

# *Adventure Activities Licensing Service*

44 Lambourne Crescent, Cardiff Business Park, Llanishen, Cardiff CF14 5GG  
Tel: (029) 20755715 Fax: (029) 20755757 Email: info@aals.org.uk Web: www.aals.org.uk

## **Adventure Activities Licensing Service Report** **From 1st April 2016 – 31st March 2017**

### **Contents:**

- 1. Foreword**
- 2. Background to the Licensing Scheme**
- 3. The Functions of the Licensing Authority contracted to AALS**
- 4. Inspections**
- 5. Licences Issued and Refused**
- 6. Complaints**
- 7. Letters to Unlicensed Providers**
- 8. Funding and Administration of Funds**
- 9. Joint Inspections / Work with Other Agencies /  
Other Relevant AALS activity during the Reporting Year**

**Annex 1: Number of Inspections carried out**

**Annex 2: Licence Refusals/Revocations/Variations**

**Annex 3: Complaints**

**Annex 4: Text of Standard Unlicensed Provider Letter**

**Annex 5: Work with Other Agencies**

## **1. Foreword**

- 1.1 The adventure activities licensing scheme was introduced in April 1996 and implements the Activity Centres (Young Persons' Safety) Act 1995 and the Adventure Activities Licensing Regulations 1996, revised 2004. For 11 years it was administered by Tourism Quality Services Ltd. (TQS), a company designated as The Adventure Activities Licensing Authority (AALA) by the Secretary of State.
- 1.2 In 2007 the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) was designated as the AALA and contracted TQS to carry out the day to day functions of the scheme on its behalf. These include, but are not limited to, the receipt and consideration of licence applications, inspections, and the granting or refusal of a licence. TQS carries out its contracted work under the name of the Adventure Activities Licensing Service (AALS).
- 1.3 This report covers the work of AALS in fulfilling the contract during the period running from 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2017 (the reporting year). AALS has always been, and remains, a not-for-profit company limited by guarantee.

## **2. Background to the Licensing Scheme**

- 2.1 The adventure activities licensing scheme is the mechanism for the inspection and regulation of certain providers of adventure activities to young people as set out in the Activity Centres (Young Persons' Safety) Act 1995 and the Adventure Activities Licensing Regulations 2004 (AALR).
- 2.2 AALS operates under the written guidance of the HSE as detailed in 'Guidance from the Licensing Authority on the Adventure Activity Licensing Regulations 2004' (Ref: L77 Second Edition published 2007. ISBN 978 0 7176 6243 2).
- 2.3 This guidance states: "The aim of the adventure activities licensing scheme is to give assurance that good safety management practice is being followed so that young people can continue to have opportunities to experience exciting and stimulating activities outdoors while not being exposed to avoidable risks of death and disabling injury."

## **3. The Functions of the Licensing Authority contracted to AALS.**

- 3.1 The following functions are contracted to the AALS:
  - receive applications for new licences and the renewal of existing licences;
  - collect licence fees;
  - consider applications for licences against the criteria in the regulations;
  - inspect providers' activities/premises/management systems etc as appropriate;

- prepare a report following inspection;
- decide if a licence should be granted or not;
- inform the applicant of our decision;
- issue a licence as appropriate;
- handle the first stage of complaints and appeal procedures;
- refer unresolved complaints/appeals to the AALA;
- maintain the AALA public register of licensed providers on-line;
- liaise with, and assist, enforcement authorities;
- such other duties as may be, from time to time, requested by the AALA.

## **4. Inspections**

### 4.1 Initial scheduled inspections are carried out:

- As provided by the 2004 Regulations inspections of new applicants are carried out following application. For existing licence holders inspections may be carried out either following application or up to one year in advance of their scheduled renewal date;
- Wherever possible this includes both an inspection of management systems and the observation of an activity session taking place, which allows the inspector to compare theory with practice for a sample of activities. These inspections generally result in a recommendation on whether to issue a licence.

### 4.2 Supplementary scheduled inspections are carried out:

- If it was not possible to complete all aspects of the main inspection;
- To follow up on requirements made at a previous inspection;
- To investigate a complaint;
- At the request of the AALA or another agency;
- In anticipation of an application to renew a licence.

### 4.3 Spot check inspections are carried out:

- As part of a targeted schedule of checks;
- As part of a number of random unannounced checks.

The breakdown of number and type of inspection visit carried out by the Inspectorate can be found in Annex 1.

