

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
Yes I agree.	A welcome change!	Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	As long as these are provisional then fine. The review will be important.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree	It will take time to implement for new outdoor club leaders but many of our volunteers already have the training and documentation in place already.	Yes I agree.	Only question will be how often does this criteria change? Volunteers get discouraged when their competences are changed every three to four years.
Yes I agree.	It can be difficult to obtain and retain NOLRS registration, especially for part time volunteer activity leaders. It should be the responsibility of the organisation to determine that they have a suitable leadership team for each outdoor activity.	Yes I agree	I personally know experienced competent people who would make excellent activity leaders, but they do not have formal qualifications. I would rather be with a person who has demonstrated skills rather than a person with a paper qualification.	Yes I agree.	A good idea. The AAS would not need to change very often, but qualifications are changing constantly.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.	Having worked in the industry for 5 years and having to get my NOLRS for the first time I found the whole system to be a cumbersome debarcle full of errors and flaws which in reality did not reflect my competency to conduct the activities which I do. It is much preferable to have people who work with me on a daily basis, who are qualified to assess and develop my skills, deem me competent and confident to run such activities.	Yes I agree	Many different qualities make an outdoor education leader. Some are easily measured by tests and assessments formal or informal and others need to be measured by observation over time. A system that embraces more than just a rubber stamp on a short course does not seem to do our industry or its clients justice.	Yes I agree.	Yes, it makes the whole process transparent and conforms to a set standard.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.	I think this is far more relevant to WA outdoor education.	Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	Will there be access to what has been covered in each of the qualifications listed... ie what has been taught in the paddling units at La Trobe thereby allowing the organisation to check that the qualification it is consistent with the requirements of Appendix A??
Yes I agree.	I would also like to see the sector working collegiatively to make this the best it can be and to assist each other in taking appropriate responsibility delivering organisational training and competency assessment.	Yes I agree	NOLRS has been an unwieldy and overtly prescriptive process that has done little to supporting the development of emerging outdoor leaders. Alternative pathways are essential for sector long term survival.	Yes I agree.	Yes there needs to be guide to the acceptable minimum standard.
Yes I agree.	Provided that it is clear and unambiguous to our organisation that following this process a leader is accurately deemed competent	Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	I would prefer that this is the case so that it is easy to know whether a leader is qualified or not
Yes I agree.	NOLRS has not worked and does not meet the needs of employers or employees. It only has registered members in WA due to DEC adopting their roping qual for those wishing to book a DEC climbing or abseiling site.	Yes I agree	I only agree with Pathways 1 & 3. Pathway 2 is way too wishy-washy & potentially too subjective. Pathway 4 has already been tried and failed. Pathway 1 means that what ever qualifications your staff have are supported by an organisation that has qualified for National Organisational Accreditation. Pathway 3 would work really well alongside organisational accreditation as smaller operators or schools do not have the capacity to run the qualification themselves.	I can live with this.	As long as the Organisational Accreditation occurs.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree	These pathways will make it easier for our activity leaders to gain recognition of their skills.	Yes I agree.	This will be a useful tool in defining what is required by an individual leader to lead an activity.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		I can live with this.	
Yes I agree.	It has been a long road/ride/paddle ... but we can best serve the needs of people of all ages in WA/Australia, who want to recreate, to have the safest and best led experience - especially first time.	Yes I agree	The sector is extremely varied and will always be so ...with enthusiasts coming and going/commercial interests booming and busting. There will be waves of 'gimmicky' public approaches must be accommodated by reasoned approaches which take account of the risks and preserve the adventure - whatever the activity - so I have no fear of a variety of qualifications being still relevant.	I can live with this.	There is both a need for prescribed minima and encouragement of extensions to qualifications with RPL being heavily scrutinised and probably discounted after about 5 years without evidence of a refresher. I am happy for a legislated body in the Training Area to take this over and could arrange a deputation to the Training Minister? In the interim - as for the last twenty years or so I will continue to advocate at every opportunity and at every level for Recreation/OR/ Physical activity/Nature Play specialists in our schools etc
Yes I agree.	It is already in place for AAS bushwalking	Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
					<p>The list provided in appendix A is not a list of competencies etc, but a unit code list which contains lots of competency requirements, about 16 per unit.</p> <p>The training package was put together by the training sector and, in theory, produces leaders capable of running programs in a wide range of conditions and circumstances. This means the package is too cumbersome and weighty for some organisations needs.</p> <p>I.e. Scouts WA trains artificial climbing leaders to use specific methods and equipment and disallows staff to change procedures, this results in a much smaller sub-set of the training package to be needed for our staff. Procedures, standard risk, environmental issues, emergency response etc are set and documented by people with higher qualifications and experience.</p> <p>Outdoor leaders need to be capable of running programs, and dealing with non-routine issues within the context of their workplace only, yes it would be good to have further skills but not required. This mainly applies to artificial surfaces where conditions are set, there are far fewer variables from an expedition type context and support is close to hand.</p>
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		No I do not agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		I can live with this.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.	Park Trek Walking Holidays values more experiential learning for it's guides. Maturity, life experience are better ways of learning how to deal with people generally.	Yes I agree	Park Trek Walking Holidays vets its guides through offering work experince opportunities. It is through these opportunities that we get to assess and give feedback to our potential staffers. A paperwork driven process does not work for us as anyone can tick boxes and say they understand. But seeing them in the flesh is quite different.	I can live with this.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		No I do not agree.	

