

PRIVATE SECURITY - LEGAL AND OPERATIONAL ASPECT OF THE SECURITY THREAT RESPONSE

Ante Perčin¹, Ivan Nađ²

¹ Sokol Marić d.o.o., Zagreb, Croatia

² University of Applied Sciences Velika Gorica, Velika Gorica, Croatia

Abstract

Modern security threats are constantly evolving, both in terms of forms of execution, as well as with regard to categories of potential perpetrators and end targets of attacks. Adequacy of response therefore depends largely on a continuous and timely analysis of the evolution process and of all potential risks, based on which an adequate security response is formed. Given that the concept of security is an indivisible synergistic category of all the factors that form an adequate security response, the private security sector must monitor this evolutionary cycle of potential threats to provide adequate responses, through protective measures and activities at the micro-location level. When forming an adequate and effective response to potential security threats, it is of vital importance to analyse monitoring of trends and evolution of potential security threats in the private security segment, the availability of information in the sector, structuring models and optimization of security activities and, ultimately, the available resources of the private security sector in Croatia.

Keywords: security threats, risk analysis, adequacy of response.

Address for correspondence: Iva Nađ, University of Applied Sciences Velika Gorica, Velika Gorica, Croatia, e-mail: ivan.nadj@vvg.hr

1. INTRODUCTION

The current security environment is marked by continuous evolution of security threats, new forms of execution and with dynamics difficult to predict and contents of each individual threat. Having in mind the above mentioned, each form and operational method of efficient security response must take into account the previously mentioned factors, while forming a new, expectedly efficient security concept using risk analysis, which will meet end users' current security needs. However, the above mentioned serves merely as an operative component for providing private security services, which needs to be optimised and personalised with regard to professional and expert aspects.

In the previous papers on private security measures and actions we covered the issue of security environment in great detail, while also covering multiplication of security threats, new forms of execution, risk analyses, location and CI system protection particularities, availability of potential threat information,

alongside a series of other security factors used to form the final security response to recognised security threats, in form of an end model and private security services.

Since the specified operational component depends on a series of defining general and formal factors, this paper will primarily focus on the specified formal conditions of the private security sector operation in the Republic of Croatia, while also analysing the sector position within the framework of national security, expected sector functionality, objective status of the private security sector in the Republic of Croatia, amendments to the applicable Private Security Act, the role of private security with regard to the Homeland Security System Act and, finally, general relations between legal, operative and functional options of this sector.

Regarding the focus on the general and formal framework of the sector's work, the paper will not consider details regarding the micro-location com-

ponent of security service provision and all its security aspects and will use it only to explain functions and performance of private security services and its protective segment as part of the security system.

The end goal of the paper is to try to prove the cause-and-effect hypothesis of the above mentioned general and formal factors, which shape and form the contents of private protection service provision, with the end scope, level and quality of the specified protection measures for end users as well as a measurable operational shift which would be generated by specific changes in the aforementioned legal and general framework, with regard to the contents, level and quality of the private sector's services in question, all in a form of an adequate response to current security threats.

2. CONTEMPORARY SECURITY THREATS AND (RE-)POSITIONING OF THE PRIVATE SECURITY SECTOR IN THE FRAMEWORK OF NATIONAL SECURITY

Due to the small-scale nature of this paper, we will assume that potential readers of this paper are familiar with the basic definition, terms, scope, range of services and protected subjects, as well as with the main objective of the protective activities of the private security sector. Also, considering the inseparability of the overall concept of security and what is often a fluid boundary between public and private security, viewed from the aspect of the protected subjects as well as the thesis of shifting the focus of modern security paradigms to protection of individuals, it is difficult to envisage a system with an active synergistic component that is not in fact a dispositive category of private security which provides each individual with an additional security level deemed as necessary and logically outweighing the general security framework of public security.

