

| OPTION | ASPIRATIONS MET | COMMENTS | ASPIRATIONS NOT MET |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>OPTION 1 AALA with increased cost.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reassurance from statutory scheme. • Local authorities can have assurance of competence • The 'pros' from option 3 should also be added to option 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Will continue to provide assurances to users, through an accreditation scheme that has representation from the HSE within the governance structure. ii. Allows for feedback and dissemination of best practice. iii. Could meet HSE criteria for a scheme. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fee too large for very small provider, meter running for inspection would be a fairer system here. |
| <p>OPTION 2 AALA PLUS</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reassurance from statutory scheme. • Local authorities can have assurance of competence • The 'pros' from option 3 should also be added to option 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Will continue to provide assurances to users, through an accreditation scheme that has representation from the HSE within the governance structure. ii. Allows for feedback and dissemination of best practice. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reach not extended. • Scope will be up for debate. • HSE could look at where accidents are happening to inform change of scope. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fee too large for very small provider, meter running for inspection would be a fairer system here. • Not cover N Ireland. • Challenging consultation? |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>iii. Could meet HSE criteria for a scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All GB solution • More rationale for what scope is included, can bring legislation up to date with new activities etc. Can use SAAF 2015 report + Derek Grieve working group report to inform this debate. • AALA Act OK. Regulations to be changed to update. | | |
| <p>OPTIOIN 3 UKAIG SELF REGULATION</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Opt in’ re-assurance to provider about own competence. • HSE comment – ‘most duty holders want to comply with a scheme.’ • HSE have advised and discussed new scheme with UKAIG. • Reduction in cost due to economies of scale due to bringing more (providers) into scope. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UKAIG comment - option 3 not greater cost than AALS. • UKAIG comment – need to opt in all 4 parts. • HSE comment – ‘HSE requires equivalent scheme’. • HSE comment – ‘automatic transition’. • HSE comment – ‘inspection is a snap shot – not necessarily longer or costing more’. • HSE comment – ‘HSE concerned about safety, if slippage in scheme, provider still compliant to 1974 act, don’t want teachers to have to check risk assessments’. • HSE comment – ‘HSE plan to provide governance of the new scheme.’ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don’t know enough about the inspection regime • Public view of self-regulation is negative • ‘Opt in’ pretty irrelevant. • Concern over cost. • Concern over what inspections would look like ie what is covered? opt in/out of 4 parts? • Remove the Act and replace with any number of unknown solutions. • To be better than the status quo need large number to sign up. If not signed up lack of re-assurance. • Difference in credibility of ‘endorsement’ compared with ‘statutory licence’. • 8 adventure mark holders, 180 AALA licence holders. • No AALS creates a vacuum. |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• HSE comment - 180/8 is not a fair comparison as in the absence of AALS more will sign up to a voluntary scheme.'• HSE comment – phased subsidy of new scheme towards self-financing in 3 to 5 years.• HSE comment – observed Adventure Mark inspection of food safety, legionnaires, asbestos register etc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increase in cost due to more covered in inspection possibly requiring overnight accommodation.• 4 part inspection takes inspection time away from adventure activity inspection time.• Extra setup costs of new scheme increase cost.• 'End user' parent not engaged in the process.• Provider would need to be sure of benefit of new scheme. |
|--|--|---|--|