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
Yes I agree.		I can live with this.	In combination where relevant, but in many cases solely initially when appointed. Increased skills and where available formal qualifications are often gained once in a position.	I can live with this.	Providing this list contains recommended items and not all are compulsory. Many people gain initial skills and passion for outdoor activities through participation and on job training.
Yes I agree.	Organisational accreditation must also have industry benchmarks that they can be measured against. It is not enough for organisations to create their own benchmarks. This leaves room for unethical organisations to set their own very low bar. It would be ideal if there was a reporting or audit mechanism in place to capture or hold unsavory organisations accountable.	Yes I agree	The AAS should be an attainable benchmark for organisations to measure their operations against. The pathways are important, but unless there is a benchmark that is supported and attainable it will revert back to the 90s where it was a free for all. There must also be a process to measure compliance. The pathways and standards cannot sit on their own. It is too late to audit who is complying after an incident has occurred. We need to know that it is working in the present and strategies need to be put in place to encourage compliance.	I can live with this.	Also suggest showing pathways on how to gain and develop skills, address skills gaps. Yes - that would be helpful... as long as it is clear that the list is a guide and that only the qualifications/skills relevant to the organisation's activities need be included in their training program/documentation.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.	I think we need to be very careful to ensure that we have an adequate definition of what a 'dependent group' is. We currently have the position where recreational bushwalking clubs are being restricted from conducting activities in places like Karijini because their leaders do not have formal NOLRS qualification. This leads to less bushwalking than would otherwise be the case. It leads to activities taking place on a less formalised basis than would otherwise be the case. In one case I know of the two leaders involved plan to undertake special formal training at considerable personal cost, to allow them to continue to conduct an activity in Karijini that they have safely conducted for a good number of years. The 'old' system has led to less activity overall, to less safe activity, and to increased cost.	I can live with this.	I believe that we need to be very careful not to encumber the recreational bushwalking sector - as distinct from the educational and commercial sectors with additional bureaucratic rules. Increased bureaucracy will lead to less bushwalking activity, and to increased difficulty in finding leaders and will not lead to increased safety. This sector already has an enviable safety record.	I can live with this.	Again, We need to ensure that recreational bushwalking clubs do not get caught up in bureaucracy that is intended for educational and commercial activities. these clubs conduct a very wide range of activities and leadership skills need to be fit for purpose - and the clubs have a history of selecting leaders very well. History has shown us that every time the bureaucracy is increased more of their competent leaders decide it is all too difficult to take a group and decide to walk alone. This is surely not in anybody's best interest.
Yes I agree.	This has worked for years in the organisation I am in, and as the say if it aint broke why fix it.	Yes I agree	Again it has been working for scouts for a number of years already.	I can live with this.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.	I believe some of this occurs in the outdoor world already. However I think the organisation should be responsible and if the organisation is satisfied with the qualifications of the leaders.	Yes I agree	RPL and these techniques are suitable.	Yes I agree.	

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
Yes I agree.	We need to consider however, that the organisation running the activity has a suitable amount of experience and insurance to cover the outdoor leaders that they say are suitable. Perhaps a minimum requirements list for the organisations needs to be set in place before this can go ahead??	Yes I agree	A mix of these is best if possible	I can live with this.	As long as these quals, skills, knowledge and experience aren't a 'prerequisite', then this would be fine. Need to think of people starting out their careers in the outdoor sector, they wont have the years of experience but may have the skills and knowledge.
