

The #SafeCitizen Campaign

Building hope for law-abiding citizens



Tuesday, April 15th 2025

**THE DIRECTOR
PRIVATE SECURITY INDUSTRY REGULATORY AUTHORITY**

PER EMAIL TO REGULATIONS@PSIRA.CO.ZA

PER COURIER TO 420 WITCH-HAZEL AVENUE, ECO GLADES OFFICE PARK, BLOCK B
HIGHVELD EXTENSION 70
CENTURION

FORMAL SUBMISSION OF SAFE CITIZEN CAMPAIGN NPC 2020/086087/08

IN RESPECT OF

'AMENDMENT TO THE PRIVATE SECURITY INDUSTRY REGULATIONS 2002'.

Copied to: Mr. E.N. Mchunu Minister of Police emchunu@parliament.gov.za; Mr. Milton Ntwana milton.ntwana@csp.gov.za; Ms. Bilkis Omar: bilkis.omar@csp.co.za; SAPS Media Liaison Officer: Kamogelo Mogotsi, Ms mogotsimk@saps.gov.za, Chair: Police Portfolio Committee c/o bmbengo@parliament.gov.za.

Locus Standi of Safe Citizen to reply to the tabled amendments.

Safe Citizen is a registered NPC, and amongst other objects, aims to motivate and enable the people of South Africa to work together to support the objectives of community safety, supporting the authorities as law-abiding citizens and responsible firearms owners, and consistently engaging with policymakers, government and related stakeholders, creating and sustaining an open line of communication - facilitating meaningful action around community safety.

Safe Citizen is deeply concerned about these amendments on several fronts.

We have concerns about the legitimacy of the proposals based on (a) the necessity for the specific amendments, (b) the net effect of such amendments and their incongruity with the Constitution and other relevant legislation and finally (c) the fact that much of the amendment bill appears to restate existing legislation that is already perfect for the purpose.

We are indeed challenged to understand the necessity for these sweeping amendments, but as always, we are prepared to become involved and support government if government will share with us its thinking around these aspects. If there is a common ground, we will work with government to perfect it.

Please Withdraw the Regulations and open discussion with stakeholders

As things stand currently, we are unable to support the amendments or even the necessity for this amendment bill. Safe Citizen is a firm proponent of the precept of 'hear the other side' and as we are prepared to learn what it is that concerns government, we too would appreciate being one of the public stakeholders who are heard on this critical issue.

Context of this submission

There is a dire necessity for this conversation, because it is in the practical circumstances of the man in the street, the person who relies on the government, or failing that, private security contractors who he has paid to keep his family safe, that the effects of these amendments will be experienced.

If one is focused on an overriding objective, it can be a simple matter to lose sight of how a proposed new law may work to the disadvantage of the public and it is our duty as an involved, expert and experienced commentator, representative of our members and vicariously the public at large to bring these concerns and our perspective to government.

Notwithstanding the fact that the police force under the current Minister of Police has demonstrated the potential to rise above the situation championed largely by the previous minister, we will surely all be able to agree that the SAPS has a very long path ahead of it in the battle against crime.

South Africans are a resourceful nation, and we have learned to live with constant danger and the threat of criminal violence. This is why the security industry has grown into such a remarkable support to South Africans, and why any act or omission that threatens to dilute the efficiency of that function ought to be very very carefully considered.

LOCUS STANDI OF SAFE CITIZEN TO REPLY TO THE TABLED AMENDMENTS	2
PLEASE WITHDRAW THE REGULATIONS AND OPEN DISCUSSION WITH STAKEHOLDERS	2
CONTEXT OF THIS SUBMISSION	3
UNNECESSARY.	5
1. DRAFTING OF THE AMENDMENTS.	5
2. PRIOR CONSULTATION IS CRUCIAL FOR INFORMED REGULATION.....	5
3. THE ABANDONED MANDATES – SAPS, PSIRA AND CIVILIAN SECRETARIAT FOR POLICE SERVICES (CSPS)	7
5.1 THE PSIRA MANDATE – KEY POINTS:	9
5.2 THE SAPS MANDATE	12
CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATE (SECTION 205):.....	12
SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE SERVICE ACT, 1995:	13
COMMUNITY POLICE FORUMS IGNORED?	14
5.3 THE CIVILIAN SECRETARIAT FOR POLICE SERVICES HAS ABANDONED ITS MANDATE	15
6. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC SPEAKS	18
7. IMPACT ON SECURITY OFFICERS AND PUBLIC SAFETY	20
8. JOB LOSSES AND KNOCK-ON EFFECTS	20
10. APPARENTLY SOUTH AFRICA DOES NOT NEED THE COMMERCIAL SECURITY INDUSTRY	21
10. A CHOICE REMINDER OF THE CRIME SITUATION IN SOUTH AFRICA	22
10.1 Murder	22
10.2 Rape	23
10.5 Cash in Transit Robberies	25
10.6 Kidnapping:	25
11. GENERAL COMMENT APPLYING THE SECTION NUMBERS OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.	26

Unnecessary.

The proposed amendments are unnecessary and go against the Private Security Industry Regulation Act's mandate to support public safety through private security and the government's Constitutional obligation to protect citizens' rights.

If this amendment is passed it will be fundamentally at odds with the legislative and constitutional imperatives of this government, which in this context are to ensure that the state fulfils its duties viz a viz the public by preserving and enhancing – and not undermining the vital role of the security industry.

1. Drafting of the Amendments.

The amendments were presented on March 28th via the Government Gazette Notice 3088 of 2025.

As with the [previously withdrawn] Amendments to the Firearms Control Act in 2021, these amendments evidently resulted from internal discussion, involving only (one must assume) government and police. We are perplexed and disturbed that such sweeping changes to regulations (essentially the law) that would affect almost 600,000 security officers and the tens of millions of people that the officers protect have been hatched without any discussion or request for input from the private sector (non-government stakeholders).

2. Prior Consultation is Crucial for Informed Regulation.

The fact that the draft amendment was prepared without consulting non-government stakeholders, is contrary to Section 33 of the Constitution, which guarantees a procedurally fair administrative action.

While the draft is open for public comment until April 25, 2025, prior consultation was crucial for informed regulation, especially for an industry employing over 600,000 officers and protecting tens of millions. The lack of engagement almost certainly breaches the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act (PAJA), which gives effect to Section 33 of the Constitution, itself requiring affected parties to have a fair opportunity to make representations before decisions are made – in this instance decisions with enormous and far-reaching consequences for South Africans.

The South African Police Service Act, 1995 section 18 mandates cooperation with community policing forums (Section 18) to enhance public participation in crime prevention, reflecting a partnership approach. There was (as far as information to hand reflects), **no consultation at all with community policing forums when considering and drafting these proposed amendments.**

We are puzzled too, that there is no preamble or framing statement to the regulations, something at least that would provide a clue as to why the government feels that it needs these regulations when there are suitably robust and tested laws already in place.

It is likely given the far reaching effects of the amendments that the lack of consultation with non-government stakeholders violates constitutional rights to just administrative action, and invites legal challenges. Pitting government against its own citizens and vice versa ought to be avoided.

3. The Abandoned Mandates – SAPS, PSIRA and Civilian Secretariat for Police Services (CSPS)

Safe Citizen will now demonstrate that if these amendments were to become law, these three entities, on the face of it, responsible for the proposed amendments to the PSIRA Act Firearm Regulations will have effectively and unlawfully abandoned their mandate and obligations to South Africans.

Operating under the authority of the Private Security Industry Regulation Act 56 of 2001, Psira is mandated to provide a framework for regulating the private security industry.

The industry has registered more than 2 million security officers, with around 600,000 currently active. This based on data from PSIRA as of the end of 2022. These officers are employed by around 10,000 registered security companies. It is important to note that the commercial security industry fields about 3 times the amount of police officers deployed by SAPS. SAPS staffing requirements are reported as being around 250,000. In a 2024 report by the Portfolio Committee on Police, SAPS reported around 180,000 officers of which at least 1-1.5 out of every 5 officers are administrative posts.

There are two contextual issues at play:

The industry is a major employer not only in terms of direct staffing levels but also the **volume of business (think economy) conducted with third party suppliers to resource security company operations**; and

- (A) The industry provides security services – keeping South Africans safe at work, in their homes, on the road and in public venues.
- (B) The industry has shown a growth rate of around 43% in staffing levels in the last decade. These numbers highlight South Africa's private security industry as one of the largest globally, significantly outnumbering the South African Police Service (SAPS), which has fewer than 200,000 officers.

In the nexus between PSIRA, CSPA and the South African Police Services (SAPS), lies the responsibility of these organisations to fulfil their mandates and constitutional duty to South Africans.

5.1 The Psira mandate – key points:

Not one – even obliquely – of these following excerpts from the PSIRA mandate can be claimed as being supported by the draft legislation. In fact, were the amendments presented by PSIRA to become law, every single point of the mandate of PSIRA, would be breached and effectively abandoned and PSIRA would be in breach of its Constitutional obligations to the South African public.

