12 FAH-7 H-120
DETERMINING REQUIRED SECURITY MEASURES

(TL:LGP-01; 08-10-2001)

12 FAH-7 H-121 GENERAL

(TL:LGP-01; 08-10-2001)

a. The mission is responsible for determining specific security measures required in accordance with policies and guidance from the Department. The nature of the threat to each post is assessed and published semi-annually in the Security Environment Threat List (SETL) distributed by the Office of Intelligence and Threat Analysis (DS/DSS/ITA). Each post is assigned to one of four threat categories: low, medium, high, or critical. Threat factors are considered in all categories that bear on:

(1) Internal political stability and existing or latent violence;

(2) The existing or potential threat to personnel or facilities from mob violence, terrorist attack, or other violence; and

(3) The existing or expected nature of criminal attacks against personnel and residences.

b. The level of threat drives the specific security measures to be employed at a post. Missions are responsible for developing their security programs. This will include a LGP. Posts must obtain approval from DS, per guidelines provided in this handbook, for their LGP. The program must include coverage for vehicle access, perimeter security, explosive detection, surveillance detection, bodyguards, residential security, etc.

c. In selected instances, a post may seek to implement residential security standards above and beyond those required for the overall threat rating in the SETL. In these situations, the post must coordinate their requests with the Facilities Protection Division (DS/CIS/PSP/FPD) before taking any action unless an immediate or emergency situation dictates otherwise. If an RSO and/or PSO seeks to make residential security changes permanent, the Emergency Action Committee (EAC) will be required to provide specific justification for the permanent changes to DS/CIS/PSP/FPD for review and approval.

12 FAH-7 H-122 SECURITY MEASURES CONTINGENT UPON THREAT LEVEL

(TL:LGP-01; 08-10-2001)

Security measures employed by posts involving a LGF should be responsive to and be designed to match threats, taking into account the commitment of security resources by the host government. No LGF would normally be authorized for residential security for those posts in the low threat category except for the EMR. If there are unusual local circumstances that require consideration for guard forces and/or bodyguards even though the threat level per se does not warrant this coverage, this information must be provided in the request for approval by DS. For example, a LGF may be needed to effectively counter an endemic high level of criminal activity directed against residences and/or their occupants.

12 FAH-7 H-123 FACTORS FOR DETERMINING LGP SCOPE

(TL:LGP-01; 08-10-2001)

a. The governing factors for determining the scope of the mission's LGP include:

(1) The nature of the threat to U. S. Government assets (personnel, official facilities, residences);

(2) The extent to which the host government can and does provide protection for them;

(3) The nature and extent of the assets to be protected;

(4) 12 FAH-6, *Security Standards*; and

(5) Post's threat ratings as identified in the SETL.

b. Each mission should document its assets. Assets are defined in terms of people, things or property. This documentation has value not only for the purpose of planning the LGP, but it directly affects the post's emergency action plans (EAP).

12 FAH-7 H-124 OFFICIAL FACILITIES

(TL:LGP-01; 08-10-2001)

The RSO should be familiar with all official buildings, offices, structures and space, including consular agent offices, other than residences, of all agencies under the purview of the COM. A summary of such facilities is found in the Real Estate Management System (REMS) Report. This report should be on file at the General Service Officer's (GSO) office, giving the function, address, and agency name of each property. This serves as the basis for the conduct of the security survey used by the RSO to determine the level of security protection required. **NOTE:** U.S. Government sponsored or other international schools are not official facilities for the purpose of this handbook. If requested, RSOs can provide schools with assistance in determining security requirements. See 12 FAM 334.1*, International Schools,* for details.

12 FAH-7 H-125 PERSONNEL AND DEPENDENTS

(TL:LGP-01; 08-10-2001)

Personnel falling under the COM's responsibility for security should be identified where:

(1) Their residence will require guard protection; and

(2) Where additional protection will be needed, such as an armed escort.

12 FAH-7 H-126 RESIDENCES

(TL:LGP-01; 08-10-2001)

The COM or the principal officer (PO) and the Marine security guard (MSG) residences are considered to be at risk, regardless of the general level of threat to U.S. assets. Although not required for the principal officer residence (POR) and Marine security guard residence (MSGR) at low threat posts, guards may be authorized for any or all of these residences if there are unusual local circumstances.

12 FAH-7 H-127 LGP SECURITY FORCE DEPLOYMENT

(TL:LGP-01; 08-10-2001)

a. The LGF should be deployed to achieve maximum security by having guards stationed as the initial barrier against threats to U.S. assets. LGF personnel must deter or fend off attacks, and serve as an early alert capability. Key to the success of such a force is:

(1) The identification of specific posts and related security work and procedures needed in light of the threat;

(2) The nature and extent of host government protection and U.S. Government physical security measures used; and

(3) Proper training, supervision, and management.

b. The surveillance detection (SD) force should also be deployed to achieve maximum effectiveness in the identification of possible hostile surveillance. Successful deployment of this force requires:

(1) Identification of specific posts to include vulnerabilities and locations from which hostile surveillance would probably be carried out:

(2) Identification of choke points along routes commonly used by employees;

(3) Agreement with the host government on the operation of the SDP;

(4) Good communications between SD personnel and the RSO; and

(5) Proper training, equipment, supervision, and management.

12 FAH-7 H-128 MISSION DETERMINES REQUIRED SECURITY MEASURES

(TL:LGP-01; 08-10-2001)

a. U.S. missions determine post-specific security measures in accordance with policy guidance and security standards developed by the OSPB. After receiving DS/CIS/PSP/FPD approval for a LGP, the RSO with the concurrence of the COM, will establish implementation measures.

b. Post requests for authorization and funding of security services from DS/CIS/PSP/FPD which exceed Department standards will require the post's emergency action committee (EAC) recommendation and the COM or PO's approval.