Yes I agree.		I can live with this.		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.	This allows the organisation to select staff on the basis that they have the potential to do the job at hand without necessarily having the academic ability to gain the formal qualifications. We are being over run by academics trying to create a regulatory framework in areas where they quite frequently do not have the capability to do the physical areas of the job. All they are doing is trying to create a career path for themselves and making life ridiculously difficult for those on the ground providing these activities. It is extremely difficult to attract staff to remote areas unless a little bit of common sense prevails. Let me recruit the staff I want and then train them to do the job the way I want it done.	No I do not agree	Keep the academics out of adventure activities. They'll only stuff the industry up like they have everywhere else that they've poked their noses in.	No I do not agree.	Once again, you are trying to make life difficult for activities operating in remote areas. The system is not broke....so don't try to fix it just to justify your own position.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	It would be nice to hear representatives from industry in other states, to see what they believe has or has not worked oin their AAS. Rather than reinventing the wheel we should be looking at ways to get the wheel more efficient.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.	Having 30 years experience in outback survival,adventure training and various associated activities I agree that there should have always been a skills, knowledge and personality suitability test available as a choice to all organisations to a standard they require	Yes I agree	I believe there should be a logical and affordable choice of options for all sectors to apply and in some cases the ability to provide thier own standards becuase of the diversity and levels of skills required, from school excursions to extreme wilderness challenges	Yes I agree.	Please consult the organisations where lower skills and experince are all that is required - have a leveled based skills requirement and make it easier for those people to still conduct thier business activities. A scheme that employs the a system that is easier and realistic based on common sense would be welcomed
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		No I do not agree.	Not needed, not acceptable. If adopted, then a short list of needed compentencies only, not the bloated training package that is the entire problem to start with.
Yes I agree.	As I am responsible for employing staff to be running activities i will not employ anyone without personally knowing there skills and abilities first hand. i believe it is a duty of care to look after my clients in this way.	I can live with this.	it is good as long as everyone is being trained to the same standards.	I can live with this.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
Yes I agree.	Have concerns about the consistency of Leader qualifications between organisations. Differing standards could place participants and others users at risk. I can see that this currently exists regardless by my experiences and as outlined in the summary..	Yes I agree	Definately a combination is required. Could some organisations see this repsonsibility as too risky and start to withdraw outdoor opportunities, I hope not but already within the Education system that I am invloved with the conversation of risk always raises questions and nervousness within the heirarchy.	Yes I agree.	I believe that the added guidance will make it easier for aspiring leaders and organisations to achieve competence.
Yes I agree. Yes I agree.	Absolutely, I believe individual organisations need to be able to make employment decisions for themselves as blanket policies can never suit all cases and inevitably lead to them being ignored. Documented framework would help individuals decided whether an individuals qualifications are suited to their program.	Yes I agree Yes I agree	Finally a common sense approach which allows for employers to use their discretion.	Yes I agree. Yes I agree.	Provided it is a well researched comprehensive list.
Yes I agree. Yes I agree.	Organisations should have the autonomy to do what works for them. Outdoor leaders should be able to regulate their peers and staff to ensure best practice and appropriate skill level.	Yes I agree Yes I agree	These are good pathways but some of them shouldn't be used in isolation. For example, I wouldn't want people thinking they could get a Formal Training Qualification and then 10 years later go and work in the outdoor sector havinig done no skills practice, training or log book time since the initial training.	Yes I agree. I can live with this.	This could be a good way for people to get information about qualification pathways and the units required for skill sets.
Yes I agree.	The concept that peers in your industry control your ability to access sites and run activities for your students/charges is fraught with potential nepotism, conflicts of interest and as we've seen in past, blatant autocracy. The self annoited 'peak body' status of OWA has been used/abused in the past by both OWA and DEC to force un-needed change, beauracracy, cost and control. You have to admit, this survey is one small concession to the fact. One perfect example is the decimation of the abseiling instructor community by the forced instroction of NOLRS. The 'wheel was never broken' but a handful of righteous people in OWA decided to ram it down everybody's throats. 3/4 of the skilled roping instructor community disappeared from the industry as a result. What a waste of knowledge and experience. We stopped running roping activites as a result and several hundred dollars worth of gear was discarded. My years of experiance didn't evaporate simply because we could not justify a tenfold increase in annual paperwork costs.	Yes I agree	Single-entity control is prone to disquiet.	I can live with this.	