So, when at the end of May of 2017, the Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Croatia (MORH) presented one of the drafts for the National Security

Strategy in which private security was mentioned in a reluctant and general way when it comes to the private sector use,¹ we considered it necessary² to make a clear distinction between the general notion of private sector and private sector security, since it needs to be seen as an analogous antithesis to the public security sector, and the term needs to cover the entire private security industry.

The undisputable fact is that, in addition to providing services in accordance with the Private Security Act, all privately owned security companies, small enterprises (obrt) for the provision of technical security services and internal security services³ are monitored in every segment of their work and business operation by the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Croatia.

Based on the aforementioned, we find it clear why the "private security" segment dealing exclusively with security affairs should be clearly distinguished from all the other private entities whose capacities may be used if needed, whether they

1 by using the terms... "...if required, privately owned and public companies as well as citizens and associations will be included", "The existing and new security threats, risks and challenges extend responsibility from the state to the individual, society as a whole and the private and public sector", "Croatia has a range of capacities, institutions, public administration bodies... as well as public and private sector at its disposal", etc.

2 as part of a public debate

3 so, for example, during the licensing procedure of direct operators for security jobs / subsequently, licensed security guards, guards and technicians / the Ministry of the Interior performs checks on site in the context of the quality needed for performing this activity for each individual candidate, and only after a positive opinion is obtained, the candidate is able to access training, ... then only after the approval, candidates may enrol in the educational institutions (... following the programme approved by the Ministry of the Interior) into a 100 hour training, ... after completing the training, they take the exam before the Ministry of the Interior's examination commission, ... the Ministry of the Interior issues a license for security guard, guard or technician in the name and surname of each candidate, ... once employed at a particular security company / internal security service, they pick up a security card at the Ministry of the Interior, which they also return to the Ministry of Interior in 3 days in case of termination of employment, ... and the Ministry of the Interior's Inspectorate continuously monitors the work of security companies in all business segments

are legal persons, associations of citizens, owners or users of critical infrastructure, etc. We did not include these categories in the homeland security system in case of certain functionalities, but the private security sector which provides private security services in accordance with the Private Security Act cannot and may not be included in the system only on an as-needed basis, since it is, operationally speaking, a permanent, integral and inseparable part of the system, which forms an inseparable unit with the system of public security.

The aforementioned fact regarding a changing security paradigm as well as refocusing and expanding of the responsibility for security from the state to the individual, which is now in the focus of protective activities, adds to this interpretation. Nevertheless, despite the aforementioned shift in the security paradigm, public security, with a range of modifications, still covers its primary general security activities, so natural and legal persons can only look for additional forms of potential threat to an individual or legal entity, as well as specific requirements and capabilities related to the security segment (which is outside of the public security framework) within the private protection framework.

When considering the fact and the notion of security, which is a unique and indivisible unit, and the fluid boundary where public security ends and private security begins, it is indisputable that both elements must function uniformly to ensure that a subject is protected.

Therefore, in addition to the usual formal phrasing regarding the synergy of the public and private security sector, we considered that this segment should primarily be a permanent component of homeland security, as it unifies all cognitive, coordination and supervisory functions of all the remaining components of the (public) national security, while all the other components of the private sector, depending on their specific functionalities for individual segments of national security, may be included as needed.

3. EXPECTED FUNCTIONALITIES OF THE PRIVATE SECURITY SECTOR IN THE NATIONAL SECURITY FRAMEWORK

The abovementioned efforts towards logical positioning of the private security sector, at least in the domain of strategic security policy determination and definition of instruments for achieving strategic goals and achieving the desired degree of security and protection of the population, aimed at changing the concept of the synergy of the two sectors and moving away from its definition as a general and formal category without any operational application, used only in the context of common phrases for scientific and other tertiary needs.

In addition to the above, the actual operationalisation of the synergy of two sectors would change how the private security sector is treated in the segment of critical infrastructure security⁴, for which the surface-level protection alongside the continuity (Murray, 2012) of the infrastructure's functionalities is secured by the private security sector, but commonly only on a basis of commercial request of each owner / CI user, who is often unable to perceive all the potential security risks and challenges specific CIs face.

