



4400 Carnegie Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44103
440-424-5321

SECURITY INTERNATIONAL

Dear Mace Security International, Inc. Stockholders:

We are writing to address several issues recently raised by one of the Corporation's stockholders regarding the Company's recent Notice of the 2018 Annual Meeting of Stockholders (the "Notice") and proposal Nos. 1 and 2 therein regarding (i) the election of directors, and (ii) amending Section 3.14 of the Company's Bylaws regarding the percentage of directors who are required to be independent.

We are also writing to notify you that we are enclosing herewith an Amended and Restated Notice and associated Proposals (the "Amended Notice") for the reasons explained below.

1. With respect to Proposal No. 1, before it proposed such nominees, the Board determined that six of the seven nominees would qualify as independent directors under the standards for independence applicable to the Corporation's Board. The Board's determination of such independence is more fully explained as follows:

A. What determines whether a director is "independent?" As indicated in the Notice, Section 3.14 of the Bylaws currently requires that at least 66.67% of the directors shall be "independent directors." The Bylaws define "independent" as follows:

"A person shall not be considered an "independent director" if (i) the person does not meet the definition of independent director [on] such exchange as the corporation is then listed upon, or (ii) the person has a relationship which, in the opinion of the Board of Directors, would interfere with the exercise of independent judgment in carrying out the responsibilities of a director. The following persons shall not be considered independent:

- (a) A person who is, or at any time during the past three years was, employed by the Corporation or has a family member that was employed by the Corporation at any time during the past three years, shall not be considered independent. "Family member" shall mean a person's spouse, parent, child, sibling, whether by blood, marriage or adoption, or anyone residing in such person's home.
- (b) A person who is a relative of a current officer of the Corporation or an affiliate of the Corporation and the officer is an officer that is subject to section 16 of the Securities Act of 1934, as amended, shall not be considered independent. "relative shall mean any of the person's Family Members" or a person's aunt, uncle, niece, nephew or first degree cousin, whether by blood, marriage or adoption.
- (c) A person who is a relative of any current employee of the Corporation and there are other factors present that cause the Board of Directors to

be concerned about the person's independence, shall not be considered independent.

- (d) A person (or a relative of a person) who currently or within the last three years has provided profession services directly to the Corporation, to an affiliate of the Corporation or an individual officer of the Corporation or one of its affiliates in excess of \$10,000 in any year shall not be considered independent.”

B. Which Board nominees are considered “independent” under this criteria?

Of the seven persons nominated for election to the Board in the Notice, only John McCann is employed by the Corporation and has management authority, and no other nominees have received any compensation whatsoever from the Corporation beyond director's fees permissible under the Bylaws, or are otherwise believed by the Board not to be independent based on the foregoing criteria. If elected, Messrs. Gehrisch and Singh have the potential to receive compensation as directors at some future date only if the Company's financial performance and shareholder value is substantially improved as demonstrated by material increases in the Corporation's EBITDA and other relevant measures of increased stockholder value.

Based on the forgoing criteria then, the election of the seven proposed Board nominees would continue to meet the current requirement of the Corporation's Bylaws that at least 66.67% of its Board members are “independent.”

2. The Board continues to strongly believe that its Proposal No. 2 in the original Notice you received, which proposed reducing the minimum required number of independent directors from 66.67% to a majority, is in the best interests of stockholders for the reasons noted therein. However, because (i) there is no immediate need for the adoption of such an amendment given that the continuation of a two-thirds majority of independent directors is accomplished by election of the proposed nominees, and (ii) shareholder Lawndale Capital Management, LLC has indicated its intention to pursue costly (and the Board believes to be meritless) litigation to attempt to prevent stockholders from considering and voting upon that Proposal, the Board believes that it is in the more immediate best interests of stockholders to withdraw Proposal No. 2 to spare the Corporation such litigation costs, and to allow its members to remain completely focused on their currently succeeding efforts to enhance stockholder value. The enclosed Amended Notice accordingly amends and restates the original Notice mailed to you by deleting Proposal No. 2

We understand that we serve you at your discretion, and we are committed to diligently representing your interests. We thank you for your support and look forward to continued improvement in the Corporation's performance.

By Order of the Board of Directors,

Cleveland, Ohio
May 23, 2018

Carl R. Smith
Senior Vice President Corporate Finance