## 5. Licences Issued and Refused

- 5.1 The number of licence holders runs as follows for selected years since licensing was fully implemented (*figures taken at 31<sup>st</sup> March in each year*);

1998	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
887	1134	1182	1205	1235	1214	1219	1238	1243	1267	1251

- 5.2 Giving providers specific 'required action' and ensuring that they are completed, is the means by which the Licensing Scheme is able to provide assurances that "good safety management practice is being followed" in a way that is proportionate. (Quote from Guidance from the Licensing Authority on the Adventure Activities Licensing Regulations 2004 (L77) page 1, paragraph 1.)
- 5.3 In the reporting year notices to providers that AALS was considering refusing or revoking licences were issued in 13 cases. In 9 cases the provider actioned the requirements made by AALS in the allotted time, and AALS subsequently issued or continued the licence. AALS had to refuse 2 applications and vary 1 licence. 1 provider withdrew their application as a result of the notice served.

One refusal was in respect of a new licence application and the provider decided not to proceed with their application. The second refusal was in respect of a renewal application and the provider decided not to proceed with their application. However they did subsequently re-apply for the renewal of their licence and their application is in process as at the date of this report.

One provider had their licence varied by having three activities removed from their licence when they did not provide the required information.

Adequate remedial action achieved	9
Total number of refused licences	2
Total number of varied licences	1
Total number of withdrawn licences	1
Total number of revoked licences	0
Total number of cases where we considered refusing or revoking	13

- 5.4 More detailed information for this section can be found in Annex 2.

## **6. Complaints**

- 6.1 Regulation 11(1) of the AALR states “The Licensing Authority shall consider any complaints which it receives relating to the provision of facilities for adventure activities by licence holders and shall, if it considers it necessary, cause those complaints to be investigated.”
- 6.2 Where issues related to out of scope activities offered by a licensed provider, it was deemed appropriate to deal with these because of the expertise and knowledge of the provider’s operation that exists within AALS. Enforcement authorities are notified if a satisfactory resolution is not or cannot be resolved by this means.
- 6.3 Where a complaint refers to an issue which is not relevant to the AALS (for example, complaints relating to customer care, financial issues, etc.) the complaint is referred directly to the relevant authority.
- 6.4 Where activities are offered by an un-licensed provider the complainant is advised to whom they should make their complaint.
- 6.5 In the reporting year, 19 complaints were received by AALS. Further detail about the substance of the complaints made and the actions of AALS can be found in Annex 3 to this report.

## **7. Letters to Unlicensed Providers**

- 7.1 In the reporting year, AALS received 11 reports of unlicensed providers who appeared to be offering activities that fell within scope of AALR but without holding an adventure activities licence.
- 7.2 Each of these providers was sent a standard letter. For latest version see Annex 4.
- 7.3 Of the 11 providers contacted, 3 advised that they were operating out of scope, 2 subsequently applied for a licence, 1 advised that they did not provide activities but subcontracted to providers who do hold an adventure activities licence and 1 confirmed in writing that he would stop offering activities in scope of the Licensing Regulations. 4 providers did not contact the AALS and were referred to the enforcement authority (the same local authority in 3 cases). The local authority with 3 cases subsequently contacted the providers and confirmed that none were operating in scope of the Licensing Regulations. There has been no response from the local authority in the fourth case.
- 7.4 The enforcement authority is empowered to investigate further, the AALS is not.