Why is it important to clearly define private security sector? Primarily, because of the fact that the specified activity is truly an integral and inseparable part of the overall security of an individual or a community as a whole. On the other hand, the trends and the fact that security is not free, point to the necessity of optimization and rationalization of security jobs, but again in the form of an adequate security response to new forms and types of security threats, bearing in mind a wide array of possible perpetrators and potential targets of attacks.

⁴ and which are in accordance with the Critical Infrastructure Act defined as... National critical infrastructure refers to systems, networks and assets of national importance whose discontinuation or discontinued delivery of its goods and services might have serious consequences on national security, health and lives of people, assets and environment, safety and economic stability and continuous functioning of the government.

The basis of each rationalization and optimization process in the security segment and in general, is in focusing on the primary responsibility areas in which the best operational results are achieved, which, inter alia, according to the latest trends, means outsourcing specific security needs of individuals and legal entities to the private security segment. That the specified trends are no novelty is confirmed by the fact that in 1980s a continued growth tendency of the so-called private security industry was recorded both on the level of Europe and globally (Dobranović & Mihaljević, 2007), which, according to the current date for the region, have become dominant with regard to the number of private security providers when compared to the number of public security providers. This is partly true for Croatia where there are 33,000 licenced guards, 50% of whom are employed at security companies⁵ and internal security services.

Such specified and respectable number of security guards, with appropriate coordination, clear procedures for emergency situations, sharing information in the security risk analysis segment, as well as overall synergetic activities, certainly serves as a significant factor in the overall national security. Most importantly, direct private security operators are persons who spent or will spend their entire lifetime in security functions, on jobs dealing with protection of specific micro-locations and people. These are the ultimate professional, trained and established operative security workers, who are under continuous supervision by the Ministry of Interior, whether in the area of legal and labour relations or during the provision of security services.

3.1. Risk Assessment And Risk Management In The Function Of Content Optimisation Of Private Security Services

Adequate risk assessment is one of the key processes

⁵ the percentage established as part of a market research of security services of the CEA's Security Services Association, comparing data from the Ministry of the Interior, Croatian Employment Fund and data of HR departments of security companies

in the overall concept of private security services and serves as a starting point for any future definition of content and scope of security measures and actions. Hence, the logical sequence of protection of individual CIs is an answer to the question: Which are the threats to critical infrastructure and to which consequences might that lead (Nađ & Rukavina 2017)? Adequate risk assessment, which includes a necessary identification of all the potential threats to the protected asset, their intensity, the probability of the threat and its occurrence, as well as the possible consequences that a threat may cause provide an answer to the aforementioned question. Naturally, each of the specified concepts that are subject to a security risk analysis has a number of (sub)factors that can mutually interact and in certain circumstances, might endanger the subject of protection, and your measures and actions provide this safety umbrella of adequate protection.⁶ Threats and crises in CI have a special meaning, specifically due to the utmost importance these vital systems have on the functioning of the society as a whole (Mihaljević & Čuljak 2017).

In the world of general standards, one of the standards often used for risk analysis is standard ISO 31000:2018, which refers to risk assessment as an overall process of identification, analysis and evaluation of risk. However, due to this paper's limited format, we will not cover all the aspects of potential risk analysis or risk management systems but will look at this process in the context of our topic, which is cooperation of state authorities, owners/users of Critical Infrastructure⁷, Croatia's security and intelligence system and public and private security sectors.

⁶ in case of measures and actions of private security, the specified security product is additionally concerned with the commercial component, which needs to be emphasised as it greatly affects the scope and level of security activities, regardless of the adequate security risk estimate and recognised threats...