Excerpts from Mandate: [*italics*] – reference numbers by Safe Citizen

1. ***Promote a legitimate private security industry acting in terms of the Constitution and applicable law.***

Comment – Safe Citizen

If these amendments are passed PSIRA will be unable to fulfil its duties to cause the security industry to act in accordance with the Constitution.

2. ***Ensure security service providers act in the public and national interest.***

Comment – Safe Citizen

If these amendments are passed PSIRA will be unable to ensure that security service providers are able to fulfil their constitutional obligations.

3. ***Promote professionalism, transparency, accountability, equity, and accessibility in the industry.***

Comment – Safe Citizen

If these amendments are passed PSIRA will be unable to ensure that security service providers are able to fulfil their constitutional obligations.

4. ***Promote stability of the private security industry.***

Comment – Safe Citizen

These proposed amendments will have the precisely opposite effect. They will rapidly destabilise the security industry.

5. *Encourage efficiency and responsibility in rendering security services.*

Comment – Safe Citizen

These proposed amendments will have the precisely opposite effect. They will effectively hamper the ability of the security industry to provide an efficient service and they will expose security officers to even greater danger than they presently encounter on a daily basis. The public will be similarly effected by looking for protection and finding only an ineffective response to armed criminals.

6. *Promote, maintain, and protect the status and interests of security service providers.*

Comment – Safe Citizen

These proposed amendments will work exactly and precisely against the interests and status of security service providers.

7. *Promote protection and enforcement of rights of security officers and employees.*

Comment – Safe Citizen

It is questioned that the proposed amendments will promote, protect and enforce the rights of security officers and employees. We are concerned that these proposals have not been raised with the security officers themselves via their employers or unions in order to extend to them the opportunity to know about these proposed changes which may directly impact their livelihood.

8. *Protect the interests of users of security services.*

Comment – Safe Citizen

How could it ever be claimed that the proposed amendments will *protect the interests of users of security services*? On the day that these regulations would pass into law by the effluxion of time, users of security services who contracted in good faith and in great need for personal and family security, are to be faced with unarmed guards who may not even carry pepper spray.

9. *development of responsive security services to user and community needs.*

In one fell swoop security officers are banned from using even non-lethal means to save their own lives or the lives of the public whom they protect. How can these amendments be seen as achieving, supporting or promoting the development of responsive security services to user and community needs.

5.2 The SAPS Mandate

The mandate of SAPS is examined and commented on here because the Private Security Industry Regulatory Authority (PSIRA) reports to the Minister of Police in South Africa.

PSIRA was established under the Private Security Industry Regulation Act of 2001, and its governance structure mandates that it operates under the oversight of the Minister of Police.

The Minister appoints the PSIRA Council, which governs the Authority, in consultation with the Cabinet. This reporting relationship ensures that PSIRA aligns with national policing policies and priorities set by the Minister, as part of the broader Department of Police framework. Additionally, PSIRA regularly briefs the Portfolio Committee on Police in Parliament, further reinforcing its accountability to the Minister.

By promoting these amendments SAPS is effectively breaching its mandate to South Africans and to the more than 10,000 security service providers. The support of SAPS to PSIRA to draft these amendments is in fact an instruction to PSIRA to breach its own mandate on multiple levels.

SAPS draws its mandate essentially from key legal frameworks such as South African Police Service Act, 1995, with an overriding obligation to the public based on Section 205 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996.

Constitutional Mandate (Section 205):

Section 205 of the Constitution outlines the core responsibilities of the police service in South Africa and clarifies:

Purpose and Function:

The South African Police Service has the responsibility to "prevent, combat and investigate crime, to **maintain public order, to protect and secure the inhabitants of the Republic and their property**, and to uphold and enforce the law." [Bold and italics by Safe Citizen]

SAFE CITIZEN COMMENT

This establishes SAPS as the primary agency for law enforcement and public safety, with a broad mandate encompassing both proactive and reactive duties.

It is trite that circumstances in South Africa, not the least of which is the failure of SAPS to provide, timeous, qualified and dependable services to the public have contributed meaningfully to the growth and scale of the commercial security industry.

The result is that millions of South Africans, left vulnerable to crime by the SAPS (and government failure) to control crime, have had at their own expense, to make alternative arrangements for their personal safety and security.

It is thus challenging to understand how the government feels that it is justified, rational and fair to release proposed amendments of the magnitude of this bill without thorough and open discussion with the three groups: security officers, their employers and the tens of millions of people who rely at least once every day on the commercial security industry for their safety.

South African Police Service Act, 1995:

The Act elaborates on the constitutional mandate, providing detailed operational and organizational guidance.

Establishment and Core Functions:

Section 13 of the Act reiterates the Constitutional duties: "The Service shall be structured at national and provincial levels to **function efficiently in the prevention, combating and investigation of crime; the maintenance of public order; the protection and securing of the inhabitants of the Republic and their property; and the upholding and enforcement of the law.**"

SAFE CITIZEN COMMENT

How is it expected that the proposed amendments drafted without external/public stakeholder engagement can be seen as contributing to the maintenance of public order (effectively disarming commercial security officers) and the protection and security of the inhabitants of the Republic, and their property?

Community Police Forums Ignored?

The Act mandates cooperation with community policing forums (Section 18) to enhance public participation in crime prevention, reflecting a partnership approach.

SAFE CITIZEN COMMENT

There has been no public participation or any form of cooperation with community policing forums around these proposed amendments.

Service Excellence and Ethics:

The Act incorporates a Code of Conduct requiring SAPS members to act with integrity, respect diversity, uphold the law, and strive for service excellence, reinforcing the **constitutional mandate with ethical standards**.

SAFE CITIZEN COMMENT

We believe that the qualities of **service excellence, ethical standards and Constitutional muster** are not to be found in the proposed amendments.

Practical Scope: and Additional Context:

The SAPS mandate is supported by subsidiary legislation (e.g., the Firearms Control Act, 2000, and Domestic Violence Act, 1998), which SAPS enforces. SAPS ALSO collaborates with the Civilian Secretariat for Police Service (for policy oversight).

SAFE CITIZEN COMMENT

Information to hand suggests that the Civilian Secretariat for Police Service (CSOP) has been instrumental in drafting these amendments – without stakeholder involvement. Safe Citizen will examine and comment on the mandate of the CSOP with reference to the public.

In summary - this mandate reflects clear obligations on SAPS, designed to address South Africa's complex safety and security needs, balancing enforcement with prevention and community engagement, all while adhering to constitutional principles of human rights and accountability.

SAFE CITIZEN COMMENT

The SAPS mandate within the context of these proposed amendments is effectively abandoned.

5.3 The Civilian Secretariat for Police Services has abandoned its mandate

[Bold and italics by Safe Citizen]

The CSPS was established under the Civilian Secretariat for Police Service Act (2011) and Section 208 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996), which mandates the creation of a civilian secretariat to function under the direction of the Minister of Police. This legal framework ensures that the CSPS operates independently to provide oversight and support, **promoting a transformed and accountable police service that reflects democratic values and principles**. The establishment of the CSPS aims to **enhance transparency, accountability, and effectiveness in policing, addressing the need for civilian involvement in police governance**.

Core Mandate and Responsibilities

The primary mandate of the CSPS is to ***conduct civilian oversight of the SAPS, ensuring that policing is efficient, effective, and aligned with constitutional principles***.

[Where is the civilian oversight in the development of the draft amendments?]

[Where is the alignment with Constitutional Principles?]

This oversight includes monitoring and evaluating police performance through audits and assessments, ensuring compliance with legal and ethical standards.

The CSPS serves as a technical advisor to the Minister of Police, providing policy and strategic support on various matters, including departmental policy, strategy, legislation, and international obligations.

[If the CSPS is indeed providing technical support, **how is it that these amendments can make unworkable regulations such as electronic tracking devices in firearms and expect this to pass into law by the effluxion of time?**]

Key responsibilities include:

Civilian Oversight: The CSPA exercises its powers without fear, favour, or prejudice, maintaining effective and efficient policing with high standards of professional ethics.

The words 'effective' and 'efficient' do not lend themselves in any sense to the possible outcome if these regulations were to be adopted.

This involves **ensuring that the SAPS operates accountably and transparently**, reflecting the democratic values of South Africa.

[Similarly, there was no transparency between the police and the public regarding the drafting of these proposed amendments].

Policy and Strategic Support: It advises the Minister on policy development, conducting qualitative and **evidence-based research** to formulate departmental policies.

[Herein lies possibly the largest dichotomy if the policy development on the proposed amendments was a CSPA initiative. What evidence-based research resulted in this bill?

Monitoring and Compliance: The CSPA monitors the implementation of specific laws by the SAPS, notably the Domestic Violence Act [1998], to ensure compliance and effectiveness in protecting vulnerable groups. It also conducts audits to evaluate overall police performance, identifying areas for improvement.

Community Engagement and Crime Prevention: The CSPA mobilizes role-players, stakeholders, and partners outside the department through engagements on crime prevention and other policing matters. This includes facilitating public participation programs, such as izimbizo and anti-crime campaigns, to foster community involvement in safety initiatives.

