



Private and Confidential

18 June 2025

Legislative Update on First Aid and Statement of Reasons

Dear Members and Non Members

I am writing to provide an important follow-up regarding the First Aid certification requirements under the new Private Security Regulations 2025.

I have some concerns about the ambiguity in the current wording of both the legislation and the regulations. At this stage, there is a lack of clarity as to whether Private Investigators may, in fact, be required to hold a current First Aid certificate due to the way the regulations are currently structured. Specifically, the issue lies in the separation of Regulation 17(1)(e) from Regulation 17(2), which defines the security activities that mandate First Aid qualifications.

To address this, I have formally raised the matter with the Office of the Minister for Police and am seeking a last-minute amendment to the regulations. I am requesting that Regulation 17(1)(e) be explicitly referenced within Regulation 17(2), alongside the existing subsections (a) and (d), to clearly identify which roles are subject to the First Aid requirement. This would ensure investigators are excluded unless explicitly required.

I will provide a further update as soon as official clarification is received.

Following the release of the Private Security Regulations yesterday, the Statement of Reasons was published today. This document provides a summary of stakeholder submissions and outlines the rationale behind the final form of the regulations and amendments to the Act.

Of the 14 submissions received during the consultation, nine specifically addressed concerns about requiring investigators to hold a Business Security Licence. As many of you are aware, this issue has been a central focus of our advocacy efforts.

However, I must express serious concern regarding the Department of Justice's response, which states:

"Consultation prior to introduction of the amending Act clearly suggested that the proposed provision would not disproportionately disadvantage any sole traders with ABNs who almost exclusively already hold a business licence.

However, following passage of the Act, the private investigation sector submitted that in that sector it is common to hold an individual licence and an ABN but because of the nature of the work, sham contracting is not an issue in that sector. Investigators noted that this provision would have a disproportionate effect on their sector, causing businesses to falter if they have to obtain a business licence."

This statement is misleading and easily disproven with documented evidence. The suggestion that most sole traders already hold a Business Security Licence is factually incorrect, and the assertion that earlier consultation identified no issues of disproportionate impact is deeply disingenuous.



As stated, I will provide a further update as information becomes available.

Yours faithfully

Stephen Scahill
President