## **8. Funding and Administration of funds**

- 8.1 For some time now AALS has operated under an interim regime scenario pending resolution between UK Government departments and the devolved administrations as to the future of licensing. This means that certain detailed requirements of the contract cannot be met owing to short term timing issues e.g. the length of the remaining contract. This also means that certain providers for whom obtaining a licence is of marginal benefit tend to hold off pending a resolution of the future regime.
- 8.2 This has not affected the ability of AALS to deliver the services and there is no current implication that it might in the foreseeable future. However there is now an accumulating problem with respect to financing.
- 8.3 This was detailed in last year's report to which the reader is referred. However in summary a freeze in the departmental budget since 2002 and a freeze in fees charged to the industry since 2007 mean that there has been a gradual squeeze on budget which is now intensifying as inflation begins to resume.
- 8.4 In addition to inflation certain statutory costs have also risen e.g. Insurance Premium Tax will be 12% for 2017-18 as opposed to 6% a few years ago. Statutory pension contributions are also rising.
- 8.5 With the regime operating on a short term per 8.1 the scope for productivity increases and/or longer term discounts is very limited and the AALS believes it has now squeezed all the possible benefits from the revised regulations that came into force in 2007.
- 8.6 The above coupled with the frequently reported uncertainty as to income in the closing period of each financial year led to a request in early Spring of 2017 for additional funding of £15,000 to be made available. This was agreed and was utilised.
- 8.7 Last year's report also detailed a diminution of fee income due to lengthening of the average duration of a licence. This has continued, further pressuring the budget. As at the end of the financial year 2016-17 the AALS contract only ran to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2017. However a possible extension was under consideration pending the results of 8.1 and hence AALS flagged that the outline estimated funding requirement for 2017-18 was £440,000. (Subsequently the contract has been extended and AALS is currently working on a more detailed set of estimates for submission to the AALA).
- 8.8 Since the financial year end, the AALS results for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017 have been audited. The audited figures show no material differences from draft figures already submitted to AALA in support of the invoices for that year.

- 8.9 TQS Ltd. maintains internal checks on its financial operations and is not aware of any discrepancy or losses within the funds that it administers. However, the annual audit apart, it does not utilise independent monitors owing to the relatively small sums involved overall.
- 8.10 TQS Ltd. is not aware of any threats to the company that might prejudice its ability to continue to fulfil the functions noted at 3.1. However due to the continuing uncertainty over the future form of licensing, which results in short term contract working, any forecasts of income and related expenditure continue to be less reliable than before.

## **9. Joint inspections / Work with Other Agencies / Other Relevant AALS activity during the Reporting Year.**

### **9.1 Consultancy work undertaken by AALS.**

In the reporting year, Senior Inspectors and/or the Head of Inspection spent a total of 854.30 hours (hours when the Senior Inspector and/or Head of Inspection were not available to do their normal duties, including travel time) on:

- Ministry of Defence inspections (736.30 hours). A consultancy fee was charged for this work. Owing to delays in the receipt of funds, no monies were credited to the 2016-17 accounts. The balance was subsequently settled in full during the 2017-18 year.
- Reviewing draft material and attendance as an External Panel Member at a higher education college degree course development meeting. A consultancy fee was charged for this work.
- Joint visits with HSE/ LA enforcement. No consultancy fee was charged for this work.
- Preparing reports for HSE/LA enforcement. No consultancy fee was charged for this work.
- Attendance at, and reporting on, coasteering guides training and assessment courses. No consultancy fee was charged for this work.

See Annex 5 for more information on assistance provided.

### **9.2 A two year pilot project with the Royal Yachting Association (RYA)**

In 2015/16 we carried out a two year pilot project with the Royal Yachting Association (RYA) to explore the duplication of AALS and RYA inspections. The RYA carry out annual inspections of their Recognised Teaching Centres (RTCs) some of which also hold an AALA Licence and are inspected by AALS. We wished to explore the feasibility of reducing this duplication by the centre having

both its RYA RTE status and their AALA Licence revalidated with just one inspection by one inspector.

The initial part of the pilot involved a small number of RYA inspectors accompanying certain AALS Senior Inspectors on their scheduled inspections of Licensed centres that were also RYA RTEs.

We found, as expected, that where a sailing centre satisfies the requirements of an RYA RTC then it will also (in all but the most unusual of circumstances) generally satisfy the requirements of AALR.

By the end of the pilot some of these RYA inspectors were authorised to carry out a Licensing inspection (as allowed by AALR regulation 12) at the same time as they carried out their RYA inspection. Their AALS reports were reviewed by an AALS Senior Inspector as for other AALS free-lance inspectors.

A significant reduction in duplication was therefore achieved.

### **9.3 Merchant Shipping Act exemption.**

Towards the end of the RYA pilot (above) we were contacted by (a different department of) the RYA to say that they believed certain RYA RTE's were now exempt from AALR. They claimed this exemption on the basis that:

- the RYA now carry out certain functions on behalf of the Marine and Coastguard Agency (MCA) under the Merchant Shipping Act (MSA) and
- the definition of watersports in AALR regulation 1: Interpretation which excludes

*craft the construction, equipment and use of which is subject to a requirement for a certificate issued pursuant to the Merchant Shipping Act 1995<sup>(c)</sup> or any regulation or order made thereunder*

HSE subsequently agreed with the RYA's interpretation. Moreover, HSE were reassured by the finding of the pilot (above) that there would be no reduction in the standard of safety at these centres. The centres would merely be inspected only by the RYA and not both the RYA and AALS.