CSPA has in terms of these proposed amendments done absolutely nothing to mobilise external role-players and stakeholders, completely excluding even Community Police Forums from any engagement around the contents of these regulations.

6. The Constitution of the Republic Speaks

Excerpt from Constitution: [*italics*] – reference numbers by Safe Citizen.

The South African Constitution, particularly Chapter 2 (Bill of Rights), includes key provisions, inter alia, relevant to public safety and security:

1. *Section 11: "Everyone has the right to life."*

[This includes the right of ordinary, law-abiding citizens to be able to protect themselves in their homes and be protected by others who are qualified and licensed so to do. The amendments, by restricting firearms in public places and limiting non-lethal tools, will reduce the effectiveness of private security, directly increasing crime risks. For example, prohibiting firearms in shopping malls and hospitals will leave these areas vulnerable to armed attacks, infringing on citizens' rights under Sections 11 and 12(1). Similarly, property owners relying on armed response for protection could face increased risks, affecting Section 25 Constitutional rights. This direct impact will be experienced as the state failing its positive obligation to protect rights, especially given the inability of the police to control violent crime].

Section 12(1): "Everyone has the right to freedom and security of the person, which includes the right to be free from all forms of violence from either public or private sources." Given the scope and nature of unchecked crime in South Africa it stands to reason that South Africans need to be effectively and sustainably resourced to protect themselves from violent crime – either in person or by virtue of a contracted service. The vicarious benefit to a whole community and nation (including those who can't pay but do benefit from community security) that is extended by the presence of effectively armed and equipped security service providers (for example at public places where others pay for private security) is clear to see.

Section 33: "Everyone has the right to administrative action that is lawful, reasonable, and procedurally fair." [There is little, if anything brought to the fore in the proposed amendments that in even the longest stretch of imagination can be regarded as 'reasonable'. The amendments place officers and the public in danger, seek to enforce technically irrelevant conditions such as electronic tracking devices in every firearm and embrace a sweeping definition of the noun – 'weapon'.

Section 36: Allows for limitation of rights if it is **reasonable and justifiable** in an open and democratic society, considering the nature of the right, the importance of the purpose, the **relation between limitation and purpose, and less restrictive means**.

For the amendments to be rules as Constitutional, any limitation on rights must pass the Section 36 test, being reasonable and justifiable. The purpose and effect of the amendments must be to enhance safety and accountability in the industry and thus must be balanced against the impact.

Provisions like banning firearms in all public places are disproportionate, given established risk levels.

Similarly, mandatory tracking devices - being still in development in other countries are a fanciful notion – and a very expensive exercise – likely unaffordable by all except the best resourced companies. One must wonder how much and what level of research prefaced this nonsensical amendment – if unopposed - to become law in 180 days, and how it is planned for companies to implement and manage this technically, and who in PSIRA is technically qualified and equipped to manage the enforcement of this regulation?

Annual evaluations similarly are based on vague references and embrace even the locomotive system of a person – with no specific guidelines. Is it proposed that persons with a physical disability are to be excluded from employment as a security officer?

7. Impact on Security Officers and Public Safety

The amendments could lead to job losses due to increased costs of operation, affecting the right to choose one's trade or occupation under Section 22. For the public, reduced security effectiveness could mean **higher crime exposure, particularly in areas where police response is slow, contradicting the state's duty under Section 205(3) to prevent, combat, and investigate crime.**

The state has a constitutional duty to protect these rights, which includes ensuring effective law enforcement and public safety measures. **Given the SAPS's challenges, private security is a critical component, and any regulations must balance safety with operational capacity.** The current regulations are adequate when the police do their job.

8. Job Losses and knock-on effects

With reference to the points elucidated above it is unthinkable that PSIRA, as the entity mandated to promote the security industry, in concert with the Minister of Police, and most apparently on government (ANC) instruction has embarked on a course of action that if perfected, would **damage the livelihood of hundreds and thousands of security officers and place the public at even greater significant risk of personal harm and loss.**

Rationality and Proportionality Under Section 36

In view of the comment period ending April 25, 2025, there is an urgent need for the Minister to address these concerns. The draft amendments may violate constitutional rights to life, security, and property, and fail procedural fairness tests under Section 33.

10. Apparently South Africa does not need the commercial security industry

Yet it was the commercial security industry acting in concert with licensed private gun owners that **prevented the insurrection in Kwa-Zulu Natal from engulfing this country.**

Perhaps the most telling and relevant indictment of the socio-political and regulatory environment into which the government seeks to impose the proposed amendments is penned on July 24th, 2021, by the Kathrada Foundation¹. Here [*our italics and emphasis*] is an excerpt from a media statement of that august institution:

“The sluggish response of our police, army and intelligence services to the mayhem is beyond comprehension. **And when they did react, they did so almost grudgingly,** resulting in a **profound loss of faith** among South Africans in the structures meant **to protect and serve the public at large.**”

“Communities and business owners **were left to defend themselves** from the mass looting that was unleashed. Many of these efforts may not have been necessary, had the police acted timeously and adequately to enforce public order to safeguard communities and property.”

One can imagine what that would have looked like if these amendments (proposed in 2025) were in place as law in July 2021.

¹ <https://www.kathradafoundation.org/2021/07/24/looters-and-racists-cannot-set-the-agenda/>

10. A Choice Reminder of the Crime Situation in South Africa
(just in case the Minister has forgotten)

Considered within the context of the historical, current and future crime trends of South Africa, these proposed amendments are bizarre.

10.1 Murder^{2 3 4 5 6}

About **26,000 murder events** were reported in South Africa in 2024, based on available quarterly data derived from South African Police Service (SAPS) statistics and news reports.

Quarter	Period	Estimated Cases
Q4 2023/2024	January to March	6,536
Q1 2024/2025	April to June	6,198
Q2 2024/2025	July to September	6,542
Q3 2024/2025	October to December	6,953
Total for 2024	January to December	26,229

² [BusinessTech: Shocking murder numbers](#)

³ [Mail & Guardian: Police crime statistics](#)

⁴ [Worldometers: South Africa Population](#)

⁵ [News24: SA crime stats](#)

⁶ [DefenceWeb: South Africa’s murder rate increased](#)

10.2 Rape^{7 8 9 10 11}

38,000 to 40,000 rape cases were reported in South Africa in 2024.

From South African Police Service (SAPS) quarterly crime reports and news articles, approximately 38,000 to 40,000 rape cases were reported in 2024. This estimate includes data from January to December, calculated from available quarters.

Quarter	Period	Estimated Cases
Q4 2023/2024	January to March 2024	9,252
Q1 2024/2025	April to June 2024	9,309
Q2 2024/2025	July to September 2024	10,190
Q3 2024/2025	October to December 2024	9,670
Total for Calendar Year 2024	January to December 2024	38,421

10.3 Robbery¹²

*'Robbery is taking or attempting to take something valuable by **force, threat, or fear**, with intent to permanently deprive'* – yes, those events that are still experienced by South Africans, even with a functioning force of tens of thousands of armed security officers [that function that the minister of police would evidently like to hamstring].

Roughly 180,000 robbery events were reported in South Africa in 2024.

Quarter	Period	Estimated Cases
Q4 2023/2024	January to March 2024	49,943
Q1 2024/2025	April to June 2024	44,744
Q2 2024/2025	July to September 2024	45,000
Q3 2024/2025	October to December 2024	45,000
Total for Calendar Year 2024	January to December 2024	184,687

⁷ [Mail & Guardian: Police crime statistics](#)

⁸ [defenceWeb: SA's second quarter rape statistics](#)

⁹ [Human Rights Watch: World Report 2024](#)

¹⁰ [Statista: Number of sexual offenses in South Africa by crime](#)

¹¹ [Minister Senzo Mchunu: Release of third quarter Crime Statistics 2025](#)

¹² [South African Police Service \(SAPS\) Crime Statistics](#)

10.4 Home Invasion^{13 14}

That moment **when bad people break into your house, and you know that you are in mortal danger**, and you **pray for your own gun or just someone with a gun** to come and save you.

About 20,000 home invasion events were reported in South Africa in 2024. These events are classified as "robbery at residential premises" in official statistics, involving unlawful entry with force or threats.

Quarter	Period	Estimated Cases
Q4 2023/2024	January to March 2024	5,200
Q1 2024/2025	April to June 2024	4,900
Q2 2024/2025	July to September 2024	5,100
Q3 2024/2025	October to December 2024	4,800
Total for Calendar Year 2024	January to December 2024	20,000

¹³ [Minister Senzo Mchunu: Release of the Quarterly Crime Statistics](#)

¹⁴ [Crime statistics: who are we to believe? | GroundUp](#)

10.5 Cash in Transit Robberies¹⁵

About 200 cash-in-transit robbery events were reported in South Africa in 2024. Cash-in-transit robberies, have been a significant concern in South Africa, always involving extreme violence and mostly amongst public on the roads.

We have all seen the CIT officers standing at shopping centres, holding a self-loading rifle, to guard a cash collection. How are the CIT staff expected to guard these shipments when the new regulations will ban security firearms at shopping centres?

