

AALA Review Consultation – Outline of Options

Option 1 – Retain the AALR and current licensing scheme underpinned by the Health and Safety at Work Act and increase fees.		Option 2 – Retain the AALR underpinned by the Health and Safety at Work Act and increase fees and activities in-scope		Option 3 – Remove the AALR and move to an industry-led; not-for-profit accreditation scheme underpinned by the Health and Safety at Work Act, to provide assurance to users of outdoor activities.	
For	Against	For	Against	For	Against
A robust and well respected inspection regime.	Phased increase in fee from £715 to £920, in the first instance.	A robust and well respected inspection regime.	Phased increase in fee from £715 to £920, in the first instance.	By widening the scheme fees could be better managed.	Likely increase in fees as with Option 1 & 2.
An assurance to users that robust health and safety management systems, related to in scope activities, are in place.	It has not met one of the original aspirations of the Act to be self-financing.	An assurance to users that robust health and safety management systems, related to in scope activities, are in place.	It has not met one of the original aspirations of the Act to be self-financing.	Will continue to provide assurances to users, through an accreditation scheme that has representation from the HSE within the governance structure.	Market forces could have both a positive and negative impact on any scheme.
Retains current maximum licence duration.	Does not extend the reach of the scheme.	Retains current maximum licence duration.	No clear link or accountability to the outdoor sector.	Retain the maximum licence duration.	Removal of statutory requirement to hold a licence.
Maintains current age criteria.	Does not broaden the scope of the scheme.	Maintains current age criteria.	Not UK-wide implementation.	Maintains current age criteria.	
Could allow for an alternative method of calculating fees.	Can't broaden the inspection to cover issues such as quality of delivery, safeguarding, transport or accommodation.	Could allow for an alternative method of calculating fees.	Can't broaden the inspection to cover issues such as quality of delivery, safeguarding, transport or accommodation.	Allows for flexible and alternative approaches to calculating fees to better reflect the range of operators in the Sectors.	
Well-respected inspectors.	Not UK-wide implementation	Allow for a broadening of the scope of the scheme to other activities.		Can allow for a cross border approach throughout the UK.	
Valued guidance produced.	No clear link or accountability to the outdoor sector.	Well-respected inspectors.		Would be clearly accountable to the sector, through a new sector representative management body.	
Would continue to demonstrate compliance to health and safety law.	Lack of flexibility in the regulations to deal with new or developing adventurous activities.	Valued guidance produced.		Allows for a broadening of the inspection to include quality of delivery, learning, accommodation, safeguarding etc.	
May allow for some unification of inspections.		Could extend the reach of the scheme		Allows for a broadening of the scope to deal with new activities.	
		Would continue to demonstrate compliance to health and safety law.		Allows for feedback and dissemination of best practice.	
		May allow for some unification of inspections		Could allow for unification of some inspections to save money and time.	
				Would continue to demonstrate compliance to health and safety law.	
				Could extend the reach of the scheme.	
				Could meet HSE criteria for a scheme.	