



G4S plc
Manor Royal,
West Sussex,
RH10 9UN, UK.
www.g4s.com

G4S response to the Lou Pingeot report 'Contracting Insecurity: Private military and security companies and the future of the United Nations'

G4S is the world's leading global integrated security company. Our businesses can contribute positively to the realisation of human rights by the range of services we offer to protect people and enable them to enjoy their rights.

We also recognise that we have a duty to ensure that we are not at risk of violating human rights through the services we provide, the customers we work with, the suppliers we use and through the fair and appropriate treatment of our own employees and others who are in our care.

To help ensure that we fulfil this duty, we operate to a number of core standards. The details of some of which are outlined below:

UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights:

In April last year, we launched a global human rights policy and framework which aims to align the company's human rights practices with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and to introduce additional global guidelines for areas not currently covered by existing standards. Co-authored by Dr Hugo Slim, an internationally recognised human rights expert, the policy and framework documentation is being implemented across the group through a communications and awareness programme and a systemic approach to human rights due-diligence and risk assessment.

UN Global Compact:

G4S plc has been a signatory of the UN Global Compact since February 2011 and is active within the UNGC UK Network, participating in Working Groups and as a member of the governing Advisory Committee. We have been pleased to confirm our on-going commitment to and support for the aims of the Compact in our 2012, 2013 and 2014 Communications on Progress.

International Code of Conduct for Private Security Providers:

G4S is a founder signatory of the International Code of Conduct for Private Security Providers and has been a key member of the steering committee during the development of the oversight and compliance mechanism for the Code. At its launch in September 2013, G4S Global Risk Services became a founder member of the ICOC Association.

For further information regarding G4S' approach to corporate social responsibility, including our business ethics policy and ethical employment partnership, please visit: www.g4s.com/csr

Our 2013 CSR Report will be published on 14th April 2014 and will be available to download at: www.g4s.com/csr2013



G4S statements regarding specific issues mentioned in the February 2014 report by Lou Pinget:

Delivery of the London 2012 Olympic contract

The Olympic and Paralympic Games were a great success for the UK and we are pleased that we played a part in keeping safe and secure the many thousands of spectators who came to the Games. We have conveyed our thanks to the military and the police for their support. We have also thanked the 16,000 men and women of G4S who helped secure the Games despite the challenges faced by the group.

We regret and have accepted responsibility for failing to provide a complete, contracted security workforce for the London Games. We achieved 82% of our commitment for the Olympics and 100% for the Paralympics, and we covered in full the additional costs incurred by the military and police.

A thorough and independent review of the company's performance on this contract was carried out by PWC at the request of the G4S Board. Whilst the review identified that the failures were largely specific to the very special nature of this contract, we have learned from the mistakes made and have taken action in relation to both the management and governance of G4S to ensure we continue to deliver the highest standards of customer service and contract delivery across the Group

Mr Jimmy Mubenga

The death of anyone in our care is deeply felt by all of us and the death of Mr Mubenga was a tragic event.

The welfare of those in our care is always our top priority and we took great care to ensure that our employees on this contract, which has been carried out by another provider since November 2011, were made aware of their responsibilities in this respect. Our employees were also trained, screened and vetted to the standards defined by strict Home Office guidelines.

We believe that at all times we acted appropriately and in full compliance with the terms of our contract with UK Border Agency and it should be noted that the Crown Prosecution Service found no basis on which to bring criminal charges against G4S in this case. It would not be appropriate for us to comment on behalf of our former employees who were separately represented throughout these proceedings.

Mangaung Correctional Centre

G4S has operated the Mangaung Correctional Centre (MCC) since 2000. In that time, the MCC has come to be regarded as a benchmark in correctional services in South Africa, receiving numerous national and international awards. Throughout this time, G4S, we have maintained a strong, open relationship with the South African authority, the Department of Correctional Services (DCS).

There is an active and independent inspection regime in place at MCC, including regular visits from the judicial inspectorate and an independent DCS Controller. The DCS Controller is located within the



MCC and monitors activity to ensure that G4S adheres to and operates according to approved policies and procedures.

South African legislation specifies that prisoners who pose a security risk should be detained and monitored in more stringent regimes. These prisoners may be detained in a single cell as per their security classification. G4S cannot place an inmate in segregation, nor can it extend the period that an inmate is detained, without the legal and official authorisation of the DCS Controller. The process is meticulously monitored by the DCS Controller, and prisoners are visited daily by healthcare professionals and psychologists.

On the 18th of September 2013 we were placed in a difficult position after 331 G4S employees working at Mangaung were dismissed following an illegal strike. As MCC is an essential service, strike action is prohibited by law. The Commission for Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration, which presided over the wage arbitration, ruled in favour of G4S, finding that the wage offer made by G4S was fair and reasonable.

In order to manage this staffing matter and maintain order at the MCC, we put in place a number of short term plans which included requesting support from the DCS and we welcomed the decision by the Acting National Commissioner of the DCS, to appoint a temporary manager to the MCC.

Despite the staffing issues resulting from the illegal strike we have maintained control. Contrary to some media reports, all staff members deployed during the incidents were trained and were able to perform the duties expected of them. Services were performed to the exacting guidelines laid down by our contract with the government.

