

# Safety and protection services

[Business](#), [Work](#)



In the process of creating a security agreement, the first essential task which we should be able to undertake is to differentiate what are those locations as well as specific conditions which the security would be addressed through public good -- those that would be provided by the local government -- as well as the security issues that would be addressed by private enterprise.

Such a differentiation would allow for us to make specific boundaries and avoid security coverage overlaps between those which would be provided by the government and that was what shall be covered by the local agencies which the company would hire. The reason why we would like to avoid overlaps in outlining the report and specify which issues are addressed by one group and which ones are addressed by another is that it would not only avoid regulatory and conflict of interest overlaps but also the cost efficient as well.

We must remember that especially for a public good provisions such as security of the company which the government would be providing for the firm, then they have a limited budget in order to do this. Also, the security of the company with respect to the private enterprise which shall be addressed by our firm should also be cost efficient. Recent literature reflecting the costs of private security reflected that they are consistently increasing over the years. We would not want to have overlapping costs that would further create an inefficiency condition for the company (Commission & Toulson, 2004).

In the discussion of who would be concerned providing security, there are two units and agencies which we should address. These agencies, however,

are only the first step in information dissemination and coordination of security for the firm. These two are the local government units that would be providing security, as well as the security agencies as well as the security staff of the company. They are the two essential units where large focus must be given in drafting a security agreement.

However, there also has to be circulating information across both the staff of the company and the government units so that they too may be informed of the further security issues that have to be addressed. The reason for this is that especially in a sensitive matters such as private protection -- especially if our company has high in assets, may they be tangible or intangible -- there is the constant danger of misinformation and might lead to further problems in the future if those which are in full -- even in the smallest sense -- are misinformed.

The basic primary service that we would like the safety and security services of the law enforcement department of the local government units to perform are those that involve security coverage from the immediate surroundings of the companies location . However what we must remember is that local government agencies in policing already have theresponsibilityof protecting the surroundings of such public locations. With the security draft must focus on, however, is the schedule time frames or in areas highly sensitive data that are stored within the perimeter of the company.

This may be done through interaction with local government units involving security and policing with the respective security agencies and departments of our company. Relevant research reflects higher risk security frameworks

especially in institutions that have data assets which would be essential for the success of competition. In discussing security concerns between the company and the policing agencies, the focus must not only be two immediate security and physical assets but also in data security as well this would be discussed later on and further reports (Stamp, 2005).

Another probable help the local law enforcement agencies may give to the company is a fast response policy in the case that incidents are reported by the security departments of the firm. This is usually already done in major metropolitan areas although there are times when specific overlaps in misinformation cause for various security holes exist. What the draft and suggestion must identify are the standard operating procedures for local government security in the case that they are required -- in an emergency or otherwise -- by the security departments of the company.

Although it may not be explicitly stated by the government, the agreement, and company, there also probable ways are there to be better security support for such local policing units by giving preferential protection and security response times -- even dedicated response servers and direct lines -- to the security departments of the company. What we as business analysts would like to compare it to is an indirect method of outsourcing security but only in specific locations in specific instances so that the costs of the hiring additional security in-house would be less than those from the outsourced perspective (Commission & Toulson, 2004).

Of course, however, did not reply completely on the security that is provided by local policing agencies. Also, even given the fact that there is a ready and

in-house security department at the company, having the ability to tap the resources from outside security units such as those that are provided by the government does not necessarily mean that local security could slack off and relax.

In fact, outsourcing and removing in-house the total security method of the company should logically make the company's own security department more vigilant because of the scattered holes and overlaps that an outside security unit with prose. The primary safety and security services that would be performed in-house are those which first, covered a specific geographic insight location of the company. It would be a greater security risk if outside security units that are provided by the government are allowed to roam freely within the premises of the firm.

Although it may in fact decrease costs with relation to the amount that are paid to in-house security services, it nevertheless significantly increases risk of outside infiltration of the firm because of the lack of checks, balances, and specific operational controls when making use of outside security in securing the inside of the structures. Therefore, in the draft, we should be able to indicate that outside security units which are provided by the government may only enter the premises upon request for additional assistance in-house security units.

Also, because it is completely logical that it is the security department of the company which knows the sensitivity of assets within the firm, as well as the day-to-day security concerns of the company, it is they who have the responsibility of training and informing the outside security resources which

would be provided by the government in understanding the way the company works to tighten and cover the various security holes that may be found.

In the draft, it is recommended that more responsibilities are placed on in-house security units because of the expected approval of such agreement -- the less costs that are crude by the government for security of the company, the more likely it is that the mayor would prove such an agreement.

However, we must also make sure that the benefits that the company which received with respect to the efficiency would be experienced by the in-house security Department would be just equal to the benefits that would be taken by the local government units for security (Wyman, 1999).

Lastly, the draft should include what are the specific responsibilities that would be done jointly by the local policing agency and the in-house security department of the company. In this respect, the responsibilities included should cover those involving the safety and security of local employees and keeping resources. Unlike tangible assets and data, human resources and employees of the company are allowed to move around.

As a result, there is no specific covert locations that could be wisely allocated either to in-house security or to policing agencies. Therefore, it would eventually be the responsibility of the two units to cover the safety and security of employees. However, it is the local policing agency which is largely responsible for the outside safety of employees, while the responsibility of the in-house security of the company would be to make sure

that only employees have access to the company's premises as well as the assets that are assigned to employee use.

These are the conditions and important factors that should be included in the draft to be written that would be submitted to the mayor of the city.

Although there are still other specific minor issues that have not been addressed, these, at least, are the general frameworks that must be followed in drawing an agreement between the two security units and departments.