Protective Security Improvement Activity Scoring Guidance

1.   Introduction

1.1   There are many ways in which we can improve the protection of Crowded Places despite the fact that in most cases they are open systems that encourage and offer unrestricted public access. The improvements we make to security are not limited to countering terrorism but will also have positive impacts on other social issues including crime and disorder.

1.2   Our approach needs to consider these measures in terms of the effects that we want to achieve namely Protect, Prepare, Deter, Detect and Delay. The advice we give must always be proportionate and acceptable.

1.3   This scoring guidance is written to assist those concerned in the assessment of protective security elements at crowded places sites and provide an informed view of how a site's security can be improved through a range of measures. It is acknowledged that the list of improvement measures are not exhaustive but are deemed as the most applicable for use within the crowded places environment.

Protective security measures can fall under the headings;

Policy	Setting out what is to be achieved
Operational	Setting processes in place to make the Policy work
Physical	The "hardware"
Partnership	Working with those who can or are needed to make security work
Training	Making sure those with a role to play in the security welfare of the site are properly equipped and empowered to act effectively

2. Scoring Principles

2.1 This scoring guidance is intended to provide an illustrative aid for you to complete the Crowded Places Protective Security Improvement Activity (PSIA) questionnaire in relation to the security measures at your site. It has been developed to engender consistent application of the scoring process.

2.2 The principle is based upon the premise that in relation to protective security measures that **"something is better than nothing"** and that collectively the measures will all add value to building the holistic, integrated and proportionate

protective security regime. This will also provide an audit process to ensure that improvement activity or opportunities are not missed.

2.3 The scoring process used may appear challenging at first appearance but as you progress through the scoring mechanism there is a large degree of common scoring and self replication. The scoring tool is also self-calculating and will provide a percentage improvement score at its conclusion.

Following the initial assessment, the process to be followed will be one of maintenance and update of the scoring tool.

3. Scoring Tool Guidance

3.1 The majority of the technical and specific protective security standards or advice is provided in **Annex B.**

These have been sourced from CPNI, NaCTSO, ACPO and Police documents and policies. The user should refer to these when completing the questionnaire as an aid. Consideration of any security improvement measures should be proportionate to the site operation and not all the measures may necessarily have to be implemented or achieve the specific technical standard – **"Something is better than nothing"** .

3.2 Where there is no specific officially produced guidance, the help and explanations in **Annex A** have been produced to help steer you to an appropriate answer. These have been developed based on good practice and experience and are solely illustrative in nature and are meant to encourage wider thinking and eventual engagement. Please note that some of the headings are relevant across all attack methods, but need to be considered in the context of each attack type. The examples are not prescriptive or exhaustive and you should use your experience, training and local good practice to determine criteria eligibility.

"Up To Scores"

3.3 With the scoring process, some mitigations are highlighted as "up to Scores". These are highlighted with a yellow background i.e. 24. This is the maximum score a measure can achieve if all areas are covered or processes are undertaken. Where a site has implemented some of the measure, but not all, credit should be given for this and a percentage of the total can be given. Experience and good judgement should be exercised in the allocation of these scores.

Example: **Training:** Operation Fairway (Total achievable score 4) – If Only Security Staff have received the Fairway input then a full score should not be given. If all staff (or significant majority coverage) have received the input then a full score can be given.