10.6 Kidnapping.^{16 17 18 19 20 21 22}

There were approximately 18,500 kidnapping events were reported in South Africa in 2024. The trend of increasing kidnappings is often linked to organized crime.

Quarter	Period	Estimated Cases
Q4 2023/2024	January to March 2024	5,110
Q1 2024/2025	April to June 2024	4,205
Q2 2024/2025	July to September 2024	4,600
Q3 2024/2025	October to December 2024	4,600
Total for Calendar Year 2024	January to December 2024	18,515

¹⁵ [Cash-in-transit heists bring terror](#)

¹⁶ [South Africa: kidnappings 2023-2024 | Statista](#)

¹⁷ [Kidnapping on the rise: What to look out for in 2025 | The Citizen](#)

¹⁸ [South Africa’s armed robbery problem drives kidnapping | ISS Africa](#)

¹⁹ [Over 3000 kidnappings reported in SA in three months - Issue 6 2023 - SMART Security Solutions](#)

²⁰ [Crime Stats: Almost 4,000 people kidnapped in three months in SA](#)

²¹ [Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities on recorded kidnapping cases in South Africa | South African Government](#)

²² [Minister Senzo Mchunu: Release of third quarter Crime Statistics 2025 | South African Government](#)

11.GENERAL COMMENT APPLYING THE SECTION NUMBERS OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.

PSIRA SECTION NUMBERS AND TEXT	SAFE CITIZEN COMMENT
1. In this Schedule, "the Regulations" means the Private Security Industry Regulations published under Government Notice No. R.190, in Government Gazette No. 23120 of 14 February 2002.	
2. Regulation 1 of the Regulations is hereby amended-	
(a) by the insertion of the following definition: 'ammunition' means ammunition as defined in section 1 of the Firearms Control Act, 2000 (Act No. 60 of 2000):	
(b) by insertion after the definition of 'Board' of the following definition: 'bolt action rifle' means a type of firearm action where the handling of cartridges into and out of the weapon's barrel chamber is operated by manually manipulating the bolt directly via a handle, which is most commonly placed on the right-hand side of the weapon:	
(c) by insertion after the definition of 'director' of the following definitions: 'firearm' means a firearm as defined in section 1 of the Firearms Control Act, 2000 (Act No. 60 of 2000); 'Firearms Control Act' means the Firearms Control Act, 2000 (Act No. 60 of 2000):	
(d) by the insertion after the definition of "repealed legislation" of the following definition: 'security business' includes an employer of in-house security officers to the extent that these regulations apply to such a person as contemplated in the Act: 'semi-automatic' means a semi-automatic as defined in section 1 of the Firearms Control Act:	
(e) by the insertion after the definition of "these Regulations" of the following definition: 'weapon' means a weapon as defined in item 4 of the Code of Conduct for Security Service Providers, 2003 and includes – (a) any object other than a firearm: (b) a dangerous weapon; and (c) handcuffs and any similar device, object or equipment manufactured, designed or adapted to restrain a person who is under arrest.	As we will now demonstrate, the architects of the amendments invested hardly any effort in properly defining and demonstrating an understanding of what comprises a 'weapon' within the context of a security officer defending a life (or property such as a national key point, or cash in transit) against an unlawful attack. According to the Code of Conduct for Security Service Providers, 2003, Page 9, 'weapon' means 'any weapon other than a firearm'. A weapon is fundamentally an object used to injure, defeat, or destroy, with applications in combat, hunting, and

	self-defense, as supported by Merriam-Webster, Britannica, and Wikipedia. This definition, created by the drafter, is the foundation of possibly the most contentious proposed amendments. If (a) in the proposed amendments is to be taken at face value, it encompasses literally any object from a tea cup to a roll of tin foil. The inclusion of this non-sensical sub-definition into (2)(e) is vague and ill-considered and leaves the regulations open to subjective interpretation. (b) a dangerous weapon, what is a 'dangerous' weapon? Surely if an object meets the standard to be considered a 'weapon' has it not already satisfied the test of being 'dangerous' in the wrong hands or unlawful context? Is a teaspoon with a sharpened end not also thus a 'dangerous' weapon? What we seek to illustrate here is a self-evident dearth of understanding of the definition and a disregard for the application and enforcement of a possible law – based on such loose and inappropriate definitions. (c) If handcuffs and 'any similar device' are now to fall within the definition of 'weapon' does this include nylon rope, cable ties, duct tape, electricians' tape and similar items? And if not, why not? Is it feasible in the mind of the architects of this bill, that security officers must have prior permission to carry cable ties and duct tape in the absence of written permission to carry a set of handcuffs? And to the reader of this submission: before you dismiss this objection as insubstantial consider that cable ties,
--	--

	originally designed and still in the main applied for exactly that, are routinely issued to various law enforcement and police teams around the world for use as restraining devices. Have you not in your proposed regulation also specified 'cable ties' under the definition of weapon because of how ridiculous it would appear to have a law that banned possession of cable ties by a security officer? An internet search on handcuffs specifies this device as used for restraint. The first major manufacturer, the Hiatt Handcuff company, was founded in 1780, marking a significant step in the commercialization of handcuffs. Here is the result of a deep internet search asking what police forces anywhere in the world define handcuffs as weapons: Research suggests no police force defines handcuffs as weapons; they are classified as restraining devices. Handcuffs are used for control and safety, with some tactical uses causing pain, but not reclassified as weapons. Legal and policy documents consistently treat handcuffs as restraint tools, with no evidence of weapon classification. Yet in South Africa, under the proposed regulations, South Africa scores a world first in defining handcuffs as weapons?
3. The following Regulations are hereby inserted after Regulation 13:	
13A. Firearms and ammunition	

13A. (1) A security business may only issue a firearm to a security officer employed by it for the rendering of a security service if -	
(a) the issuing of the firearm by the security business is in accordance with all applicable laws:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(b) the receipt and possession of the firearm by the security officer is in accordance with all applicable laws:	Ditto
(c) the firearm is in good working condition and free from any defect which may render it an inherent source of danger to any person:	Ditto
(d) the security business and the security officer are both registered as security service providers in terms of the Act and their respective registrations are not suspended or withdrawn:	Ditto
(e) the security business is not deregistered:	Ditto
(f) the security officer is in possession of his or her certificate of identification as contemplated in regulation 9(2) of these regulations:	Ditto
(g) the security officer is in possession of an original document from the security business, signed by the licence holder of the firearm or a person authorized thereto in writing by the licence holder, containing the name, address, firearm licence particulars and registration number of the security business as well as the name and employment address of the security officer, and stating that the possession of the firearm by the security officer is authorized for rendering a security service as described in the document and for the period and place specified in the document:	Ditto
(h) the security officer is on duty or standby duty, or is about to perform duty or standby duty:	Ditto
(i) the necessary particulars of the issuing of the firearm and ammunition are entered into all the registers that must be kept by the security business in terms of law:	Ditto
(j) the security business and the security officer are not under State investigation in respect of an offence specified in the Schedule to the Act relating to the unlawful use of force or an offence provided for in Schedule 2 of the Firearms Control Act, or are not being criminally prosecuted in respect of such an offence:	Prefacing with 13(a)(1) - 13A. (1) A security business may only issue a firearm to a security officer employed by it for the rendering of a security service if – (read (j)) In other words, if even one officer employed by a company has been accused (and thus under State investigation) of an offence relating to the unlawful use of force, the security company may not issue a firearm to any officer in its employ, nor may the

	officer receive a firearm for the purposes of carrying out his duty and thus earning his living while such investigation continues. It is trite that the police have a wide latitude when deciding how they will manage a self-defence or private-defence shooting, and it is commonplace for the person who did the shooting to be immediately charged with murder, even though these charges may not later be pursued by a prosecutor. While the investigation, which may take months or longer unfolds, the officer and his employer are to be punished on the strength of an unproven allegation. Is this the intention of the architects and can they really believe that it is in the interests of public safety to suspend an entire company over an allegation?
(k) there is no pending improper conduct enquiry initiated by the Authority into an alleged violation of the Code of Conduct, by the security business or the security officer relating to an offence contemplated in paragraph (j):	Once again, even an enquiry of improper conduct appears to possess the gravity to halt the operations of the security service provider. As with 13[A](1)(j) above, it is incomprehensible that the presumption of innocence until proven guilty may be trampled by these amendments. The mere accusation does not justify suspending the right of a person to earn a living nor a company to pursue its objects. South African criminal law operates on the principle of "innocent until proven guilty," not "guilty until proven innocent." This is constitutionally guaranteed under Section 35(3)(h), with the burden of proof on the prosecution, as reinforced by case law and legal practice. There is no evidence of a "guilty until proven innocent" principle in the system, and any attempts to reverse this burden