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		I can live with this.	The comeptancies should be a guide and not mandatory as not all skills are needed for all activities.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	I'm also concerned as to who will maintain the lists of competancies. If Outdoors WA maintains them then they should be called Outdoors WA's Adventure Activity Standards.
Yes I agree.	Fantastic idea. From a Head of Phys Ed at a large OED program, this will place the recognition of competency back with the school. I like that idea.	Yes I agree	We will combine Peer recognition and formal qualification.	Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.	Fully support the change from NOLRS which is far too prescriptive, expensive and cumbersome overall. Sets the bar impossibly high in many instances and precludes good personnel from being used because of it. Definitely support the individual organisation taking more responsibility for determining local suitability for leaders.	Yes I agree	I think the outlined model gives the greatest flexibility and resonableness to the provision of outdoor leader selection.	I can live with this.	Yes, providing the process does not make a simple task complex.
Yes I agree.	I have been in the industry full time for over 12 years and 10 years before that. I have a firm conviction on this subject as i have seen many good people come and go because of the red tape and hoops that we all have to jump threw. I am registered with NOLRS but ultimately the responsibilty lies with the organisation running the activity to make sure they have accredited competent and upto date people running their programs. I will take experience and competency over a Piece of paper any day.	Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		I can live with this.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		I can live with this.		I can live with this.	We need to minimise red tape for the small operators. It is the death of events, clubs and small business.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.	There are alot of experienced outdoor providers out there who have the judgement to make the call whether someone is a suitable leader or not.	Yes I agree	We need the flexibility to recognise different types of qualifications ie. A highly experienced person from over east or even the UK isnt recognised under the current regime.	Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
Yes I agree.	As long as it does not lead to a dumbing down of instructors. In house training is not a substitute for industry recognised courses.	Yes I agree	Definitely a combination but none should stand alone.	Yes I agree.	As long as there are multiple ways to achieve the units of competency. There are many experienced instructors out there who have been denied registration because they lack one or two competences on paper where in reality they meet the requirements in their work everyday. There are also many new instructors graduating cert III and above courses with all the paperwork but little experience making decisions in the field.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.	This approach is the most appropriate for two main reasons. Firstly, it allows individual organisations the flexibility to determine their own requirements for leaders whilst taking responsibility for the 'assessment' and holding the risk of their leaders in the particular activity. With the vast array of clubs, organisations and businesses operating in this field, there exists a variety of skills required depending on the type of activity being undertaken. As in Outward Bound's case, we require our staff to be very competent off track guides which may differ from the requirements of a weekend bushwalking club that never takes a group off track. We need that flexibility to ensure our staff are competent and confident in a particular discipline. The second reason this approach is supported is due to the current 'stale-mate' with regards to minimum qualifications and registration required for leaders. At least with the determination resting with the organisation, we can get on with the job of putting people in the outdoors in a safe environment and be confident that our organisations have a system to recognise our leaders.	Yes I agree	Outward Bound is fortunate to be able to deliver formal qualifications through our internship program, so this combination of pathways suits our current structure. It also allows us to be more flexible in taking on direct entry staff who may have other qualifications and experience.	Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	We struggle to attract leaders who will be willing to perform the additional requirements above the actual leading of a trip or project. We do believe this is an essential part of the planning and conducting the Project to ensure a safe outcome and to be able to show procedures were followed and preparations documented.
Yes I agree.	Yes, This is a great step back to the reality of what's happening in practice and put's the onus back on the operator, who is ultimately responsible anyway.	Yes I agree	Gives a good amount of flexibility. I like it.	Yes I agree.	Good work on this.
Yes I agree.	This will encourage more training and provide better outcomes.	Yes I agree	Discussed within the committee.	Yes I agree.	

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
Yes I agree.	There should be more than one way for a person to be recognised as suitable. The organisations will have to have documented framework though	Yes I agree	Far too many people have been "locked out" due to not having formal qualifications. This will help overcome the problem	Yes I agree.	Good idea, appendices will help.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		I can live with this.	
Yes I agree.	an appropriate skill level still needs to be maintained across the outdoor industry	Yes I agree	I believe prior experience will have greater recognition and a lesser workload will be required to fulfill a specialized registration process	Yes I agree.	It will help determine the grey area in the outdoor industry.
