

# Record of inspection of a Licensed Asbestos Contractor by a Local Authority Inspector

**Local Authority Details**

Inspector title  Inspector forename  Inspector surname  Date of inspection

Name of local authority

**Site Details**

Name of licence holder  Licence number

Address of work site

**Hazard Topic**

	Discussed	Not Discussed	Adequate	Not Adequate
Planning (including Plan of Work)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Training and competence (including managers)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Control measures (including wet strip, RPE, PPE)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prevention of spread (including enclosures)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Decontamination (including transiting)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Compliance with licence conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Time spent - Hours  Minutes

**Action Taken**

None  Advice  Letter *(please attach)*  Notice *(please attach)*

Prosecution *(please provide details in notes overleaf)*

**Licence Recommendation**

No change  Amendment  Revocation

**Inspection rating** *(see notes for overall rating)*

1  2  3  4  5  6

**Notes of inspection** *(please provide details of names of persons seen, site conditions, matters discussed, etc)*

<b>Asbestos Licensing - Notes for overall rating</b>	
<b>Rating 1 - High Standards</b>	<p>Some aspects meet best practice, beyond minimum compliance, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan of work detailing all aspects, site specific and being followed.</li> <li>• Physical conditions of high standards (perfect enclosure with excellent vision [vision panels and/or CCTV], good condition of RPE face fit tested, DCU fully operational).</li> <li>• Management and supervision actively involved in encouraging best practice, with worker involvement.</li> </ul>
<b>Rating 2 - Good Standards</b>	<p>Meet minimum legal requirements, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan of work fit for purpose and being followed.</li> <li>• Physical conditions provide adequate protection and fit for effective decontamination.</li> <li>• Management and supervision active in ensuring work is carried out in compliance with legal requirements.</li> </ul>
<b>Rating 3 - One or More Minor Shortcomings</b>	<p>As these shortcomings are not serious, they can be dealt with informally with oral advice, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan of work not detailed but sufficient to enable additions to be made and work to progress.</li> <li>• Physical standards more or less adequate with minor issues needing addressing, eg airlock flaps not weighted, DCU doors not self closing.</li> <li>• Management and supervision trained and competent but not using competencies well.</li> </ul>
<b>Rating 4 - Standards are Patchy</b>	<p>It is necessary to address one or more shortcomings by giving formal instructions for remedial action to be taken, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan of work not sufficiently specific to provide satisfactory work instructions.</li> <li>• Physical standards need improvement and some action, eg air movement in enclosure.</li> <li>• Management and supervision is not proactive, ineffective and does not ensure effective control.</li> </ul> <p>Formal instructions may be implemented by, eg, obtaining a verbal undertaking from the company to take specific action or sending a letter.</p>
<b>Rating 5 - Standards Unsatisfactory</b>	<p>Typically, there is at least one contravention that gives rise to a discernible risk gap, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan of work generic and not site specific.</li> <li>• Physical standards require formal action, eg no services for DCU, unshaven workers, insufficient wetting of ACMs.</li> <li>• Management and supervision poor with no effective control.</li> </ul>
<b>Rating 6 - Standards Unacceptable</b>	<p>Unless application of the EMM identifies duty holder factors that provide strong mitigation, the issuing of a notice and/or prosecution is likely to be appropriate, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No plan of work.</li> <li>• Physical standards bad eg dry stripping.</li> <li>• Management and supervision absent or non functional.</li> </ul>