10,000	Renewed Annually (Since 1 September 2001)	£17,740
Paris France	Euroguard Securicor	Control access to main British Embassy building and out housed Visa and Consular section	£67,122.27	Renewed Annually	£67,122.27
Peking China	Beijing General Security Service Company (External Affairs Branch)	Provide security guards for British Embassy	\$11,400	Renewed Annually	
Phnom Penh Cambodia	DFID used MPA	Secure new office premises	£530	15 June 2002 - 15 August 2002	
Port Louis Mauritius	Securicor	24 hour guarding of residential properties and visa/consular sections during office hours	£27,080	Open ended	
	Electronic Security Limited	Rapid response team linked to intruder alarm system at the Residence	£4,800	Open ended	
Port Moresby Papua New Guinea	Protect Protection and Security (PPS)	Provide 24 hour guard service for all properties and a rapid response service	£24,641.55	31 July 2002	
	Pacom Communications (PC)	Provide hand held radio sets	£863.85	31 July 2002	

<b>Post</b>	<b>Name of Company</b>	<b>Type of Work in which Company engaged</b>	<b>Cost for FY 2001–2002</b>	<b>Duration of Contract</b>	<b>Value of Contract over its full life (where applicable/available)</b>
Port of Spain Trinidad and Tobago	Securicor	Employment of local guards for the High Commission and official residences	£41,549,98	Renewed Annually	
	Guardia Wackenhut	Employment of local guards at staff residences	£36,939,16	Renewed Annually	
Prague Czech Republic	ADT Security and SV-Agency	Provide security systems to some hired units of accommodation	£2,500	Renewed Annually	
	GRAL Security Service and SV-Agency	Provide physical and personnel security to the Consular Office at Prague airport	£12,500	Renewed Annually	
Pretoria South Africa	ADT Security	Provide guarding response and alarm control	£1,147,59	Renewed Annually	
Quito Equador	Wackenhut International	Provide building security for British Embassy and Residence	£30,862,69	Renewed Annually	
Sanaa Yemen	Group 4 Securitas	Provide security guards for residential properties; supply, install and maintain CCTV	£59,069	Renewed Annually	
San Jose Costa Rica	Seguridad por Monitoreo	Provide security guard	£5,000	Open ended (Since 1999)	
Sao Paulo Brazil	Empresa de Vigilancia MLC Ltda	Provide 24 hour guards for Consul-General's residence	£18,860	Open ended (Since April 2001)	
	Sabre Seguranca e Vigilancia S/C Ltda	Provide 12 guards at Consulate	£2,635	Oct 2001 - March 2002	
Seoul Korea	Handuk Engineering	Provide 24 hour guard duty at main entrance, screening visitors and opening the gates and safety barrier	£82,667	1 February 2002 - 31 January 2003	

Post	Name of Company	Type of Work in which Company engaged	Cost for FY 2001-2002	Duration of Contract	Value of Contract over its full life (where applicable/available)
Singapore	APRO Asian Protection Pte Ltd	Provide protection officers to guard the British High Commission and staff houses	£66,000	Oct 2002 - Oct 2002	£132,000
	The Commercial & Industrial Security Corporation (CISCO)	Provide protection officers to guard British High Commission and British High Commissioner's Residence	£104,000	June 1999 - June 2002	£450,000
Sofia Bulgaria	Triple S Ltd	Provide rapid response team and security guards	£26,084.69	Renewed Annually	£26,084.69
Stockholm Sweden	Securitas	Provide technical servicing of fire alarm system in Consulate General	£17.00	Open ended (2 July 2002)	
St Petersburg Russia	Securicor	Provide guards for residential building, where UK officers, including the Consul General, live.	£19,000	Renewed Annually (Since 1992)	£136,000
Suva Fiji	Guardforce	Provide security guards to properties, and mobile patrols	£68,449.38	Open ended	£4,222.73
	ADT Security	Provide electronic monitoring of building alarms and security systems	£1,291.39	Open ended	£554.54
	ArmourguardWormald		£432.09	No Formal Contract	£432.09
			£534.48	No Formal Contract	
Tallin Estonia	ESS (Estonian Security Service)	Provide a full range of security activities: guarding, patrolling, checking visitors and vehicles, monitoring CCTV	£39-40,000	Open ended (Since 1999)	£1117-120,000
Tegucigalpa Honduras	Sistemas de seguridad	Provide 24 hour guards at British Embassy and 2 residences	£17,250	Open ended (Since 1999)	
Tokyo Japan	Seishu	Provide security guards, including vehicle checks and patrol of Embassy compound	£165,020.81	May 2001 - March 2002	
Valletta Malta	Group 4	Provide office security	£20,000	Open ended	



Post	Name of Company	Type of Work in which Company engaged	Cost for FY 2001-2002	Duration of Contract	Value of Contract over its full life (where applicable/available)
Vancouver Canada	Scott Security Systems	Provide and monitor alarm at Deputy Consul General's residence	£154	Open ended	
Victoria Seychelles	Pilgrim Security Ltd	Provide and maintain alarms at 2 residential properties, send rapid response team when alarm activates and provide mobile patrols that make random visits to each property during the night	£24,500	Renewed Annually	
Vilnius Lithuania	Ekskomisarai	Install and maintain security systems in residential accommodation and response in event of an incident	£4,400	Open ended (Since 1996)	£22,000
Warsaw Poland	Falk Ochrona Spolka	Install and monitor residential property alarm systems. Plus call out by guards on mobile patrol	£9,000	Open ended	
Wellington New Zealand	Armour Guard	Provide security guard at entrance of British High Commission	£8,496	15 October 2000 - 15 October 2001	£15,500
	ADT Armour Guard	Alarm monitoring	£241.56	November 1998	
	Armour Guard	Security equipment maintenance		Renewed Annually	
	Armour Guard	Planning to install security systems in all of the UK staff residences	£1,800 (expected cost)	Renewed Annually	£5,400
				Three year contract	
Yaounde Cameroon	Wackenhut	Provide rapid response to BHC and residences	£4,827.76	Aug 2002-2003	£4,920.86



Published by TSO (The Stationery Office) and available from:

**Online**

[www.tso.co.uk/bookshop](http://www.tso.co.uk/bookshop)

**Mail, Telephone, Fax & E-mail**

TSO

PO Box 29, Norwich NR3 1GN

Telephone orders/General enquiries 0870 600 5522

Order through the Parliamentary Hotline *Lo-Call* 0845 702 3474

Fax orders 0870 600 5533

Email [book.orders@tso.co.uk](mailto:book.orders@tso.co.uk)

Textphone 0870 240 3701

**TSO Shops**

123 Kingsway, London WC2B 6PQ

020 7242 6393 Fax 020 7242 6394

68-69 Bull Street, Birmingham B4 6AD

0121 236 9696 Fax 0121 236 9699

9-21 Princess Street, Manchester M60 8AS

0161 834 7201 Fax 0161 833 0634

16 Arthur Street, Belfast BT1 4GD

028 9023 8451 Fax 028 9023 5401

18-19 High Street, Cardiff CF10 1PT

029 2039 5548 Fax 029 2038 4347

71 Lothian Road, Edinburgh EH3 9AZ

0870 606 5566 Fax 0870 606 5588

**TSO Accredited Agents**

(see Yellow Pages)

and through good booksellers

ISBN 0-10-156422-8



9 780101 564229