Yes I agree.	This is something we have already implemented and see it as the only way forward for us to keep our volunteers with the organisation.	Yes I agree		I can live with this.	most of this is fine but I would like to raise a point. The Bibbulmun Track has, as part of its route, a 120m canoe crossing on flat water (Irwin Inlet). For our guides to be able to lead a walk from Walpole to Denmark it is necessary to cross the inlet. If our guides do not have NORLS in canoeing (and none including myself, do) then we can no longer lead walks on that section - moreover ever lead an end-to-end walk. To hire a guide for 120m crossing is completely impractical - especially given it remote location. This is quite an issue and it would be good if there was some way to address it rather than simply turn a blind eye to it which is what happens currently.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.	Yes, I agree in totality... it is long overdue.	Yes I agree	My one question would be this, how are small or mid-sized businesses held accountable for ensuring currency and competency of leaders??? Large businesses will likely use Cert III or Cert 4 quals plus an internal 'pass out' (e.g. what you've labelled 'Organisational accreditation or qualification') whereas clubs will likely base decisions on (very experienced) peer recognition systems (e.g. what you've called Peer recognition and verification). I can see the potential for small or mid-sized businesses (or even schools for example) slipping through the gaps for numerous reasons.	Yes I agree.	Yes, I agree... Whereas NORLS, Australian Canoeing, and Cert 4 statements of attainments are black and white, university degrees are a little different. I think the appendices will need to be just as prescriptive in relation to the acquisition of hard skills within the different university degrees.
Yes I agree.	The responsibility for the acts of the frontline instructors lies with the employers and hence this is a more inclusive strategy rather than a more restrictive (one size fits all) one that is in place.	Yes I agree	It is practical and more inclusive yet it does not compromise on issues of accountability. It is simple and affordable for everyone - especially the instructors.	Yes I agree.	Some thoughts about overseas quols... some are world class (and some may need bridging modules for the Australian/specific environments here) from way - the British Canoe Union or the American Mountaineering Assn or from the National Outdoor Leadership School etc....or courses from the eastern states...i believe the new proposal allows for individual organisations and employers to assess these overseas competencies/quols based on their needs

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	Is there a legitimate reason, other than current NOLRS location, that the Qld AAS is used as the provisional listing? What does this say about the current WA AAS?
Yes I agree.	This is great. Small bushwalking clubs and organisations are quite capable of self-determining their leaders. they do not need to go through a formal process.	Yes I agree	The less paperwork the better. having been in a walking club for the best part of thirty years I know what will work. Anything that smacks of bureaucracy will not. having said that I think there may be scope, for those who want to, is to achieve formal qualifications.	I can live with this.	I would like to see the list before I comment on this. I think a web-based registry is the way to go rather than leaving it to the clubs to maintain. It would also make it transferrable if someone decides to change clubs. I see a role for the Federation in this whole process.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		I can live with this.	
Yes I agree.	however this should not mean that someone who is deemed competent without relevant qualifications should be left with a group (rope, water environments). In house training is a good idea and 1-2 yearly if not more frequently. organisations should re-induct and assess competencies so if any changes are made they can be met and corrected where need be.	Yes I agree	see answer to question 1	Yes I agree.	a wonderful idea however experience wise there are some leaders out there who also need updating- in house training and re-inductions should cover this. -old school vs new skills -safeguarding children (laws are becoming more and more restricting on contact and everyone needs to be made aware of them. ie i cant just give a child a hug if they are crying i have to ask them if they need one)
Yes I agree.	I have been working in outdoor education as my primary source of employment for nearly twenty years with over three hundred weeks in the field leading groups from 10 to 75 years. I have been working in WA for 11 years and would very much like to continue doing so. Being forced to register (and pay?) for NOLRS would be very difficult and expensive for me as I have very little in the way of formal qualifications. The organisations I work for have recognised and appreciated my experience and given me whatever training I require on the job.	Yes I agree	My experience in the industry has been primarily through pathways 1 and 2 especially considering the relevance of on the job training in extremely remote locations such as the central Kimberley. If I am required to prove formal training qualifications and forced to meet registration requirements I fear I may be excluded from working in WA and all that experience that may be available for training future leaders in that environment will be lost to WA.	I can live with this.	It is not easy to find individuals with the skills set required to work in remote locations and this strategy looks to make our task all the more difficult. I am a strong believer in the value of extended backcountry expeditions in outdoor education and I fear this strategy places pressure on organisations to dramatically increase their workload to meet a qualifications framework that may not be wholly relevant to them.