⁷ CI is used as a main example since the vast majority of security factors focus on the issue of CI protection, even though CI facilities and systems are not the only locations where the cooperation and synergy of the two sectors are necessary. We witnessed this a number of times over the past year after a series of terrorist and other attacks and threats

Why is this context of particular importance? Because of the abovementioned perception and positioning of the entire private security sector, which, despite of its role as an active factor in the execution of general security activities at the micro-location level, is left to its own devices conceptually, substantively and operationally and forced to find balance between its security products and commercial projections of individual CI owners/users, who, naturally, are unable to perceive all aspects of security threats to their sites and systems.

3.2. Status Of The Private Security Sector In Croatia

It has been proven many times that the form, regardless of whether it is satisfactory or not, and the general framework of activities are one thing and the substance is a whole other thing. Therefore, when analysing the current status of the private protection sector, a form of self-criticism needs to be included as a basis for qualitative growth of the security service level. With regard to the above mentioned, as we have been pointing out for many years and after over two decades of legal framework⁸ defining conditions and operation of the private security section, a mere glance at this field provides clear conclusion that the profiling process for this field is far from its final phase (Perčin, 2016), and if it were in the final phase, it would clearly imply a defined and organised operational branch. An additional problem which may even be greater than the one already specified refers to the simultaneous profiling of security services as a personal profession which has been underdeveloped even though the occupation has formally existed for 22 years.

The underdevelopment is best described by the fact that there is a current deficit of security guards in the private security sector which, according to current analyses, is almost 23% of the total volume of all the currently employed security guards in the private security sector. Another

poor indicator is in the fact that more than 50% of over 30,000 licenced security guards do not work in the private security sector and they, by all indicators, represent a permanent loss for the sector. However, the current deficit of security guards can primarily be attributed to the opening of EU borders which has been accompanied by a mass security guard exodus across EU.

The proof that security services are a temporary occupation lies in the fact that most of security guards do not work on such jobs in EU either - security guards mostly work at jobs for which relate to their secondary education, which not only happens with security guards in EU but within Croatia as well, although in a much lower percentage.

Low energy and low wages in the profession for basic security guard categories, at the level of minimum personal income, do not contribute to further profiling of the profession and neither does the long-term unfair competition of security companies on the security service market. These factors resulted in a long-term negative selection of direct service providers which, in addition to the overall trend of workforce deficiency, resulted in merely formal maintenance of the scope of contracted private security jobs, without insisting on contents and quality of security activities. With regard to the unsustainability of the specified state from the economic, legal and labour, expert and professional aspects, the private security sector⁹ has continuously been looking for immediate solutions for the issue. Along with the necessity of personnel management solutions, the sector, together with regulators and trade union partners, insists on improving the material status of security guards and raising it

⁸ the first Person and Asset Protection Act was adopted in 1996

⁹ one of the latest initiatives in the sector is the request to the Croatian Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Labour and Pension System for temporary employment of retired Ministry of the Interior's employees in the private security sector in form of permanent-basis employment while keeping all the previously acquired benefits and, accordingly, the full pension, which was proposed by the CEA's Security Services Association

to the level of average personal income in the Republic of Croatia, which is already applicable to the original professions of security guards. This would, we believe, reduce the fluctuation of security guards to other occupations, stabilise the staff structure of private security companies and thus create conditions for positive selection of staff and further professional development of direct service providers.

The described human resources assumptions,¹⁰ alongside the most modern resources and systems of technical protection and the expected dynamic nature, flexibility and financial possibilities of the sector, serve as a realistic basis for widening the range of services of the private security sector as well as its optimisation for specific security needs of individual security service users. The above mentioned implies that a range of security products of the private protection sector needs to be optimised¹¹ in accordance with the current security threats, while also guaranteeing an efficient security response to potential threats, as the contrary would imply that the basic purpose of private security as a dispositive category for meeting personalised security needs of natural or legal persons is lost.