	have been struck down by courts, ensuring fair trial rights are upheld.
(l) the possession of the firearm by the security officer is reasonably necessary for rendering a security service, taking into account the nature of the security service, the contract between the security business and its client, the circumstances under which the Service is rendered, the nature of the firearm and any other relevant fact:	What does 'reasonably' mean? Not a self-loading rifle for a restaurant, or only a bolt action rifle for a farm security officer?
(m) the security officer has successfully completed the security training required for the rendering of the security service in question, any training, instruction or guidance required by law in respect of a possession, handling and use of the firearm, as well as any further or additional training necessary or required to handle the firearm in a proper and safe manner:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(n) the security officer is not under the influence of a substance which has an intoxicating or narcotic effect:	Ditto
(o) the security officer is in a mentally stable condition and the security business has no reason to believe that he or she will use the firearm for an unlawful purpose or in an unlawful or negligent manner:	Who will decide at the time of issuing a firearm whether or not the security officer is in a 'mentally stable condition'? And on what basis? And on what basis are firearms issued to members of the SAPS who are frequently in the news for shooting themselves and or their family members? If SAPS evidently cannot manage this how is it expected that the private sector must make a determination on 'mental stability'?
(p) the firearm is to be carried in a public place, the security officer is in possession of the holster, holder or other container required in terms of the Firearms Control Act for the carrying of the firearm in the public place:	
(q) such issuing does not include security officers possessing firearms at the following public places:	Instead of saying 'no security officer may be in possession of a duty firearm at the following places, the architect provides a list of places where 'such issuing' is included. Vague, clumsy, and ill-considered. Now, who in PSIRA, or the CSPS or SAPS themselves, is in a position to decide in unprecedented, sweeping and irrational proposals having a direct impact on people's lives, where, when and in what geographic location the circumstances (within the shifting commercial security environment) will justify the presence of a lawfully issued or owned firearm?

	Is this not the province of commercial rationale and qualified expertise required of registered security officers? Gun Free Zones, such as Telkom and SARS facilities are not in contention. But, the general classification of places based on the nature of the place make absolutely no rational sense in a safety and security context.
(i) Taxi rank:	If a taxi operator can afford an security officer to keep him and his clients safe ought he to be denied this right? Think section (12)(1) of the Constitution.
(ii) Cemetery:	How about a cemetery, where it is already illegal to fire a gun into the air - If a Cabinet Minister attends a funeral will the VIP protection unit of the Minister stand down at the cemetery gate?
(iii) Stadium:	Given the scale and organisation of criminal gangs is it reasonable and rational to forbid the operators of a sports or entertainment stadium to employ an armed security company? Think section (12)(1) of the Constitution.
(iv) Shopping Malls:	Shopping malls are likely one of the most frequently attacked locations by criminals and criminal gangs. Why should the law abiding public be disadvantaged by a law that forbids armed security there? What is an unarmed security officer to do when a child is forcibly snatched from its mother's arms in a kidnapping? Is this really expected to be a solution to the problem of violent crime in SA?
(v) Church:	The precepts and notions of faith aside, is it feasible to forbid a faith or culture attending worship to employ an armed security officer to keep them safe?
(vi) Restaurants:	Gangsters routinely enter restaurants to rob patrons. Mostly content to leave with cell phones and wallets. What is the recommended

	course of action from the PSIRA architect when the gangsters take a liking to someone's daughter, mother or sister and decide to take her along?
(vii) Parks:	It appears from the proposals that communities who live in a high-rise building and take their children to the local park to catch a ball or have a picnic are to be forbidden from arranging for their security with an armed guard.
(viii) Hospital	It is well established around the world that firearms are generally not welcomed in hospitals more often than not at the instance of the hospital's own policy. This ought not to preclude armed guards conducting access control. To prohibit any armed guard at a hospital is to send a message to gangsters, come and rob our dispensary, kill a patient or simply abduct someone – there will be no armed resistance here.
(ix) Public and Private Schools; or	The penchant of local gangsters and thugs to descend on school children at their schools is well established, Knife attacks are commonplace from within and outside the student body. How is it proposed by PSIRA that an unarmed security officer is to deal with one or more knife-wielding thugs?
(x) Any other similar public establishments.	Ah, the catch all. So to take a leaf from (ii) above, a security officer could probably be arrested and charged for being on duty at a funeral home with a firearm? Yes? No? Is a funeral home not a 'similar public establishment' to a cemetery? Vague and nonsensical. Irrational and unenforceable.
(r) the security officer is under proper control and supervision in the rendering of the security service for the purposes of which a firearm is provided:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(s) the security officer, is provided with no more than a reasonable quantity of ammunition for the purposes of rendering the relevant security service and the ammunition	That word 'reasonable' again – what exactly is reasonable? 2 or 6 rounds for a revolver, 12 or 42 for a pistol, 3 or 1 for a shotgun, 20 or 100 for a

meets any applicable requirements contemplated in the Firearms Control Act:	rifle? And as per our comment above in 13(A)(1)(q) how can the drafters of this bill expect to enforce something that is so vague? And how is it that the expertise of physical security deployment and management becomes by default, the province of the drafters?
(t) the security officer signs for receipt of the firearm and all ammunition provided to him or her immediately upon such receipt; and	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(u) A security service provider using or intending to use firearms in a public place as envisaged in sub-regulation (1) of this regulation must meet the following requirements:	
(i) the public place must not be declared a firearm free zone as by the Minister in terms of Section 140 of the Firearms Controls Act:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(ii) the use of firearms must be in the interest of public safety:	How exactly is this to be determined? What is the definition (according to the architects of this Bill, of 'public safety'? And who apart from the criminals of South Africa will consider planning the use of a firearm to be contrary to the interests of public safety? How do the drafters of this bill expect to enforce something that is so vague? And how is it that the expertise of physical security deployment and management becomes by default, the province of the drafters? Does this requirement mean that an a security officer protecting himself or his own client may be found guilty of not using a firearm in the interests of <i>public</i> safety?
(iii) firearms must not be used unless a risk assessment report has been submitted to the Authority:	A risk assessment report? In what format? Delivered how? In respect of every single deployment of an armed security officer? Delivered to who? Accepted by who? Confirmed by who? Recorded by who? On what criteria?

(iv) steps must be taken to mitigate identified risks in terms of paragraph (b) of this regulation; and	In the absence of logical reference we must proceed on the basis that the 'paragraph (b) of this regulation' that is referred to is the paragraph (b) subordinate to 13(A)(1). In any event, commercial rationale in most companies and clients will determine that all steps will be taken to mitigate risks prior to employing expensive armed security. Finally, and in summary of these paragraphs under 13(A)(1) in considering the nature of armed response, how do the architects of this proposed bill expect that armed security officers (including those commercial anti-kidnap teams) are to act when pursuing or responding to an armed attack that occurs or migrates to one of the 'forbidden' places? Ill-considered. Irrational. Unworkable. Unenforceable.
(v) there is no other alternative means of protection without using high calibre firearms.	What exactly is a high caliber firearm? Is a 50 caliber rifle more deadly than a 22 magnum?
(2) A person applying in terms of section 23(1) of the Act for registration as a security service provider must include in the application form for registration as security service provider, information relating to its intention to render security services requiring the use of firearms and if applicable, the number and type of firearms to be used.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(3) The Registrar of Firearms when considering an application in terms of section 20(2)(a) of the Firearms Control Act, must in the prescribed form:	
(a) Request the Authority to confirm the registration status of the applicant security service provider in line with regulations 13(5)(d) and 21(2) of the Regulations of the Firearms Control Act; and	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(b) Provide the Authority with the information relating to the type, calibre, make, model and all marked serial numbers of the firearms the applicant intends to use.	Ditto
(4) The Registrar must also include, in the request for verification the details of the proposed responsible person by the security service provider for the Authority to verify his or her registration status with the Authority.	Ditto
(5) The Authority shall issue a form contemplated in sub-regulation (3) to the Registrar against payment of a fee to be determined by the Authority from time to time.	Ditto

(6) The Authority shall upon receipt of the request for verification by the Registrar as contemplated in sub-regulation (3), assess and issue its recommendation in respect of the status of registration of the security business against the records of the Authority.	Ditto
(7) (1) A security business which is using firearms or intending to use firearms to render security services must, within 30 days of being issued with the firearm licence, provide the Authority with the following particulars:	Ditto
(a) details of competency certificates issued to security service provider in terms of the Firearms Control Act:	Ditto
(b) details of firearm licence issued to security service provider in terms of the Firearms Control Act:	Ditto
(c) the total number of firearms and ammunition issued to the security officers for purposes of rendering security services:	Ditto
(d) full particulars of security officers issued with firearms and ammunition; and	Ditto
(e) any additional information that the Authority may require.	Ditto
(8) A security business providing firearms to security officers employed by it must -	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(a) maintain all firearms licensed to it and which are provided to security officers in a proper working condition, free of any defects which may render them an inherent source of danger:	Ditto
(b) have and adhere to proper and safe procedures in respect of the issuing and returning of and control over firearms and ammunition provided to security officers and must have and enforce a proper disciplinary code in respect of the conduct of security officers regarding their receipt, possession, carrying, use, safekeeping and return of the firearms and ammunition, and in respect of the conduct of all its other personnel involved with such functions:	Ditto
(c) ensure that firearms and ammunition provided to security officers are returned for safekeeping as soon as possible after completion of their duties or work shifts:	Ditto
(d) actively monitor whether security officers who are provided with firearms and ammunition are trained, instructed and guided as contemplated in sub-regulation (1):	Ditto
(e) actively monitor whether security officers also possess their own firearms or is provided with firearms by any other person while rendering a security service, and take any appropriate steps in this regard to ensure compliance with the Act:	Ditto
(f) ensure that security officers provided with firearms are properly assessed to the satisfaction of the Authority, including an assessment of their visual and audio capacity,	'Properly assessed' What does this mean? Looking, touching, measuring, interviewing?