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
Yes I agree.	The commercial principle that the operator is accountable for staff, their at work safety and their ability to perform tasks to a satisfactory standard has been the backbone of most commercial sectors. Increasingly the same principles are expected of for not for profit and volunteer agencies. The change reflects the reality.	Yes I agree	The strategy recognises that skills and experience come from a wide range of sources. The experience outdoor leaders provide is not just about skills but encompasses their life experiences that only enhance the client relationship.	Yes I agree.	Yes, some work may be required on the definitions. It is reasonable to recognise to a certain level. I am unclear how deep it needs to be i.e do we include Bobs Bunkhouse abseil tower safety orientation day Certificate? There are 3 certificates I have personal interest in that may form part of the 'list' Munda Biddi Trail Foundation Basic Mechanics Course Munda Biddi Trail Foundation Ride Guide Leaders Course. Rescue 3 Whitewater Rescue Technician Certificate
Yes I agree.	This process will be easier to manage and is more sustainable and industry friendly.	Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	General Comment - anything that allows an easier or more flexible approach. Potentially having the closed or single pathway is a deterrent for community members to enter the 'outdoor' industry. The cost of pursuing awards and qualifications is prohibitive for individuals unless pursuing for career objectives - enjoyment and participation are not considered. I am a member of a mentored 'paddling' club via the Dept of Sport and Recreation. To try and maintain a suitable level of leadership ratios etc. is difficult if the pathway is narrow and expensive. We aim to provide enjoyment and participation for a group of 'mature' participants in a safe learning environment and to do this within the 'official' policy guidelines of DSR.

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
Yes I agree.	I agree it is important to recognise the experience of our leaders, and this often is so much more than a qualification. I like this option to give organisations the responsibility to ensure their staff are suitably qualified for the position they are being staffed for.	Yes I agree		I can live with this.	I agree with this in parts. I think we should be careful and aware not to narrow the field of recognisable qualifications too much - both Australian and international qualifications. I believe we should be open to international qualifications that equal, or surpass Australian qualifications. A key example would be the NZ NZOIA Qualifications, which set a very high industry standard in NZ. We should recognise NZ instructors who have these qualifications. I think this should be written on the AAS (that we accept international certifications of equal or higher standard) I note, we can not list all acceptable qualifications/certifications on our AAS, so maybe this is where the organisations play their role in ensuring the leaders they employ are qualified appropriately.
Yes I agree.	Many organizations have excellent training opportunities and standards for their staff to become competent outdoor leaders without the need to seek external trainers.	Yes I agree	Some of the most competent and highly skilled instructors I have worked with have not completed a cert III or above. I have also found that some of the prac students and fellow instructors I have worked with over the years lack fundamental qualities like sound judgement and decision making abilities despite having completed cert III and even university undergraduate courses.	Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.	Restricting the role of outdoor educators to just those who are willing to pay for and participate in institutionalised accreditations above and beyond current first aid puts great limitations on the depth and diversity of our educator pool. It would be ridiculous for an industry based on experiential education to place little value on employment based training.	Yes I agree	I was inspired by the wisdom of ORIC after reading their draft AAS for NSW. This range of pathways is what they support and they place great value on field experience.	I can live with this.	Only if it is non prescriptive and doesn't involve costly certification that needs constant renewal. It is enough of a burden to remain current with Wilderness First Aid as a field instructor on minimum wages.
Yes I agree.	This seems like a common sense approach allowing flexibility yet clear requirements to ensure a high standard of safety.	Yes I agree	We already have a strict process in place to identify suitable outdoor leaders and the pathways mentioned will work well for our organisation.	Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree. Yes I agree.	Yes, organisations need to have the option to show accountability & responsibility (with the aid of a well structured framework that sets them up for success) for assessing staff competency as 'leaders'.	Yes I agree Yes I agree	Especially in the area of Outdoor Leadership & Education, there are so very many avenues for 'Leaders' to have gained competence. There absolutely needs to be a structure in place to be able to assess this within an organisation. It would be very limiting to define only one avenue for this assessment, & likely alienate some of the most experienced 'leaders' in the process.	Yes I agree. Yes I agree.	

