

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 2017 – 31st March 2018**

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**
- 10. Other Relevant Issues and 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 2017 to 31st March 2018 (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:
 - a) 'Guidance from the Licensing Authority on the Adventure Activity Licensing Regulations 2004' (Ref: L77 Second Edition published 2007. ISBN 978 0 7176 6243 2).
 - b) The Approach to the Inspection of Providers within Scope of the Adventure Activities Licensing Scheme to Permit the Issue of a Licence (2009).
- 2.3 L77 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." (L77 page 1 paragraph 1.)

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 the AALS' decision;
- issue a licence as appropriate;
- handle the first stage of complaints and appeal procedures;
- refer unresolved complaints/appeals to the AALA or to the relevant Enforcement Authority, as appropriate;
- maintain the AALA public register of licensed providers on-line;
- liaise with, and assist, enforcement authorities as requested;
- such other duties as may be, from time to time, requested by the AALA.

4. Inspections

4.1 Initial scheduled inspections.

- 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 or not 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 31st March in each year*);

1998	2002	2006	2008	2010	2012	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
887	949	1052	1134	1205	1214	1238	1243	1267	1251	1180

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 17 cases. In 13 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 1 application and vary 2 licences. One provider decided to withdraw their licence as activities were no longer being delivered under the licence.

The refusal was in respect of a new licence application. The provider decided not to proceed with their application.

One provider had their licence varied by having watersports removed from their licence when they did not provide the required information. Watersports was subsequently re-instated when the required information was received.

A second provider had their licence varied with the removal of two activities when they did not provide the required information.

Adequate remedial action achieved	13
Total number of refused licences	1
Total number of varied licences	2
Total number of withdrawn licences	1
Total number of revoked licences	0
 Total number of cases where we considered refusing or revoking	 17

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 achieved 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, 28 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 20 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 20 providers contacted:

Operate with family groups only	6
Not operating in AALR specified terrain or water	4
Subsequently applied for a licence	4
Licensable activities subcontracted to licensed provider	2
Only offer activities not in scope of AALR	2
Booking agent rather than provider of activities	1
Confirmed in writing that would stop offering activities in scope of AALR	1

7.4 If any of the providers had not responded, they would have been referred to the relevant enforcing authority. The enforcement authority is empowered to investigate further, whereas the AALS is not.

8. Funding and Administration of funds.

8.1 During 2017-18 AALS continued to operate 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 the problem with financing flagged in the last two years' reports became more acute during 2017-18.

8.3 This was detailed in the earlier reports 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 Starting in 2016-17 the above has been compounded by an unexpected (and to a large degree unexplained) drop in the numbers of licence holders renewing their licences. AALS has no resource to research why this has been but the obvious 'culprit' is uncertainty over the future of licensing. Whatever the cause AALS was faced during the summer months of 2017 with a dropout rate of nearly 20%. This had a large effect on financing as the income was lost instantly but significant cost savings could not be introduced until the following year.

8.6 The above coupled with the frequently reported uncertainty as to income in the closing period of each financial year led to great difficulty in AALS' ability to offer HSE and the sponsoring department any certainty about the eventual requirement for support. Working on worst case scenarios the forecast was at one point £470,000 against the departmental budget of £400,000. Little could be done in mitigation as the work required is statutory.

8.7 In the event the outturn was £425,000 but it was most unsatisfactory that neither AALS nor HSE was able to rely on any particular figure until the last moment. In summary it was without doubt the most difficult year for financial forecasting that TQS/AALS has experienced in its 20 year involvement with this legislation.

- 8.8 For a number of reasons, AALS expects the situation to stabilise somewhat for 2018-19. Primarily this will be that the marginal licence holders will have mainly left and AALS itself will have been able to implement cost saving measures. In addition there will be a one off benefit for an external contract falling into 2018-19. Hence the recent forecast for 2018-19 is for support requirement of £450,000 (down from a worst case scenario of £500,000 given during 2017-18).
- 8.9 Since the financial year end, the AALS results for the year ended 31st March 2018 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.
- 8.10 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. HSE has introduced a new financial liaison system for 2018-19 which will improve the detailed understanding of events as they unfold.
- 8.11 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, financial forecasting will remain both more volatile and uncertain than in earlier years.

9. Joint inspections / Work with Other Agencies

Consultancy work undertaken by AALS.