12 FAH-7 H-129 OVERSEAS BUILDINGS OPERATIONS (M/OBO)

(TL:LGP-01; 08-10-2001)

a. Certain types or sizes of M/OBO construction or renovation projects may require the use of local guards to ensure security at a mission or construction site. M/OBO Security Management (M/OBO/PE/SM), M/OBO Area Management (M/OBO/OM/AM), and DS/CIS/PSP/FPD will discuss and assign responsibility for security funding at M/OBO projects. For construction and/or major renovation projects, the RSO and the site security manager (SSM) (if one is assigned to the project) are responsible for deciding on the appropriate level of security and what costs are related to the project.

b. Additional guards needed as a result of an M/OBO construction project are funded by M/OBO. The additional guards needed for M/OBO construction projects are usually obtained through a contract modification to an existing NPS guard contract. Posts using a PSA arrangement for guard staffing may need to hire additional guards.

12 FAH-7 H-129.1 Site Security Manager (SSM)

(TL:LGP-01; 08-10-2001)

a. For major projects, M/OBO designates an individual as the manager of security for the project. This individual is known as the site security manager (SSM). Whether or not the SSM is in the chain of command, the SSM will monitor performance of the local guard force at the project site and is expected to maintain frequent contact with the LGF shift commander. The SSM, in monitoring guard performance, is required to inform the RSO of any guard who does not provide services in accordance with the guard force general orders or the post orders for the post to which the guard is assigned.

b. The RSO is normally the COR for all local guard services under a NPS contract, including those guards supervised by the SSM at a construction site. Local guard general and post orders should specify the SSM's authority and the local guards be advised accordingly. When changes are required in general or post orders, the SSM submits the changes to the RSO for approval. The SSM has no authority to change the scope of work of a guard force contract or to otherwise modify the terms of the contract. If changes are needed, the SSM consults with the COR, who then makes a request to the CO for a modification of a NPS contract.

c. In the absence of the SSM, a cleared American guard (CAG), if present, may monitor guard performance, issue technical guidance and act as a point of contact for the RSO. CAGs do not have the authority to supervise or discipline guards.

12 FAH-7 H-129.2 Controlled Access Area (CAA) Construction-Related Guard Posts

(TL:LGP-01; 08-10-2001)

a. Local guard positions at access and/or egress points which are primarily used for M/OBO construction activities at new and/or ongoing construction sites involving a CAA, are funded by M/OBO/PE/SM. The guard positions are administered through the RSO or PSO even though a designated site security manager (SSM) may be assigned for project security.

b. The SSM is responsible for preparing comprehensive guard orders for the LGF, and for assuring that local guards assigned to the construction site perform work in accordance with the guidelines expressed in terms of the existing local guard contract.

c. The SSM will coordinate all security requirements with the RSO and/or PSO to ensure that these requirements are properly implemented and administered. M/OBO/PE/SM funded positions include, but are not limited to access control facilities, construction vehicle gates, auxiliary entrances for M/OBO personnel or construction materials, and any other entrances necessary for M/OBO project operations exclusive of mission business. All local guard orders must be written in both English and the local language, and posted in the access control facility. Additionally, after consultation with the RSO, the SSM should define the role of the LGF in response to emergency plans.

d. Static guards and/or the creation of a mobile patrol for coverage of buildings (including warehouses used solely by M/OBO) or properties that are used primarily for M/OBO activities, such as offices which may be at a different location then the actual point of construction, are also included int he M/OBO/PE/SM funding.

12 FAH-7 H-129.3 Non-CAA Construction-Related Guard Posts

(TL:LGP-01; 08-10-2001)

Local guard positions at access and/or egress points primarily used for M/OBO construction activities and involve non-CAA projects will be funded by M/OBO/OM/AM. Local guard administration will be through the RSO or PSO even though an SSM may be assigned. The SSM will coordinate all security requirements with the RSO and/or PSO to ensure requirements are properly implemented and administered. Static guards and the creation of mobile patrol coverage of buildings or properties used primarily for M/OBO non-CAA related activities would also be funded by M/OBO/OM/AM.

12 FAH-7 H-129.4 Non-Construction Guard Posts

(TL:LGP-01; 08-10-2001)

Local guard positions at access and/or egress points which are primarily used for embassy and/or consulate business are funded by DS/CIS/PSP/FPD (using both International Cooperative Administrative Support Services (ICASS) and non-ICASS funds), and administered through the RSO or PSO for the given post. This may include perimeter entrances, chancery and/or office building entrances, consular entrances, general public access, and any other access and/or egress points exclusive of M/OBO construction operations. Static guards and/or mobile partrol mobile coverage of official facilities used primarily by mission personnel and/or service a mission function, also remain funded by DS/CIS/PSP/FPD.

12 FAH-7 H-129.5 Guard Posts at Vacant Official Properties or in Response to Specific Vulnerabilities

(TL:LGP-01; 08-10-2001)

a. Property, which is vacant or where construction is not yet underway, may require static and/or mobile local guard coverage in order to prevent vandalism or homesteading. DS/CIS/PSP/FPD will not support the creation of a mobile patrol solely for M/OBO property which is unoccupied, vacant pending development, or sale. DS/CIS/PSP/FPD will fund a static or roving guard at unoccupied M/OBO properties when the RSO and M/OBO have agreed on the level of protection required. RSO and the M/OBO recommended guard coverage must be submitted to DS/CIS/PSP/FPD for approval.

b. In response to specific vulnerabilities, due to distance from perimeter screening to work site, or due to limited clearance of local construction workers, additional guard presence at the construction site may be required, and M/OBO will fund this request whether or not it is a non-CAA or a CAA construction project.