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
Yes I agree.	<p>Voluntary, non profit clubs are totally different than commercial organisations.</p> <p>People that participate on activities with Action Outdoors Association do so at their own risk. They sign an acknowledgement that they accept this as a requirement to participate on the activity. Participants are in effect a guest of the trip leader and as such do not have any right or expectation the trip leader will look after their well being.</p> <p>Furthermore, The Volunteers (Protection from Liability) Act 2002 protects volunteers in clubs that are incorporated under the Associations Act 1987</p> <p>If people want the trip leader to look after their welfare then they should participate on commercial trips where they pay an appropriately trained and experienced person to lead the event and look after their safety. Otherwise they participate on activities run by volunteers and accept all the risks that involves.</p>	No I do not agree	It is inappropriate for voluntary, non profit associations to be obliged to develop leadership skills. It is a barrier to volunteers to lead trips, not required under The Volunteers (Protection from Liability) Act 2002 and does not differentiate voluntary clubs from commercial ventures.	No I do not agree.	It is inappropriate for voluntary, non profit associations to be obliged to develop competencies, skills or knowledge of its trip leaders. It is a barrier to volunteers to lead trips, not required under The Volunteers (Protection from Liability) Act 2002 and does not differentiate voluntary clubs from commercial ventures.
Yes I agree.	I believe that it is detrimental to the outdoor sector to require national training certifications or schemes outside of individual organizations. The organization running the activity should be responsible for ensuring and determining the suitability of leaders through a documented framework.	I can live with this.	All four pathways are good as long as registration schemes or formal training qualifications outside of individual organizations do not become the de facto standard. Individual organizations must always have the ability to operate using their own in-house training.	No I do not agree.	I believe that it is detrimental to the outdoor sector to require national training certifications or schemes outside of individual organizations. The organization running the activity should be responsible for ensuring and determining the suitability of leaders through a documented framework.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.	We need to make it easier for people that want to work in the industry to be qualified. Where is the rest of the states with NOLRS is it working for us?	Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.	<p>The change is positive in that it recognises that the NOLRS 'one-size-fits-all' approach lacks flexibility.</p> <p>Provided that leadership and authority selection and development decisions made by individual organisations are capable of being supported by appropriate processes and documentation this change should be supported.</p>	Yes I agree	This combination better reflects the real world mix of learning and experience that characterises good leaders.	Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.	I believe that the individual organisation should be able to assess their leaders and if they believe that they are competent and capable then they should be allowed to take groups etc for an activity.	No I do not agree	Being a small business i feel that it will be hard to find staff if there are too many qualifications/ accreditations needed.when more often than not a lot of people have the experience without the piece of paper to go with it. Therefore i think that the individual should be responsible for selecting suitable staff regardless of whether they have the paper to prove their skills.	No I do not agree.	As mentioned before i believe the individual organisation should train their staff and when they believe the employee is ready then let them conduct the activity.

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
Yes I agree.	I believe that the individual organisation should be able to assess their leaders and if they believe that they are competent and capable then they should be allowed to take groups etc for an activity.	No I do not agree	Being a small business i feel that it will be hard to find staff if there are too many qualifications/ accreditations needed.when more often than not a lot of people have the experience without the piece of paper to go with it. Therefore i think that the individual should be responsible for selecting suitable staff regardless of whether they have the paper to prove their skills.	No I do not agree.	As mentioned before i believe the individual organisation should train their staff and when they believe the employee is ready then let them conduct the activity.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
Yes I agree.		No I do not agree	We as a club only agree with the principle of Peer Recognition and Verification and feel it is relevant to our club as our club is small. Personally I feel that for small clubs like ours the impost of having to have formal qualifications to lead activities will only cause stagnation in activities and growth for the club and the people. I have seen clubs and organisations implode trying to comply with the standards and so people go it alone putting lives and property at risk.	No I do not agree.	As a club we do not agree as we believe it is best to pass on best practice standards and further develop the required skills while adhering to club policy and procedures.
Yes I agree.		Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
No I do not agree.	It's really hard to answer this question because I feel that another question needs to be asked alongside this - "do organisations need to be accredited to ensure that, organisationally, they are running their operations in accordance with national industry best practice?" I could answer 'yes' to this question, but I can't without knowing the answer to my question above. To ensure that an organisation is able to make the judgements that are in the suggested changes, the people running the organisation need to have been measured against industry best practice and the entire operations of the organisation need to be considered against a similar bar. Outdoors WA may well consider that I am tainted by others in this organisation but I hope that OWA is mature enough to realise that, having worked nationally and internationally in the profession for 20 years for a diverse spectrum of providers, I am able to make my own mind up about all issues that come before me.	I can live with this.	Once an organisation goes through its own accreditation, I feel that the identified pathways would provide suitable professionals to our industry - whether starting out or coming in as mature outdoor professionals. I do feel though that we need to be careful in the area of "peer review" if an organisation has been accredited to ensure that the appropriate staff within that organisation are accrediting staff against qualifications/standards/competencies that are deemed to be industry best practice.	No I do not agree.	Aren't we talking about two separate things here - Adventure Activity Standards and Outdoor Leader qualifications/competencies? I realise that to run an activity we need the outdoor leader but can we not keep them separate so that we can see a clear delineation between the two things: the activity and the person?