locomotive system, neurological system and general mental and emotional condition at the cost of the security business, at least every 12 months, or within a shorter period which may be reasonably necessary in the circumstances, to verify that they do not suffer from any physical or mental condition that would render their continued possession of a firearm and ammunition as posing an unreasonable risk or as undesirable:	Visual capacity – it stands to reason that it would be foolish of anyone to issue a blind security officer with a firearm. It is still incumbent on the architects to specify a globally acceptable level of eyesight. Audio capacity – is it intended that a hearing impaired security officer not be issued with a firearm? If so what is the criteria? One ear? Both ears? 20% 50% 90%? Locomotive system – does this eliminate a security officer with one leg, who may be deployed in an office, or a security officer with a prosthetic limb, or a security officer who is grossly overweight but still able to perform? What is the standard in this ill-considered wish list? Neurological System - a low-level search of the internet reveals a wealth of highly technical data around the human neurological system. The data is inserted here to illustrate the irrationality of making a sweeping and undefined requirement into an amendment that would become law and expecting companies who possess a core competency in physical security to develop a highly-technical assessment which in and of itself may breach certain personal and medical rights of its employees: The human nervous system is a highly complex network of specialized cells that coordinates and controls all bodily functions. It is responsible for receiving sensory information, processing it, and generating appropriate responses to maintain homeostasis and enable interaction with the environment. This system is critical for everything from basic reflexes to advanced cognitive processes, making it a cornerstone of human physiology.
--	---

	Anatomical Structure The nervous system is divided into two main parts: Central Nervous System (CNS): Comprises the brain and spinal cord. The brain, weighing approximately 3 pounds, is located in the cranial cavity and protected by the skull bones. It contains roughly 100 billion neurons and is responsible for higher functions such as consciousness, memory, planning, and emotion, as well as lower functions like respiration, heart rate, and digestion. The spinal cord is a long, thin mass of bundled neurons extending from the medulla oblongata to the lumbar region, enclosed within the vertebral column. It separates into the cauda equina below the first lumbar vertebra and is protected by the meninges. The white matter carries sensory and motor signals, while the grey matter integrates reflexes. Peripheral Nervous System (PNS): Includes all nerves that connect the CNS to the rest of the body, comprising cranial nerves (12 pairs emerging from the brain) and spinal nerves (31 pairs emerging segmentally from the spinal cord). Further subdivided into: Somatic Nervous System (SNS): Controls voluntary movements by innervating skeletal muscles, involving efferent neurons. Autonomic Nervous System (ANS): Regulates involuntary functions such as heart rate, digestion, and respiratory rate. It has two main divisions: Sympathetic Nervous System: Prepares the body for "fight or flight"
--	--

	responses, increasing heart rate and energy mobilization. Parasympathetic Nervous System: Promotes "rest and digest" activities, conserving energy and slowing heart rate. Enteric Nervous System (ENS): A semi-independent system controlling gastrointestinal functions, often called the "brain of the gut," with nearly as many neurons as the spinal cord. A question for the architects: before you read this text would you have been able to describe the Human Nervous System – and if your answer is an honest 'no' then on what rational basis do you seek to make it a law that a security company ought to be able to define and interpret this requirement off your 'wish list'?
(g) ensure that the security officers provided with firearms undergo at least one proper practical training session acceptable to the Authority, at the cost of the security business, at least every 12 months, or within a shorter period as may be reasonably necessary relevant firearm and ammunition:	It is intriguing to note that this requirement does not extend to SAPS who on the instructions of the departed Minister of Police now fire only 45 rounds every five years to prove their proficiency with a firearm. There is that adjective again 'reasonably' And 'proper' what does that mean? Dry fire? Theory? Live Fire? At 5 metres or 55 metres? In the dark? In the sunlight? Out of a vehicle? For the record, Safe Citizen supports regular evaluation and refresher training which must be well defined, measurable and affordable for the security company while maintaining an acceptable standard of skill for armed security officers.
(h) ensure that the security officers provided with firearms attend at least one briefing session acceptable to the Authority, at the cost of the security business, every 12 months, or within a shorter period as may be reasonably necessary in the circumstances, during which they are properly informed of the relevant legal aspects and	If the architects mean a refresher session, we agree. With the proviso that the architects define the scope of the 'briefing session'.

procedures and of their legal duties regarding the possession, carrying, safekeeping and use of firearms and ammunition provided to them:	
(i) timeously inform a client of the security business on whose premises a security officer is rendering a security service of the possession of a firearm by the security officer unless the contract between the security business and its client provides for the possession of a firearm:	That is a contractual issue between the client and the service provider. If the officer is in lawful possession of the firearm there is no apparent issue. If the client chooses to not permit armed staff on his site it will be clarified with the contractor. This is a commercial issue and not within the authority of PSIRA.
(j) properly investigate to establish all the relevant facts, or cause to be properly investigated, and keep a full record of such investigation, every incident involving the discharge of a firearm by a security officer:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(k) take all relevant steps provided for in law and all steps that may be necessary or prudent in the circumstances, in regard to the discharge of a firearm by a security officer, and	Ditto
(l) inform the director in writing within 10 days after the use of a firearm by a security officer if such use caused any death, personal injury or damage, providing the particulars within the knowledge of the security business.	Ditto
(9) The director may direct a security business to furnish the director within such a reasonable time as may be determined by the director with information in writing regarding its procedures and disciplinary code contemplated in sub regulation (8)(b) and its compliance with any other duty contemplated in sub regulation (8).	Ditto
(10) A security business which requires the use of a handgun or shotgun must issue such firearm to a security officer as contemplated in sub-regulation (1) only for the rendering of one or more of the following security services:	In the apparently considered opinion of the architects the list (a) to (h) comprises every set of circumstances where an armed security officer may be required. Except of course if any of these deployments are within the perimeter of a 'forbidden' place.
(a) Reaction services or armed response services:	
(b) Protection of valuables which are being transported (cash-in-transit):	
(c) Private investigator services:	
(d) Environmental protection or anti-poaching services:	
(e) Close protection services:	
(f) Protection and security services at Critical Infrastructure:	
(g) Static guard and guard on site: or	

(h) Escort services and vehicle recovery.	
(11) A security business which requires the use of a bolt action rifle must issue such firearm to a security officer as contemplated in sub-regulation (1) only for the rendering of one or both of the following security services -	
(a) Environmental protection services; or	
(b) Anti-poaching services.	
(12) A security business which requires the use of a semi-automatic rifle must issue such firearm to a security officer as contemplated in sub-regulation (1) only for the rendering of one or more of the following services	Except of course if any of these deployments are within the perimeter of a 'forbidden' place.
(a) Protection of valuables which are being transported (cash-in-transit):	
(b) Protection and security services at Critical Infrastructure: or	
(c) Anti-poaching services.	
(13) The Authority may recommend and approve the use of firearms contemplated in sub-regulations (10), (11) and (12) where there are good grounds compelling the issuing of such firearms by a security business belonging to a different category or class specified in the mentioned subparagraphs.	This assumes that 'the Authority' is informed, organised, available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week as physical security circumstances develop and evolve, and naturally able to monitor and by some means issue its recommendation and approval in real time.
(14) A security business is prohibited from issuing firearms to security service providers whose details have not been disclosed or recorded in accordance with regulation 10 of these regulations.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(15) A security business which is in possession of and using firearms to render security services must notify the Authority in writing within 14 days of the number and details of firearms lost by, stolen from, sold by or transferred by security businesses or destroyed in terms of the Firearms Control Act.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(16) Every security business which is in possession of, and using firearms to render security services must install a tracking device in every firearm to track possession and use of such firearms as part of the reporting procedures contemplated in section 4(b) of the Act.	Nonsense. This is in use in a few locations in the world, at great cost, in well-resourced police departments. It is irrational, ill-considered, technically unachievable within the realm of commercial rationale and would break down technically. Moreover large swaths of South Africa are without internet and cell-phone signal. What will happen when the power device of the tracking device loses power? What will happen if the firearm is immersed in water, or the solvents used to clean firearms

	damage the device? How and when will it be repaired? Does every firearm need to be delivered to the service provider of the tracking company to be installed and services and routinely checked? What happens if this device stops working in the middle of a shift or because the item is damaged, will the officer or the company be charged for breaking the law by working with a firearm that is not 'on the electronic system'? What happens if these events take place in a holiday period, does that mean that the firearm may not be used? Will the police approve spare and extra firearms of the type that has been fitted with devices to ensure that defective tracking devices can be dealt with in business hours? Who will pay for these extra firearms and the devices and their fitting and servicing? Who may access the tracking records of where the firearm(s) is and its geographical movements?
[17] The installation of the tracking device shall be conducted by a service provider authorised and approved by the Authority.	Who is this service provider? Will it be a gunsmith seeing as the firearm is being modified? How much will it cost? How was the service provider selected? Is the service provider connected in business or family or friendship to employees of PSIRA, CSPA, SAPS or other government departments? Who will guarantee the integrity of the information tracking a firearm? May a criminal access this information by bribery or intimidation?
[18] The Director may cause an audit of all firearms in issuing, possession of or presumably in possession of a security business to be performed as often as may be necessary.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
[19] For the purposes of an audit contemplated in sub-regulation (18) every security business must provide the information required by the Director in the prescribed form, for the purposes of an audit and return such properly completed form to the Authority within the time period determined by the Director.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.

