

**STRONG VIEWS OR OBSERVATIONS**

- Non-statutory may mean corners could be cut and licensing ignored
- Our sector providers, both inside and outside AALA scope, are driving up standards – people want to do a good job for their customers
- Our sector is a safe sector
- In scope/out scope loopholes are currently being exploited
- Public awareness of AALA and/or license is poor
- Better marketing and general profiling required for current and future schemes
- Option 3 is an opportunity to implement a new and better scheme
- Option 3 is not Adventure Mark, although after a decade of providing a non-statutory scheme, they clearly have a lot to offer to support development
- Option 3 should include 'Adventure' in the definition. 'Outdoors' is not definitive enough.
- What happens if no option is a clear preference – option 4?
- Commissioning bodies do not have to use non-licensed/accredited providers
- Fee should be related to size of operation/turnover (or risk?)
- Concerned about increase in scope and how we categorise – essential to have full consultation
- Full consultation required on options 2 or 3
- Regulations are difficult to understand
- HSE: "AALA is essentially a piece legislation that helps you demonstrate compliance to another (H&S at Work Act, section3)"
- Has AALS represented value for money?
- From 1996, if we had spent the same money on education, rather than licensing – where would we be now?
- Option 3 offers flexibility
- 'Options' appear biased towards Option 3
- What is the point of an AALA license if you get prosecuted anyway under H&S at Work?
- Given that we must comply with the Law, standards apply regardless of AALA
- We need to move on from 1996 – what is fit for purpose for the next 20 years?
- Can we not use NGB accreditation?
- The service has never been out for competitive tender. Has this kept subsidy high? Would market forces make a more sustainable service?
- Fees to remove subsidy?
- A taxpayer providing outdoor services which are 'out for scope', pays (income tax) but does not benefit from the service
- Why 1/2/3 years?
- There should be no exclusion of qualifications/insurance within our sector, including the need for a AALA license
- Inspection drives quality and good practice. If we limit inspections, would we limit these drivers?

- Have we managed to engage those not currently involved in AALA and who may be coming into scope under a new scheme?