4. AMENDMENTS TO THE APPLICABLE PRIVATE SECURITY ACT

With regard to the positioning of the private security sector in the hierarchical structure of national security as a whole, it is necessary to emphasize the fact that in the past several years, in the Republic of Croatia, intensive work has been done on the amendments to the current Private Security Act by the working bodies of the Ministry of Interior with the basic aim of updating the above mentioned legal regulations, especially in the context of raising the level of education of di-

rect service providers and improving professionalism of private security services, and thus create more favourable business conditions for the development of this sector (Sotlar & Meško, 2013). In the given segment, there is an agreement between the representatives of the private sector employers and the Ministry of the Interior's Inspectorate, which supervises the sector, with regard to the interpretation of private security as an economic branch of general social importance, which must be a part of integral social protection and that it, by its very nature and importance for the society, may not be included in the service industry and it should be publicly distinguished from the seemingly related, yet very different professions such as receptionists, doormen, etc. (Krajček, 2014).

Consequently, following the topic of the general state of the private security sector in the Republic of Croatia, and especially in the field of human resources, the direct security service providers, the new draft of the Private Security Act requires two parallel directions, including both the reduction and raising of criteria for direct security service providers. In the segment of the partial reduction of the criteria for direct service providers, this applies to issuing permits for security guard jobs in the draft of the new Act, where the said amendment clearly specifies that one of the conditions is at least completed elementary education.

The conditions for issuing permits for performing security guard jobs remain largely the same, but in the context of raising the criteria for direct service providers, a new category of specialist security guards is introduced whose permit requires former security guard status, two years of work experience in security jobs, additional training and taking exams for specialist security guards.

The purpose of the aforementioned raising of criteria for this category of direct providers of private security activities is to entrust them with performing high-risk jobs including the following:

¹⁰ we need to keep in mind that the dominant segment of private security services in the Republic of Croatia is still bodyguarding and security guards are the main resources for its operation...

¹¹ which is, in addition to the security category, also the market category of private security

1. Physical protection of facilities and areas of special security interest for the Republic of Croatia,
2. Physical protection of the facilities classified as category I and II in terms of vulnerability
3. Direct physical protection
4. Security and escort during distribution of money, securities and valuables, and other shipments and transport of persons in cross-border distribution
5. Protection of persons and assets in high risk situations, which in individual cases are determined by the Ministry at the request of a legal person or small entrepreneur with a private security permit.

With respect to the relevant legal changes in the segment of reduction of the criteria for permits for security guard jobs, the legislator has respected the requests of the private protection sector to include these in the most basic category of licensed persons performing the least complex tasks and that, in the current climate of chronic deficit of the workforce in the given category, licensing may be allowed under the condition of elementary school education.

On the other hand, by separating licences for security guards and specialist security guards, the legislator indisputably strives to raise the quality of high-risk security service positions by dividing the categories of jobs for the direct service providers and creating specialist security guards through training and profiling. The same context needs to be used to interpret the introduction of a new category of Security Guards - IPU (security threat assessors), proposed by the new Act, for which basic requirements are higher education degree and 5 years of work experience in security jobs, while the basic purpose of this license is to enable assessments of the vulnerability of protected facilities, areas and persons in a manner prescribed by legislation and the regulation on conditions and manner of assessing vulnerability of persons, facilities and areas.

In the context of liberalization of the market for private security services in the Republic of Croatia, there is nothing new about the provision of Article 23 of this Act, which prescribes the conditions for issuing the Ministry's license to natural persons, EU nationals and signatories of the EEA Agreement which have the permission to carry out the abovementioned activities, from the state of residence for carrying out private security activities.

The recognition of the status of an official for licensed security guards is an issue which has been relevant for a long time but has not been materialized in this latest proposal for amendments to the Act. A glimmer of hope in this direction comes from a seemingly trivial, but operationally important provision regarding a permission to guards, security guards, and specialist security guards to wear uniforms when arriving to and leaving work. The authorities of security guards in the proposal of the new Act are superficially supplemented with the possibility of using a pepper sprayer and shackles for securing wrists /handcuffs/.

5. PRIVATE SECURITY WITH REGARD TO THE HOMELAND SECURITY SYSTEM ACT

When analysing private security with regard to the Homeland Security System Act, it can be concluded that it is very similar to the first version of the National Security Strategy in that there is no clear correlation between homeland security and private security. But let us look for the conclusion in the text of the act...