The exemption applies to approximately 60 RYA RTCs.

### **9.4 Participation numbers in adventure activities.**

There does not appear to be an accurate estimate for the level of participation in adventure activities by young people. The figure of 7 - 10 million participant-days is widely quoted. (1 participant-day equals 1 participant for a day or part of a day.) However, this figure is taken from two estimates made nearly 20 years ago, one by TQS (then the AALA) and the other by the Department for Education and Employment (DFEE) in their capacity as the AALA's sponsoring department. Nor was it ever defined what form the participation took, all adventure activities or just at licensed centres.

Since April 2016 we have been collecting participation numbers from providers during inspections. By cross-referencing these with other figures that exist elsewhere within the sector, and extrapolating, it should be possible to estimate the total size of the sector, divided into over- and under-18 year olds, and at licensed and unlicensed centres.

During the reported period we obtained participation numbers from 513 licensed providers. This allowed us to make a first **estimate** of annual participation across all **licensed centres** as follows. All figures are approximate.

- the total number of participant-days 10,000,000 p.a.
- the total number of under 18 year old participant-days 6,500,000 p.a.
- the number of school booked participant-days. 5,250,000 p.a.
  
- the average number of participant-days per provider 8,000 p.a.
- the average number of under 18 year old participant-days 5,000 p.a.
- the average number of school booked participant-days 4,000 p.a.

There is a very wide spread in the participation numbers amongst licensed providers, from the largest at 350,000 (total number of participant-days) to the smallest at a few tens. The total participation-days for the 5 largest is approximately 850,000.

By April 2019 we will have gathered figures from all licensed providers and will have a more accurate estimate.

Licensed providers represent only part of the overall provision of adventure activities. However, once a more accurate figure is established (April 2019) this will form a base-line against which future expansion or contraction of the sector can be measured.

**Annex 1: Number of Inspections per month carried out in the reporting year compared with prior reporting year.**

**Main Scheduled Inspections**

	<b>The Reporting Year 01.04.16 – 31.03.17</b>	<b>Prior Reporting Year 01.04.15 – 31.03.16</b>	<b>Previous Reporting Year 01.04.14 – 31.03.15</b>
<b>April</b>	68	81	79
<b>May</b>	79	97	73
<b>June</b>	75	91	66
<b>July</b>	69	98	66
<b>August</b>	48	44	35
<b>September</b>	30	31	41
<b>October</b>	34	25	35
<b>November</b>	29	26	28
<b>December</b>	25	19	20
<b>January</b>	38	30	37
<b>February</b>	47	48	46
<b>March</b>	54	45	68
<b>Totals</b>	<b>596</b>	<b>635</b>	<b>594</b>

**Supplementary Scheduled Inspections**

	<b>The Reporting Year 01.04.16 – 31.03.17</b>	<b>Prior Reporting Year 01.04.15 – 31.03.16</b>	<b>Previous Reporting Year 01.04.14 – 31.03.15</b>
<b>April</b>	9	16	11
<b>May</b>	15	20	20
<b>June</b>	14	18	21
<b>July</b>	44	34	42
<b>August</b>	27	29	41
<b>September</b>	20	25	27
<b>October</b>	18	18	20
<b>November</b>	10	11	12
<b>December</b>	3	5	5
<b>January</b>	0	9	10
<b>February</b>	2	2	4
<b>March</b>	2	14	12
<b>Totals</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>225</b>

**Spot Check Inspections**

45 spot checks were also carried out in the reporting year, compared with 30 during the prior reporting year and 33 during the previous reporting year

The total number of inspections under the AALR therefore, was 805 in the reporting year, compared with 866 in the prior reporting year and 852 in the previous reporting year.