In the reporting year, Senior Inspectors and/or the Head of Inspection spent a total of 743 hours (hours when the Senior Inspector and/or Head of Inspection were not available to do their normal duties, including travel time) on:

- 9.1 Ministry of Defence inspections (565 hours). Fees were charged for this work.
- 9.2 At the request of a college in Switzerland, one Senior Inspector visited to carry out an independent assessment of their practices relating to adventure activities. Fees were charged for this work.
- 9.3 Two Senior Inspectors carried out lectures to university students in their geographical area. The universities' standard lecturer rates were charged for this work in both cases.
- 9.4 Joint visits with HSE/ LA enforcement. No consultancy fee was charged for this work.
- 9.5 Reviewing reports for HSE/LA enforcement. No consultancy fee was charged for this work.

- 9.6 Advice given to LA enforcement to assist accident investigation. No consultancy fee was charged for this work.
- 9.7 Review of documentation and attendance at Instructor qualification courses in relation to course providers' requests to have their courses / awards recognised by AALS. No consultancy fee was charged for this work. AALS subsequently can accept these qualifications as adequate evidence of instructor competence during future inspections.
- 9.8 Delivering workshops on the work of AALS and related issues at National Governing Body (NGB) conferences and similar. No consultancy fee was charged for this work.

See Annex 5 for more information on assistance provided.

10. Other Relevant issues and AALS activity during the Reporting Year

10.1 Merchant Shipping Act exemption.

This came into effect in early 2017 and meant that a provider who only offered sailing and windsurfing activities within the remit of the Royal Yachting Association (RYA), and which was an RYA Recognised Teaching Centre (RTC) would be exempt from holding an AALA Licence and, therefore would not need to renew it when it expired. At the end of the reporting period 39 of these providers have not renewed.

10.2 Sharp decline in the number of Licence holders.

Section 5.1 above shows that the number of Licence holders gradually but steadily increased from 1998 to 2016. There were 2 exceptions: a sharp but temporary dip in 2001/2 due to the foot and mouth outbreak and 2011/12 following Lord Young's Report (2010) announcement that the AALA Licensing scheme was to be abolished. AALS is now experiencing a third rapid decline.

From July 2016 to the end of this reporting period the number of Licence holders has fallen from 1285 to 1180, a fall of 105, representing a reduction of over 8%.

This has had significant financial and staffing implications which will likely continue if the decline continues.

Non-renewal because of the Merchant Shipping Act exemption (above) accounts for only 39 of the 105.

10.3 Participation numbers in adventure activities.

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.

The current estimates for providers who hold an AALS Licence are approximately

- the total number of participant-days 6,685,000 p.a.
 - the total number of under 18 year old participant-days 4,510,000 p.a.
 - the number of school booked participant-days. 3,448,000 p.a.
-
- the average number of participant-days per provider 7,200 p.a.
 - the average number of under 18 year old participant-days 4,900 p.a.
 - the average number of school booked participant-days 3,700 p.a.

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

Main Scheduled Inspections

	The Reporting Year 01.04.17 – 31.03.18	Prior Reporting Year 01.04.16 – 31.03.17	Previous Reporting Year 01.04.15 – 31.03.16
April	65	68	81
May	93	79	97
June	86	75	91
July	70	68	99
August	45	48	44
September	33	30	31
October	31	34	26
November	33	29	26
December	29	25	18
January	33	38	30
February	35	47	48
March	63	54	45
Totals	616	595	636

Supplementary Scheduled Inspections

	The Reporting Year 01.04.17 – 31.03.18	Prior Reporting Year 01.04.16 – 31.03.17	Previous Reporting Year 01.04.15 – 31.03.16
April	4	9	16
May	15	15	20
June	20	14	18
July	21	44	34
August	17	27	29
September	15	20	25
October	14	18	18
November	8	10	11
December	0	3	5
January	0	0	9
February	3	2	2
March	6	2	14
Totals	123	164	201

Spot Check Inspections

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

The total number of inspections under the AALR therefore, was 761 in the reporting year, compared with 804 in the prior reporting year and 867 in the previous reporting year.

Number and Type of Inspections carried out from 2011/12 to 2017/18

Report Type	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Main	648	629	664	594	636	595	616
Supplementary	237	167	163	225	201	164	123
Spot check	44	40	46	33	30	45	22
TOTAL	929	836	873	852	867	804	761

This decline is consistent with a steady improvement in completing inspections in a single visit.