Article 1 of the Homeland Security System Act, OG 108/17, defines the purpose of adopting this act described as follows "...for the purpose of systematic management of security risks of importance for national security and functioning in crises, it establishes a system of national security. " It is then emphasised that the Act "... regulates the coordinated functioning of the homeland security system bodies and the implementation of

activities and tasks within the jurisdiction of the homeland security system arising out of this Act and relating to the management of security risks and the functioning in crises. “

Furthermore, Article 3 of the same Act defines the notion of homeland security, based on which the system is comprised of the following “...resources of the interior, defence, security and intelligence system, civil protection, fire-fighting, foreign affairs service and other bodies which perform, in an organised and coordinated manner, jobs and tasks of recognising, assessing, reducing and/or removing security threats of importance for the Republic of Croatia’s national security.”

In Article 6 of this Act, the bodies constituting the homeland security system are defined as follows: “1) central state administration bodies responsible for internal affairs, defence, foreign affairs, civil protection, environmental protection, health, finances and justice, including bodies within their scope of competence and the security and intelligence system bodies of the Republic of Croatia; 2) central state administration bodies with critical infrastructure within their scope, including bodies from their scope which participate or can participate in the activities of security risk management processes 3) other central state administration bodies.”

And finally, Article 7 of this Act lists the other homeland security system bodies which may participate within the system “...legal persons of special importance for defence, protection and rescue operations (Croatian Fire Department, Croatian Red Cross, Croatian Mountain Rescue Service, etc.), associations connected with the War on Independence, Citizens’ Associations, as well as other legal entities who, due to their capacities, can serve as support to the system of homeland security in the implementation of activities and tasks of managing security risks and in crisis situations of importance for national security. Units of local and regional self-government may also participate in the system of homeland security.”

From the above, it is only possible to conclude

that despite the fact that the integral notion of security has been defined and the necessity of synergy of its public and private components has been addressed, the private security sector does not exist in the operationalisation of measures and actions of homeland security implementation.

6. PRIVATE SECURITY ON THE CROSSROADS OF LEGAL, OPERATIONAL AND FUNCTIONAL POSSIBILITIES

By analysing the categories and circumstances in which the private protection sector operates in Croatia, we tried to rather graphically describe the general framework for the provision of such security services, while also presenting substantial legislation through the Private Security Act. We also covered constraints (Rosemont, 2017) associated with the sector’s treatment in the framework of the National Security Strategy as well as its complete omission from the Homeland Security System Act.

Based on the above mentioned, the intention of this paper is to focus on the general character of the Croatian legal framework and the actual neglect of the private security sector in any functional sense. To be specific, a superficial analysis of the desired goals regarding the National Security Strategy, and especially the Domestic Security System Act, provides evidence that the realization of individual goals largely depends on the effectiveness of measures and actions of private security at the micro-location level of protecting goods, and cases when the micro-location protection is in fact the only protection (if we exclude the general security framework of the public security sector which applies to the entire territory of the Republic of Croatia) Despite the above mentioned, the private security sector is not even mentioned as the operator in the operationalisation of these goals.

However, the approach has much more far-reaching consequences than the primarily visible omission and, to say the least, neglect of security.

It implies a fully uncoordinated approach to the use of security resources and their duplication or even points to leaving potential security threats to chance.

Therefore, we were many times left wondering in which circumstances can the private security sector form an adequate security response to potential security threats while we were defining the contents of the measures and activities of the private security sector, its possibilities and realities of cooperation between the public and private security sectors, the substance of the cooperation, adequate and timely analysis of the evolution of security threats, the availability of relevant information that the private security sector does not possess, but which is in possession of the Croatian SOS (Perčin, 2016) or the public security sector, the possibility of analysing all potential risks in given circumstances, etc.