During this period there were an unpredicted number of assaults on employees. The increase in and the reason for the attacks, which are believed to have been fuelled by outside influences, are being investigated. We have signed statements from inmates stating that a number of inmates were allegedly incited by dismissed employees to initiate violence in an attempt to destabilise the centre.

Following the dismissals, G4S implemented short and medium term plans to manage the prison staffing to ensure that G4S remained in effective control of the facility. Interventions included temporary resourcing through G4S's existing pool of employees and emergency assistance from the DCS.

Since September, we have hired 334 new recruits who were fully trained and certified in December 2013, in accordance with our contract with DCS and we believe that full management control of the MCC will return to G4S in due course.

In the 12 years that G4S has operated the MCC, we have always taken comprehensive steps to ensure the health and safety of our employees and the inmates and have always acted in accordance with our contract with the Department of Correctional Services.

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (HMCIIP) assessment of HMP Oakwood (2013)

The mobilisation of any prison is a complex and challenging operation but the size and scale of Oakwood – the largest prison in the country – makes this even more acute. As well as the logistical hurdles in new establishments, prisoners test the regime as well as the staff, many of whom are new to prison life.



Since the publication of the HMCIP report last year we have taken steps to make improvements, appointing an experienced director from one of the country's best performing prisons, establishing a dedicated taskforce to address problem areas, such as the prevalence of drugs, while providing additional funding where necessary. This is starting to yield results. We have seen a reduction in the amount of drugs entering the establishment, the use of force is reducing and better care, sentence plans and resettlement arrangements for prisoners are being put in place.

We know there is much to do to bring Oakwood up to the standard we have achieved at our other prisons. HMP and YOI Parc in Bridgend, one of five prisons we operate in the UK, experienced many of the sorts of issues as Oakwood when it first opened, however now it is one of the highest performing prisons in the country and is the only privately-operated prison to achieve a Prison Rating System score of 4, the highest possible score.

We know from our experience at Parc and other institutions, both publicly and privately-operated, that as the experience of staff develops, the regime becomes fully embedded and reporting systems improve, meaning that significant further improvements in performance will be seen.

However, Oakwood is far from a failing prison. It exceeds its targets on the provision of employment, training, educational and rehabilitation activities. The prison has been able to introduce a number of innovations, including work experience with commercial partners, and the use of sport to promote team-work and life skills.

All our staff are absolutely committed to helping Oakwood become a first-class facility which secures the very best outcomes for both prisoners.

Use of restraint at UK Secure Training Centres

Restraint should only ever be used against young people as a last resort, where it is absolutely necessary to do so, and where no other form of intervention is possible or appropriate. When carrying out restraint at our Secure Training Centres, we operate to the rules set by the authority, in this case the Youth Justice Board (YJB). The issue referred to in the report was a result of a conflict in the interpretation of the authority's rules and primary legislation.

At the time of the report, John Drew the then YJB chief executive said they would consider the ruling: "In particular, we want to make sure that we use this judgment to inform our continuous work to improve safety and to protect children and young people in custody," he said.

"Over the past few years, significant progress has been made to provide increased protection for young people in custody, with closer scrutiny and monitoring of restraint, improved complaints and advocacy procedures for young people, and the increased transparency provided through publication of the restraint data on a regular basis."

G4S operations in Israel and the West Bank

In Israel, G4S provides security systems installation and maintenance services (for example, intruder alarms, CCTV cameras, access control equipment) to the Israeli Prison Service (IPS). The IPS is not involved in the judicial process, it receives convicted prisoners or those awaiting trial and is responsible for their custody and care- the IPS has no role in trial, conviction or sentencing.



Our colleagues in Israel do not make any decisions regarding prisoners, they are not involved in the prison or policing regime and have no interaction with prisoners - they merely service and maintain the security equipment in these locations.

In March 2011 we undertook a legal review of our business in Israel by engaging Professor Hjalte Rasmussen, from the University of Copenhagen, a well-known and leading authority in international law, to review our business in Israel and provide a legal opinion. After visiting the region and carrying out an extensive review, Professor Rasmussen concluded that G4S did not violate any national or international law.

In addition to our legal review, members of the Group Executive Committee have visited the region regularly and we discuss matters regarding our operations in the region with other important individuals and organisations on an on-going basis. This includes human rights experts, ethical investment groups, members of the British Foreign & Commonwealth Office, members of the Israeli Prison Service and members of the International Corrections and Prisons Association.

As a British company operating in more than 115 countries around the world, we take our responsibilities in relation to standards of business ethics and human rights extremely seriously and the G4S Board takes a very active and keen interest in ensuring that our standards of ethics are applied appropriately across our operations. We keep our operations in Israel under constant review, as we do with all of our businesses.

In relation to our contracts with the Israeli government, G4S provides security systems installation and maintenance services (for example, intruder alarms, CCTV cameras, access control equipment) to municipal buildings, police stations and prisons throughout Israel and the West Bank. We also provide electronic monitoring of offenders in the community, a small number of whom live within the area of the West Bank.

9th April 2014
www.g4s.com