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	17
Adequate remedial action achieved	13
Total number of refused licences	1
Total number of varied licences	2
Total number of withdrawn licences	1
Total number of revoked licences	0

Of these 17 cases, inspections had identified failings relating to:

Evidence of instructor competence	9
Written policies and procedures (establishment and review)	9
Appointment & use of Technical Advisor	5
Induction, monitoring and assessment of staff and activities	5
Ensuring deployment of competent staff	5
Equipment checking & repair/replace	4
Management of and responsibility for activity sessions	3
Management of large groups	2
Gathering and sharing participant information	1
Medical concerns relating to provider	1
No longer using licence	1
Total	45

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

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

Annex 3: Complaints

28 complaints were received by AALS in the reporting year.

Complaints were made by:

Member of the Public (including parents)	14
Ex employee	4
Public Body	4
Freelance instructor	2
AALS freelance inspector	1
National Governing Body (NGB)	1
Provider's Group	1
Other provider	1
Total	28

Of these:

Licence holders where complaints related to matters in scope of the AALR	14
Licence holders where complaints related to matters not in scope of the AALR	10
Non licence holders	4
Total	28

Action taken in respect of all complaints:

Matter resolved by some other means (e.g. telephone call, e mail)	10
Arranged visit	6
Referred to enforcing authority	5
No investigation	4
Visit deferred till inspection	3
Total	28

Of the 24 relevant complaints against licence holders, the allegations concerned:

Allegations in scope of AALR:

- Young people left unsupervised whilst on a rock climbing activity. Rocks thrown from top of climb to footpath below;
- Young people left unsupervised on a watersports activity;
- Concerns about the state of a provider's kayaks;
- Injury to a young person falling down a slope at a rock climbing activity;
- Incorrectly fitting buoyancy aids, operating with large groups, inappropriate safety boat cover;
- Injury to a young person caused by an unsafe pontoon;
- Freelance instructor being told to work with high numbers and no helmets;
- Dangerous watersports session observed by an RYA inspector;

- Provider's response to potential head injury sustained by young person whilst on a paddleboarding activity;
- Provider's lack of qualifications and experience;
- Instructors' lack of experience and providing coasteering without a licence (when this complaint was made, a licence application had just been received);
- Lack of training for staff and volunteers, specifically relating to water and rescue training;
- Unsafe practices by provider on Duke of Edinburgh Award expeditions;
- Staff running sessions for which they are not qualified, no equipment checks carried out (this complaint also included matters out of scope of AALR, namely, inadequate fire safety checks, sexual harassment and bullying behaviour by a manager and employing a chef who is an alcoholic).

Allegations not in scope of AALR:

- Licensed provider not maintaining high ropes course correctly;
- Poor organisation on beach safety course run for school group;
- Instructor working at licensed provider who has been convicted of assault against partner. No DBS check carried out;
- Jet skiers getting too close to activity sessions;
- No refund from provider when son sent home early from an activity course;
- Instructors' attitude on high ropes course;
- Inappropriate short cut taken on route of Silver Duke of Edinburgh Award expedition;
- Rowdy behaviour on stag and hen parties, driving whilst over the limit and without due care and attention;
- Poor condition of ropes on indoor climbing wall, under-qualified instructors used on adult groups;
- Inaccurate claims about instructors' competence on website.

Of these 24 cases involving licensed providers:

8 complaints were deemed to have been justified:

- Young people left unsupervised whilst on a rock climbing activity. Rocks thrown from top of climb to footpath below;
- Young people left unsupervised on a watersports activity;
- Concerns about the state of a provider's kayaks;
- Injury to a young person caused by an unsafe pontoon;
- Poor organisation on beach safety course run for school group;
- Dangerous watersports session observed by an RYA inspector;
- Unsafe practices by provider on Duke of Edinburgh Award expeditions;
- Inaccurate claims about instructors' competence on website.

4 were deemed to have been justified in part:

- Incorrectly fitting buoyancy aids, operating with large groups, inappropriate safety boat cover;

- Instructors' lack of experience and providing coasteering without a licence (when this complaint was made, a licence application had just been received);
- Inappropriate short cut taken on route of Silver Duke of Edinburgh Award expedition;
- Staff running sessions for which they are not qualified, no equipment checks carried out (this complaint also included matters out of scope of AALR, namely, inadequate fire safety checks, sexual harassment and bullying behaviour by a manager and employing a chef who is an alcoholic).