(20) (1) A security business must store every firearm in respect of which it has a licence and all ammunition in a safe and secure place in the manner required by the Firearms Control Act, as well as in accordance with any directives which the director may issue in terms of these regulations.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(21) A security officer may only carry and use a firearm provided to him or her by the security business by which he or she is employed in accordance with all applicable legal provisions and must -	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(a) report to a responsible official of the security business any discharge of the firearm, as well as the loss of the firearm or any ammunition, as soon as reasonably possible after the event and furnish the necessary particulars to enable the security business to complete any relevant register contemplated in these regulations:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(b) report to a responsible official of the security business any information which he or she has regarding the discharge of a firearm as well as the loss of a firearm, issued to any other security officer by that security business, as soon as reasonably possible after the event and furnish the necessary particulars to enable the security business to complete any relevant register:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(c) at all times take reasonable steps to prevent the loss, theft or unauthorized possession or use of the firearm and ammunition provided to him or her:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(d) return the firearm and ammunition provided to him or her to a responsible official of the security business as soon as reasonably possible after the completion of his or her duties or work shift in the rendering of a security service; and	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(e) return to a responsible official of the security business, when so requested, any document provided by it in terms of law to authorize the possession of the firearm by the security officer.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(22) The director may, if there is a sound reason for such a step, through a notice served on a security business, or with the approval of the Minister if the notice is of general application -	No. The Director may not do such things as contemplated in this section (22) simply based on what he/she (the director) decides is a 'sound reason'.
(a) determine conditions, in addition to those already contained in any applicable law, regarding the storage and safekeeping of firearms and ammunition by a security business, or any class or category of security businesses:	These conditions are already exhaustively detailed in Act 60 of 2000 and its regulations.
(b) prohibit the issuing of a firearm or a particular type of firearm to a security officer employed by the security	Vague and unenforceable. (I the Director, forbid you to issue a firearm

business for the rendering of a particular security service, whether generally or in a specific instance:	to a security officer] – based on what criteria?
(c) prohibit the issuing of a particular type of firearm to a security officer employed by the security business for the rendering of a security service in a defined place or area, whether generally or in a specific instance, and	Vague and unenforceable. (I the Director, forbid you to issue a firearm to a security officer] – based on what criteria?
(d) determine that the conditions as stated by the director in the notice must be complied with by the security business regarding the issuing, possession, carrying or use of firearms by a security officer employed by it.	The notice itself will be invalid and unenforceable.
(23) A security business must, for the purposes of these regulations, keep all the registers, records and documentation that it is obliged to keep in terms of regulation 10(f)(vi) and (vii) of these regulations at its administrative offices.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(24) Every register contemplated in this regulation must comply with the following requirements:	
(a) it must be kept safely, available for inspection by the Authority for a period of 4 years from the date of the last entry that is made in the register:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(b) it must consist of pages which are all numbered in sequence and all information recorded in it must be written or printed in permanent ink:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(c) no changes to the information recorded must be made:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(d) no recording or information may be deleted:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(e) a new entry must be made to correct any information that may have been captured incorrectly and cross-referencing to the relevant provision made; and	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(f) an entry of any action that must be recorded in it, must be made without undue delay.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(25) A security business issuing firearms to security officers employed by it must keep a register containing the following particulars:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is

	already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(a) all the firearms in respect of which the security business has a licence specified by make, type, calibre and serial number as well as the date and other particulars of the acquisition, disposal, transfer, loss, theft or destruction thereof, and	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(b) a detailed record of the issuing of such firearms and of ammunition to security officers, describing the firearm and ammunition, the date, time and place of such issuing, particulars of the security service and where it is to be rendered, the name, registration number and signature of the security officer, the return of the firearm and ammunition and the name of the person issuing the firearm and ammunition.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(26) (a) A security business must keep a register with sufficient information of every instance where a firearm issued to a security officer employed by it was discharged by that security officer or any other security officer employed by it for any purpose whatsoever.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(b) The register contemplated in paragraph (a) must contain at least the following:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(i) name and registration number of the security officer discharging the firearm:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(ii) full particulars of the firearm and ammunition:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(iii) the date, time, place and circumstances pertaining to the discharge of the firearm:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(iv) particulars of any damage, injury or death caused by the discharge of the firearm:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(v) the report of the security officer contemplated in sub-regulation 22(a) and (b):	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.

(vi) information and documentation regarding the investigation by the security business into the discharge of the firearm: and	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(vii) any further relevant facts regarding the incident.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(27) A security business must keep a register regarding the performance of its functions contemplated in sub-regulation (8)(f), (g) and (h), containing at least -	We have already dealt with the vagueness of (8)(f)(g) and (h). Rejected where applicable.
(a) the time, date and venue of the assessment session, the practical training session and the briefing session:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(b) the names of the persons and institutions handling the sessions contemplated in paragraph (a), and their contact particulars:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(c) the names and signatures of security officers attending the sessions contemplated in paragraph (a):	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(d) the results, outcomes and findings, as the case may be, of the assessment session, practical session and briefing session; and	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(e) types of firearms and the number of ammunition used during assessment, training and briefing sessions.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(28) In performing any function contemplated in this regulation an inspector has all the powers of entry, search and seizure contemplated in section 34 of the Act, as well as all the powers provided for in this regulation.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(29) An inspector may at any reasonable time without prior notice, require from a person contemplated in section 34(1)(d) of the Act the production to him or her all or any registers, records, files or documents that a security business must keep in terms of any law relating to the issuing, return, possession, use or storage of firearms and ammunition, as well as any further information that an inspector may require to ascertain compliance with the	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.

provisions of these regulations by a security business, its officials or its security officers.	
(30) A security business having firearms or providing firearms to security officers employed by it must, at the request of an inspector, produce for inspection and examination all firearms and ammunition under its control and every licence to possess a firearm issued to it.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(31) An inspector who has reasonable grounds to believe that a person is a security officer and has or recently had a firearm or ammunition in his or her possession, may direct such person to:-	
(a) provide his or her full name and employment address:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(b) provide the name and contact particulars of his or her employer:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(c) produce the document contemplated in sub-regulation 13(1)(f) in respect of the possession of the firearm:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(d) produce a licence if the security officer is in possession of a firearm licensed to him or her:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(e) answer questions regarding the whereabouts of the firearm, and	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(f) furnish any other information reasonably required by the inspector for the purposes of these regulations.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(32) (a) An inspector may without warrant seize any firearm or ammunition in possession of a security service provider if the inspector has reasonable grounds to suspect that the security service provider is not in lawful possession of the firearm or ammunition, and, in the case of a security officer, the security officer is not in possession of the documentation required in terms of sub-regulation 13(1)(e) and (f) in respect of such firearm.	Does this pre-suppose that: (1) The inspector is in possession of a certificate of competency for handgun, shotgun, manual rifle and self-loading rifle? (2) The inspector has a secure and suitable steel lockbox within which to transport the firearm(s) and ammunition

	(separately) that he has seized? (3) That he has the required forms to be signed and handed to the security officer whose firearm he has confiscated? And if not? Why not? Have these aspects been considered in the wish list?
(b) The inspector seizing a firearm or ammunition contemplated in paragraph (a) must as soon as possible thereafter hand the firearm and ammunition to a member of the Service at a police station, who has to receive such firearm and ammunition and keep it in safe custody pending a further investigation, subject to the applicable provisions in chapter 14 of the Firearms Control Act.	As soon as possible? Same day? Next day? After supper? After tea? After the weekend? What does that mean?
13B. Weapons	
(1) A security business may only issue a weapon to a security officer employed by it for the rendering of a security service if the -	Circular references on top of circular references, we have already dealt with this.
(a) requirements, with the necessary changes, contemplated in sub-regulation (1)(a), (b), (d), (e), (g), (k), (m), (n) and (p) are complied with.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(b) requirements with the necessary changes, contemplated in sub-regulation (1)(i) and (j) are complied with in the case of a dangerous weapon:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(c) security officer is well-trained in the proper handling and use of the weapon and successfully trained in accordance with any applicable standards imposed by law; and	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(d) weapon is free of any defect or characteristic which may render it an inherent source of danger or capable of easily causing excessive personal harm or damage.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(2) The security business must register such weapons with the Authority including the evidence supporting the training of security officers in the use of such weapons.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(3) The Authority may issue a certificate of registration which contains particulars of the security business in the use of weapons, including such further information as the Authority may determine under the seal of the Director.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is