**Number and Type of Inspections carried out from 2010/11 to 2016/17**

<b>Report Type</b>	<b>2010/11</b>	<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17</b>
Main	623	648	629	664	594	635	596
Supplementary	280	237	167	163	225	201	164
Spot check	57	44	40	46	33	30	45
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>960</b>	<b>929</b>	<b>836</b>	<b>873</b>	<b>852</b>	<b>866</b>	<b>805</b>

## Annex 2: Licence Refusals/Revocations/Variations

For this reporting period the refusals/revocations are as follows:

### Licence Refusal Statistics in the reporting year

Total number of cases where we considered refusing or revoking	13
Adequate remedial action achieved	9
Total number of refused licences	2
Total number of varied licences	1
Total number of withdrawn licences	1
Total number of revoked licences	0

Of these 13 cases, inspections had identified failings relating to:

Evidence of instructor competence	5
Appointment & use of Technical Advisor	4
Written policies and procedures (establishment and review)	3
Induction and monitoring of staff and activities	3
Staffing arrangements	3
Management of activity sessions	3
Equipment checking & repair/replace	1
Failure to ensure use of qualified staff for activities	1
Inadequate preparation of participants for activity	1
Continued failure to arrange inspection	1
Inability to prove that specified activities are offered	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>

NB: The above categories are not mutually exclusive i.e. some providers had more than one problem. Indeed most refusals/revocations are for multiple reasons.

### Relevant Action Taken

	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17
<b>Total of providers who, at least initially, did not meet the requirements of AALR</b>	6	12	9	19	23	13
<b>Number of considerations rescinded</b>	5	8	7	14	18	9
<b>Number of Licences Refused</b>	0	3	2	2	3	2
<b>Number of Licences Revoked</b>	1	1	0	3	0	0
<b>Number of Licences Varied</b>	0	0	0	0	2	1
<b>Number of Licences Withdrawn</b>						1

### **Annex 3: Complaints**

19 complaints were received by AALS in the reporting year.

#### **Complaints were made by:**

Member of the Public (including parents)	12
Other provider	2
Ex employee	1
Public Body	1
School	1
National Governing Body (NGB)	1
Charity	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>

Of these:

Licence holders where complaints related to matters in scope of the AALR	6
Licence holders where complaints related to matters <b>not</b> in scope of the AALR	9
Non licence holders	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>

Action taken in respect of all complaints:

Matter resolved by some other means (e.g. telephone call, e mail)	9
Arranged visit	5
Referred to enforcing authority	2
In Progress - Issues to be addressed at next scheduled inspection	2
No investigation – complainant didn't want complaint pursued	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>

Of the 15 relevant complaints against licence holders, the allegations concerned:

In scope of AALR:

- Mountain bike accident caused by group not being given adequate time to practice braking and competence not being adequately assessed;
- Capsize and rescue of group in voyageur canoe;
- Unsafe raft building session led by an inexperienced instructor with no watersports qualifications;
- Former employee alleging that licensed provider is consistently working with large group numbers and unqualified instructors, also that technical advisor initials are being forged on paperwork;
- Unsatisfactory management of pupils with special needs during in scope watersports activities;

- Pain sustained by daughter from being expected to carry heavy and awkward rucksack on a hill walk.

Complaints not in scope of AALR:

- Near miss on water based assault course;
- Unsupervised group on a hill walk (non licensable terrain);
- Ankle injury sustained whilst on obstacle course relay race (complaint later withdrawn);
- Safeguarding issue – daughter allegedly a victim of a ‘peeping tom’ incident in uni-sex changing cubicles;
- Coasteering accident with an adult group;
- Poor practice during a via ferratta session with a family group – instructor not wearing a helmet and not following good safety practice;
- Poor management of a day of non-licensable activities offered to a special needs group;
- Management of coasteering session with adult group;
- Photo of Stand Up Paddleboarding (SUP) activity where participants did not appear to be wearing a leash (appear to be family group).

Of these 15 cases involving licensed providers:

5 complaints were deemed to have been justified:

- Mountain bike accident caused by group not being given adequate time to practice braking and competence not being adequately assessed;
- Near miss on water based assault course;
- Poor practice during a via ferratta session with a family group – instructor not wearing a helmet and not following good safety practice;
- Poor management of a day of non-licensable activities offered to a special needs group;
- Unsafe raft building session led by an inexperienced instructor with no watersports qualifications.

3 were deemed to have been justified in part:

- Capsize and rescue of group in voyageur canoe;
- Unsatisfactory management of pupils with special needs during in scope watersports activities;
- Pain sustained by daughter from being expected to carry heavy and awkward rucksack on a hill walk.

3 were deemed to have been not justified:

- Unsupervised group on a hill walk (non licensable terrain);
- Safeguarding issue – daughter allegedly a victim of a ‘peeping tom’ incident in uni-sex changing cubicles;
- Photo of SUP activity where participants did not appear to be wearing a leash (appear to be family group).