3 were deemed to have been not justified:

- Injury to a young person falling down a slope at a rock climbing activity;
- Provider's lack of qualifications and experience;
- Lack of training for staff and volunteers, specifically relating to water and rescue training;

7 were deemed to have been unsubstantiated:

- Licensed provider not maintaining high ropes course correctly;
- Freelance instructor being told to work with high numbers and no helmets;
- Provider's response to potential head injury sustained by young person whilst on a paddleboarding activity;
- Jet skiers getting too close to activity sessions;
- No refund from provider when son sent home early from an activity course;
- Instructors' attitude on high ropes course;
- Poor condition of ropes on indoor climbing wall, under-qualified instructors used on adult groups.

2 complaints involving licensed providers were referred to the relevant Enforcing Authority as AALS had no powers to investigate:

- Instructor working at licensed provider who has been convicted of assault against partner. No DBS check carried out;
- Rowdy behaviour on stag and hen parties, driving whilst over the limit and without due care and attention.

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 Previous Reporting Year of 2015/16 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 14 centres in the UK and abroad (Cyprus, Canada, Germany and the Falkland Islands).
2. AALS received a request from a college in Switzerland to carry out an independent assessment of current practices at the college relating to adventure activities. Previous inspections have been carried out in 2007, 2010 and 2014. A senior inspector spent 3 days at the college and wrote a report, which was reviewed by the Head of Inspection. The Head of Inspection also had email correspondence with the college after the inspection.
3. A university requested that a senior inspector did a lecture to their students with reference to AALS in conjunction with a managing risk module on their courses. The senior inspector presented an hour and a half lecture at the university.
4. A university (and licenced provider) requested that a senior inspector did a lecture to their students covering a brief overview of licensing and managing risk in adventure activities. The senior inspector presented an hour's lecture to students before the university's routine licence renewal inspection.
5. Technical assistance requested by an Environmental Health Officer (EHO) issuing a Prohibition Notice at a licensed centre. A Senior Inspector visited the licensed centre with the EHO and he and the Head of Inspection reviewed documentation prior to the EHO issuing the Notice.
6. Assistance requested by an EHO investigating a climbing incident involving a young person at a licensed centre. A Senior Inspector visited the site with the EHO and gave feedback on the report the EHO was proposing to send to the provider. The Head of Inspection also provided feedback on the EHO's report to the provider and visited the site. The young person had sustained serious injuries and, as well as reporting it to the Local Authority, her mother 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 not justified.
7. A local authority EHO requested advice regarding her investigation into a zip wire accident at an unlicensed centre. The Head of Inspection exchanged email correspondence with the EHO and viewed a video of the incident.
8. A company offering training courses in canyoning requested that a senior inspector review the documentation for a new Gorge and Ghyll Leader Award with a view to AALS approving the award. A senior inspector reviewed the documentation, had a meeting with company representatives and wrote a report.

Another senior inspector attended a training course later in the year, reviewed the up to date documentation and wrote a report. As a result of attending the training course, the inspector was not able to recommend that AALS recognise the award (on it's own) as appropriate evidence of competence for gorge and ghyll guides operating in the context of the Adventure Activities Licensing Regulations. He did however recommend that AALS recommends the award as a very useful training tool.

9. Following a request from an international surfing association for AALS to recognise their Stand Up Paddleboarding instructor award, a senior inspector reviewed documentation and wrote a report making a number of recommendations. The association were advised that a further consideration of their request would be undertaken if the matters arising were addressed. The inspector would also need to observe a course.
10. A senior inspector observed a developing Coasteering Guide Award assessment course following an invitation from the company to do so. The inspector wrote a report which included matters for the company to address and advised that the company may wish to invite an inspector to observe a further assessment course in the future.
11. A senior inspector delivered 2 workshop sessions to delegates at a Royal Yachting Association (RYA) conference.
12. A senior inspector delivered a workshop to delegates at the Association of Mountaineering Instructors (AMI) conference.
13. A senior inspector delivered a workshop to delegates at the Association of British Climbing Walls (ABC) annual conference.