	already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(4) The provisions of sub-regulation (1) apply, with the necessary changes, to a security business allowing a security officer employed by it to possess a weapon provided by the security officer or by a person other than the security business, or who should reasonably be aware that the security officer is in possession of a weapon while rendering a security service.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(5) A security business issuing a weapon to a security officer employed by it, or allowing the security officer to possess a weapon provided by the security officer or by a person other than the security business, must -	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(a) comply, with the necessary changes, with sub-regulation (2)(b)	
(b) actively monitor whether, and ensure that, a security officer who possesses a dangerous weapon, complies with sub-regulation 13B(1)(c):	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(c) comply, with the necessary changes, with sub-regulation (8)(e) and (f) in the case of a dangerous weapon: and	Circular. We have already dealt with this.
(d) keep a written record of and properly investigate to establish the relevant facts of every incident involving the use of a weapon causing any death, personal injury or damage, in order to enable the security business to take all steps that are reasonably necessary in this regard and to provide the director with all relevant information required in terms of these regulations.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(6) The provisions of sub-regulation 13A(9) are applicable, with the necessary changes, in regard to the compliance by a security business with the duties contained in this regulation.	Circular. We have already dealt with this.
(7) A weapon may be used by a security service provider only when it is necessary for self-defence, the defence of another person, or the protection of property.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(8) A security service provider must not use a weapon during assemblies, demonstrations or protests, meetings or any other incidents classified as crowd management under the Regulation of Gatherings Act 1993 (Act No. 205 of 1993), unless the use of such weapon is authorised and permitted in terms of law.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(9) The security service provider must conduct a risk assessment prior issuing the security officer with any weapon in terms of sub-regulation (1), including a firearm, to ensure that the weapon is free from any defect or characteristic which may render it inherent source of	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.

danger or capable of easily causing excessive possible harm, injury or damage.	
[10] The security officer issued with a weapon in terms of sub-regulation [1], must be actively monitored to ensure that he or she complies with these regulations and other applicable laws, including conditions and rules of a contract concluded between the security service provider and client.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
[11] The security business using or intending to use any weapon other than a firearm, to render security services, must -	
(a) inform the Authority within a period of 14 days of such use or intention to use weapons:	It is highly unlikely that (a) 'The Authority' will be in a position to manage the slew of information that would arrive from just one of South Africa's largest security service providers, and (b) much less to respond thereto – making this a useless paper exercise and part of the anti-gun wish list.
(b) provide the Authority with information regarding the type and total number of weapons is using or intending to use for the rendering of security services:	It is highly unlikely that (a) 'The Authority' will be in a position to manage the slew of information that would arrive from just one of South Africa's largest security service providers, and (b) much less to respond thereto – making this a useless paper exercise and part of the anti-gun wish list.
(c) provide full particulars of security officers issued with weapons for purposes of rendering security services; and	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(d) report any incident involving the use of a weapon causing death, personal injury or damage.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
[12] A security business must store every firearm, ammunition or weapon in a safe and secure manner as prescribed in the Firearms Control Regulations, 2004, as well as in accordance with any directives that the Director may issue in terms of these Regulations.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
[13] A security business must store all weapons in its possession or under its control in a safe and secure manner, and in compliance with any applicable law.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
[14] A security officer may carry and use a weapon only in accordance with all applicable legal provisions and must report to the security business employing him or her of any	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is

use of a weapon causing death, personal injury or damage, or any loss thereof, as soon as reasonably possible after the event and provide the necessary particulars to enable the security business to complete the register contemplated in these regulations.	already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(15) The provisions of sub-regulation 22(b) are, with the necessary changes, applicable with regard to the use and loss of a weapon.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(16) The director may, if there is a sound reason for such a step, exercise the powers contemplated in sub-regulation (23), with the necessary changes, in regard to weapons.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(17) Notwithstanding the provisions of regulation 13B, security service providers may not use the following weapons in the rendering of security services -	We have already dealt with the definition of 'weapon' above. It is inconceivable that if one or more of these items (a-e) below can be deployed to prevent or avoid the deployment of a firearm, that security services should be precluded from deploying them.
(a) Tasers:	
(b) Tear gas:	
(c) Water cannon:	
(d) Sponge grenade:	
(e) Rubber / Plastic bullet; and	
(f) Any other weapon that may harm civilians.	The generality and vagueness of this provision is comical.
(18) A security service provider using or intending to use any prohibited weapon as envisaged in sub-regulation (1) of this regulation must meet the following requirements:	
(a) the use of prohibited weapons must be in the interest of public safety:	We have dealt with this above. It is another circular reference.
(b) the prohibited weapon must not be used unless a risk assessment report has been submitted to the Authority:	How is it expected that a security service provider in the circumstances of a riot, attack, or other violent criminal activity is expected to create and submit a risk assessment report in real time?
(c) steps have been taken to mitigate identified risks in terms of paragraph (b) of this regulation; and	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(d) there is no other alternative means of protection without using prohibited weapon.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is

	already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(19) A security service provider using or intending to use any prohibited weapon as envisaged in these regulations and meets the requirements in sub-regulation (18) must -	
(a) submit an application to the Authority within a period of seven (7) days of intention to use prohibited weapons:	How is it expected that a security service provider in the circumstances of a riot, attack, or other violent criminal activity is expected to create and submit an application in real time?
(b) provide the Authority with information regarding the safety of the use of prohibited weapons the service provider intends to use:	What information? Safe keeping? Safety for the operator? Safety for the person on whom the 'weapon' is being used?
(c) provide the Authority with information regarding the type and total number of prohibited weapons the service provider intends to use for the rendering of security services:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(d) full particulars of security officers issued with prohibited weapons for purposes of rendering security services; and	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(e) any incident involving the use of a prohibited weapon causing death, personal injury or damage.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(20) A security business must keep the registers and documentation contemplated in this regulation at its administrative office as contemplated in regulation 5(1)(b) of the Private Security Industry Regulations.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(21) The provisions of sub-regulation 25 are, with the necessary changes, applicable to the registers and documentation contemplated in this regulation.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(22) (a) A security business must keep a register in which information is recorded of every instance where a weapon possessed by a security officer employed by it was used and caused death, personal injury or damage.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(b) The register contemplated in paragraph (a) must contain the information, with the necessary changes, as contemplated in sub-regulation 27(b).	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.

(23) A security business must keep a register regarding the performance of its functions contemplated in regulation 13B(5)(c) containing at least the information, with the necessary changes, contemplated in regulation 5(5).	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(24) A security business must keep a file with all information and documentation regarding its investigation into the use of a weapon contemplated in regulation 13B(5)(d).	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(25) Except to the extent provided otherwise in this regulation, the provisions of regulation 6 are applicable, with the necessary changes, to the powers of inspectors in terms of this regulation.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(26) (a) An inspector may without warrant seize any weapon in possession of a security officer if the inspector has reasonable grounds to suspect that the security officer is not in lawful possession of the weapon or that the weapon has been provided in violation of a provision of regulation 13B.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(b) Section 34(2) of the Act applies to any weapon seized in terms of paragraph (a).	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
13C. General Provisions	
(1) Every person referred to in section 21(1)(a)(ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi) or (vii) of the Act in relation to a security business, must take all reasonably practicable steps within his or her powers, capacity or functions to ensure that the security business possessing firearms for business purposes or issuing firearms, ammunition or weapons to security officers employed by it, complies with all the duties contained in these regulations.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(2) A security business must appoint a responsible person to perform any other function that is subject to these regulations, if such person -	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(a) is registered as a security service provider:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(b) has successfully completed the security training in terms of the Act: and	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.

(c) is in possession of a competency certificate.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(3) A security business must furnish the Authority with the details of the responsible person in terms of sub-regulation (1) of this regulation, within 10 days of appointment.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
4. Any person who -	
(a) contravenes or fails to comply with a provision of these regulations:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(b) contravenes or fails to comply with a directive, notice or request of the director issued in terms of these regulations:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(c) fails to keep a register, record or file as required in terms of these regulations, or fails to make an entry in such a register without undue delay:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(d) intentionally or negligently makes a false, incorrect or misleading entry or statements in a register that has to be kept in terms of these regulations or in any document contemplated in these regulations:	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(e) intentionally or negligently fails to make the reasonable enquiries that are necessary in the circumstances to verify the correctness of any information provided to him or her for the purposes of making an entry in any register that must be kept in terms of these regulations: or	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
(f) intentionally or negligently provides any false information in complying or purportedly complying with any duty provided for in these regulations.	Highlighted here to reflect the various circular references, some even on the basis of achieving something that is already unlawful (or required) in terms of existing legislation.
5. Every person deemed to have been registered as a security service provider and providing security service on behalf of a shipping company or at any port facility in South Africa, must within a period of 180 days from the date of promulgation of these Regulations, or within such period as the Director may allow on the basis of a substantiated written application by such security service provider within a period of 60 days from the date of promulgation of these Regulations, comply with these regulations.	Rejected

6. These regulations are called the Amendment to The Private Security Industry Regulations, 2002 and come into operation, unless otherwise specified, 180 days from the date of their publication in this Gazette.