1 complaint involving a licensed provider was referred to the relevant Enforcing Authority:

- An AALS Senior Inspector accompanied a local authority Environmental Health Officer on a visit to the provider following a complaint received from an adult member of the public regarding a back injury sustained during a coasteering activity. The complaint was deemed to have been justified in part.

2 complaints remain in progress, with the issues to be discussed at the providers' next scheduled inspection:

- Former employee alleging that licensed provider is consistently working with large group numbers and unqualified instructors, also that technical advisor initials are being forged on paperwork;
- Management of coasteering session with adult group.

1 complaint was withdrawn on the same day by the parent making the complaint:

- Ankle injury sustained whilst on obstacle course relay race

## **Annex 4: Text of Standard Unlicensed Provider Letter**

Dear

### **RE: ADVENTURE ACTIVITIES LICENSING REGULATIONS 2004**

We understand that you may be offering outdoor activities to young people under the age of 18 years and we cannot find you on our database as a Licence Holder under the above regulations. If you are providing either caving, climbing, trekking, or watersports activities to young people in return for payment, then it is possible that the above Regulations apply to you. If this is the case then to offer these activities legally you would need to hold a Licence.

The Adventure Activities Licensing Scheme was introduced by the Government in 1996 to inspect safety management systems and to issue licences to those operating within scope of these Regulations.

Enclosed is an extract from the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) guidance publication which details those activities which come within scope of the Adventure Activities Licensing. It also explains who is exempt from the requirement to hold a licence.

If you have any doubts about whether or not the law applies to your operation then you can contact us and we will endeavour to help you.

If, either you are not making any provision to young persons or you believe these Regulations do not apply to you, we would ask you to confirm this to us **in writing**, stating the reasons for your exemption. If these Regulations do apply you can apply online at: <http://www.hse.gov.uk/aala/apply-for-a-licence.htm>.

Alternatively we can send you an application form.

Thank you, in anticipation of your co-operation.

Yours faithfully,

MARCUS BAILIE  
Head of Inspection, AALS

## **Annex 5 – Work with other agencies and authorities**

1. AALS received a request from the Ministry of Defence (MoD) in the Prior Reporting Year to carry out inspections of the safety management systems for Adventurous Training (AT) within the Armed Forces and Cadet Forces and compare these with the requirements of the Adventure Activities Licensing Regulations (AALR). An initial pilot of up to 40+ inspections of different units was envisaged. During this Reporting Year, inspections have included 15 centres in the UK and abroad (Germany and the Falkland Islands).
2. A college of higher education requested support from a Senior Inspector with the writing of two modules of a BA (Honours) course in Outdoor Education and Learning. The Senior Inspector was also invited to be an External Panel Member of the BA (Honours) Outdoor Education and Learning Approval Event and attended over 2 days.
3. A company offering coasteering guides' training and assessment courses invited a Senior Inspector to attend a training course and, later in the Reporting Year, an assessment course. A Senior Inspector attended both courses, had meetings with the organisers and discussions with participants and wrote a report after each course.
4. Technical assistance requested by an Environmental Health Officer (EHO) investigating an accident on a zip wire at a licensed centre. A Senior Inspector visited the licensed centre with the EHO and wrote a report.
5. Assistance requested by an Environmental Health Officer (EHO) investigating a rafting incident involving an adult group at a licensed centre. A Senior Officer provided assistance via correspondence and telephone calls.
6. Assistance requested by an Environmental Health Officer (EHO) investigating a coasteering incident involving an adult group at a licensed centre. A Senior Inspector visited the licensed centre with the EHO, gave feedback on the letter the EHO was proposing to send to the provider and also attended a meeting between the provider and the EHO. The Head of Inspection also provided feedback on the EHO's letter to the provider. The adult had sustained a back injury during the coasteering activity and, as well as reporting it to the Local Authority, had also made a complaint to AALS. AALS referred the complaint to the Enforcing Authority as referred to in Annex 3 of this report. The complaint was deemed to have been justified in part.

### **Work from Previous Reporting Years**

7. Assistance previously requested by EHO investigating an accident at a licensed centre on a newly opened zip wire involving an adult. During the Reporting Year a Senior Inspector prepared for appearing as a witness in a court case. The two defendants both pleaded guilty prior to the court case so the Senior Inspector was not required to appear in court.