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Introduction

Now is the time to think differently about security in PNG

Weakness of police

New opportunities?
• New Government
• New Police Minister, Bryan Kramer
• Soon to be appointed Commissioner

What do we know? Security (Protection) Industry Act 2004 & SIA
Growth of Licensed Security Companies (SIA)

No. of Security Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trend line showing growth of security companies 2006-2018 (SIA) Annual growth rate: 15.3%
Number of licensed guards (SIA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL NO. OF GUARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>12396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>13200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>13500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>13967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>14231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>14562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>14981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>16801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>24323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>27987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>27309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>30279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total security guards issued permits by region

- Highlands: 2746
- Ngis: 4067
- Momase: 8668
- Southern: 14798
Factors of growth

Questions around representativeness official figures

But growth is apparent due to:
• Urban growth
• Widespread insecurity
• Prominence of resource extraction
• Favoured investment for local elites
• Manus
• Significant international/regional events
• Saturation of global north; increased growth in global south
Challenges of private-public partnerships

• private providers are highly exclusionary
  • providers currently privilege powerful state and business interests over security of ordinary citizens.
  • Re-incentivising to improve public security will not be easy

• the industry is poorly regulated

• concerns around encouraging further collaboration
  • Encroaching on police
  • Divert attention from strengthening police
  • Public-private partnerships can privilege business interests
Thinking about security

Public and private delineation
  • private security as gap filler

OR

Networked pluralised security landscapes

- weak network
  unintegrated individuals, individuals held to network by only one relationship, network over reliant on star figures

- strong network
  all individuals integrated, many individuals held to network by multiple relationships, reliance on star figures diminished by relationships unrelated to star figures
Diversity of security networks

• Services offered
• Geographies; territoriality
• Big vs small
• In-house vs outhouse
Preliminary findings: Networks are key

Local, national and transnational connections:
• between police and companies;
• companies and communities;
• companies and elites (business and political);
• between different companies;
• within companies.
Preliminary findings: Security networks are gendered

• Male dominated –
  • violent industry depends on force (reflecting and reproducing masculine culture?)

• Women involved in specialised roles: admin and “women’s spaces”

• Securitising masculinities?
Conclusions/ways forward

• Private security here to stay, not an aberration
• Need to better understand networked security in PNG
• Potential for greater collaboration between police and private security companies
  • Already happening (formal & informal)
  • Regulatory and operational framework agreements?
  • Training: private security > police?
  • Give private security more police powers?

Needs more research!