Based on the above mentioned, and after witnessing the operational execution of the above mentioned activities for a long time, it is logical to conclude that concepts such as ... coordinated approach, joint analysis of potential threats and risks, exchange of available information, educating the CI owner / user about potential hazards, establishment of a system resilient to recognized threats, optimization of security resources and synergies, are often and largely used for declarative formal purposes, without consuming the parallel contents of the mentioned actions.

The private protection sector is thus often left to its own devices when performing security activities and is at most supervised in the area of inspection of business operation while all the other coordinating elements are missing. However, we are not under the impression of that this is a planned stigmatization, but rather a simple lack of security culture that recognizes, supports and recommends private security as a qualitative supplement to the public security sector, which once multiplied to the micro level, results in the desired high level of overall security that it has been striving to achieve. Therefore, we believe

that synergistic effects of all the homeland security system bodies must primarily work on coordination and exchange of information, analyses and identification of potential risks, and, finally, operationalisation of measures and actions to combat them. Otherwise, we are left with an empty form without substance, believing we are safe based on the beneficial combination of ignorance and lack of information.

7. CONCLUSION

Since this paper has mainly focused on the analysis of the legal and operational model for the private sector functioning, it is necessary to emphasize that a part of the analysed legal framework is not new and the sector has been operating as part of that framework for many years, but the desired synergy with all the other state administration bodies which are part of the national homeland security system, judging by everything described, can and must be more meaningful, operational and efficient with regard to security. The private security sector is not an adversary to any of the specified homeland security bodies. In fact, they are the same, and the private security sector needs to be a security partner involved in the homeland security system.

For a long time, security has not been perceived as a cost, but a crucial investment, which is not free and is functionally necessary. The acceptable level of security is always the synthesis of possibilities and expectations. Security possibilities of a community influence all the activities of the private security sector, and private security is a dispositive category of an individual's personalised needs outside the framework of security activities of the public security sector. That is why the scope, quality and level of total homeland security largely depends on the participation of both sectors in the security of protected property.

This paper aims at creating an objective perception of the issue of private security sector operation, as well as of the space for raising the level of

security activities in the sector through realistic and continuous analysis of security threats based on adequate and timely information from inter-sectoral exchange, with an end goal of forming a coordinated, adequate and efficient security response.

To conclude, we believe that our arguments have explicitly proven the causal relationship between general and formal conditions of security services provision as well as their scope, level and quality. Apart from the above mentioned, we singled out the factors which may, with minimal changes and intervention, result in significantly enriched content, level and quality of the private security sector in the analysed general and formal framework, also enabling the creation of a systematic risk analysis based on relevant information and, ultimately, provide a basis for an adequate and efficient response to current security threats.

REFERENCES

- Dobranović, Ž. & Mihaljević, B. (2008). *Industrija privatne sigurnosti*. Velika Gorica, Croatia: University of Applied Sciences Velika Gorica.
- Hrvatski sabor (2017). *National Security Strategy of the Republic of Croatia (Strategija nacionalne sigurnosti Republike Hrvatske) (OG 73/17)*. Zagreb, Croatia: Narodne novine.
- Hrvatski sabor (2017). *Homeland Security System Act (Zakon o sustavu domovinske sigurnosti) (OG 108/17)*. Zagreb, Croatia: Narodne novine.
- Hrvatski sabor (2003). *Private Security Act (Zakon o privatnoj zaštiti) (OG 68/03 and 31/10 and 139/10)*. Zagreb, Croatia: Narodne novine.
- Hrvatski sabor (2013). *Critical Infrastructure Act (Zakon o kritičnim infrastrukturama RH) (OG 56/13)*. Zagreb, Croatia: Narodne novine.
- Hrvatski sabor (1996). *Person and Property Protection Act (Zakon o zaštiti osoba i imovine) (OG 83/96)*. Zagreb, Croatia: Narodne novine.
- International Organization for Standardization, (2018). *Risk management — Guidelines ISO 31000:2018(en)*. Retrieved from <https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:std:iso:31000:ed-2:v1:en>
- Krajčak, I. (2014). *Uloga privatne zaštite u urbanoj sigurnosti*. Zbornik radova Naučna konferencija Dani kriminalističkih nauka (pp. 73-83). Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina: Fakultet za kriminalistiku, kriminologiju i sigurnosne studije.
- Mihaljević, B. & Čuljak, V. (2017). *Krizni menadžment i kritične infrastrukture*. In Nađ, I. (Ed.), 10. International conference Crisis Management Days – Book of papers (pp. 103-113). Velika Gorica, Croatia: University of Applied Sciences Velika Gorica.
- Ministarstvo unutarnjih poslova, Sektor za inspeksijske poslove (2017). *Draft of the Private Security Act (Nacrt prijedloga Zakona o privatnoj zaštiti)*. Zagreb, Croatia: Ministry of the Interior.
- Murray, A. T., & Grubescic, T. H. (2012). *Critical infrastructure protection: The vulnerability conundrum*. *Telematics and Informatics*, 29(1), 56–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2011.05.001>
- Nađ, I. & Rukavina, F. (2017). *Procjena rizika u zaštiti kritične infrastrukture: Mogući problemi u provedbi*. In Nađ, I. (Ed.), 10. International conference Crisis Management Days – Book of papers (pp. 187-206). Velika Gorica, Croatia: University of Applied Sciences Velika Gorica.
- Perčin, A. (2013). *Korporativna sigurnost kao dio kriznog menadžmenta*. In Toth, I. & Nađ, I. (Ed.), 6. International conference Crisis Management Days – Book of papers (pp. 722-233). Velika Gorica, Croatia: University of Applied Sciences Velika Gorica.
- Perčin, A. (2016). *Sigurnosno okruženje potencijalnih prijetnji i ugroza kritične infrastrukture i primjerenost odgovora kroz mjere i radnje privatne zaštite*, In 9. International conference Crisis Management Days – Book of papers (pp. 143-152). Velika Gorica, Croatia: University of Applied Sciences Velika Gorica.
- Rosemont, H. (2016). *Public-Private Security Cooperation from Cyber to Financial Crime*. London, United Kingdom: Royal United Services Institute.
- Sotlar, A. & Meško, G. (2009). *The Relationship between the Public and Private Security Sectors in Slovenia – from Coexistence towards Partnership? Varstvoslovje*, 11(2), 269-285.

PRIVATNA ZAŠTITA – ZAKONSKI I OPERATIVNI ASPEKT ODGOVORA NA SIGURNOSNE UGROZE

Sažetak:

Suvremene sigurnosne ugroze kontinuirano evoluiraju, kako po pitanju samih pojava oblika izvršenja, tako i kroz kategorije potencijalnih počinitelja i krajnjih meta napada. Adekvatnost odgovora stoga uvelike ovisi upravo o kontinuiranoj i pravovremenoj analizi predmetne evolucije i svih potencijalnih rizika te sukladno istoj, formuliranju adekvatnog sigurnosnog odgovora. S obzirom na to da je pojam sigurnosti nedjeljiva sinergijska kategorija svih čimbenika koji formuliraju adekvatan sigurnosni odgovor, sektor privatne zaštite mora pratiti navedeni evolucijski ciklus potencijalnih ugroza kako bi dao adekvatne odgovore kroz zaštitne mjere i aktivnosti na mikrolokacijskoj razini. Stoga je vrlo bitno analizirati momente praćenja trendova i evolucije potencijalnih sigurnosnih ugroza u segmentu privatne zaštite, dostupnost navedenih informacija u ovom sektoru, modele strukturiranja i optimiziranja zaštitnih aktivnosti te u konačnici i raspoložive resurse sektora privatne zaštite u RH, prilikom formuliranja adekvatnog i učinkovitog odgovora na potencijalne sigurnosne ugroze.

Ključne riječi: sigurnosne ugroze, analiza rizika, adekvatnost odgovora