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
No I do not agree.	<p>It would be helpful if the wording "Organisations MUST have a documented process to recognise leaders," were replaced with "Effectuated Organisations", or "Organisations with dependent participants". This is covered in the Preamble, however a narrow reading of the AAS may put social groups/clubs which do not provide leaders/instruction/training and do not have dependant participants, in a legally precarious position. Drafters of the AAS should be careful not to negatively impact activities of groups of independent participants.</p> <p>As long as drafters are sensitive to this concern I have no objection.</p>	I can live with this.		I can live with this.	
No I do not agree.	<p>I do not support NOLRS nor this. Over-regulation is killing our industry and producing generation upon generation of people brainwashed into believing they are all entitled to anything they wish.</p> <p>The NOLRS is a classic example of creeping Orwellian '1984'-type lunacy, reducing everything important to suit the lowest possible denominator, which ultimately cedes total power to bureaucracy.</p>	No I do not agree	<p>I do not recognise your authority to intrude upon my businesses' practices, nor do I accept that I will have to pay more to cover the costs of these impractical, intrusive and meaningless regulations. because I am one of the many who will pay for it in increased fees etc - you certainly won't.</p> <p>Congratulations on compiling yet another layer of business-killing costs.</p>	No I do not agree.	<p>Why do you insist that no one except bureaucrats have a brain, when actually they are the least likely to have one, being subsumed by the committee mentality as they are, ie denying individual competence and pandering to insignificant interest groups.</p> <p>Why do I bother anyway. The idea of feedback to any government body's decision making is an utter farce and only the intention of seeking it merely a way to keep mouths working, so brains don't need to kick in, it is never sincerely meant.</p>

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
No I do not agree.	<p>This comment is in relation to the use of DEC sites.</p> <p>Moving away from NOLRS or having another scheme is a great idea however;</p> <p>1/ If an outdoor leader is employed/contracted by a large organisation, ie DSR then this can work IF DEC will accept the organisation evidence for that staff members skill/confirmed competency.</p> <p>2/ For small business operators with one or two people then this will not work; there would be no method for confirmation of skills currency.</p> <p>DEC requires a method of skills currency for the use of DEC sites.</p> <p>As far as I am aware DSR is the only organisation in WA that requires staff to have NOLRS.</p> <p>We still need another system for operators that work/use DEC sites for confirmation of their skill currency.</p>	I can live with this.		Yes I agree.	
No I do not agree.	<p>As a independent tour operator this is just more red tape we will need to go through. We just had the Green Ticks enforced on to us and this in itself should have a training schedule for tour leaders as well as fatigue management and so on. We have to carry the can for the insurance, park fees, training as well as try and run a profitable business in a very depleted market. What I have noticed talking to school teachers from other country's especially the UK , that they have had so many restrictions placed on them when conducting field trips and tours that most schools are no longer doing them.</p>	No I do not agree		No I do not agree.	<p>It is up to the company's to employ and train the right people if the don't they will go out of business. Its called free enterprise.</p>
No I do not agree.	<p>There should be one national standard for each activity for leaders, with recognition paths for those who may have other qualifications. This is the only way the public can have any confidence in a consistent level of leadership qualifications.</p> <p>It also removes the risk of negligence on the part of organisations.</p>	No I do not agree	<p>Organisations need a clear national stanadrd to work to, not a range of options which they are typically not qualified to assess. One national leader registration or award scheme for each activity s the standard that should apply.</p>	No I do not agree.	<p>This is a completely misguided concept. Leaders should do the work and get the appropriate nationally recognised quals, and organisations should use appropriately qualified leaders.</p> <p>The outdoor industry should step up and use and advocate nationally recognised quals the same as any other profession.</p>

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
	<p>The current WA AAS are too restrictive in the area of Leader Competencies, however, the proposed amendments go too far the other way. I believe that we need to accept in the AAS we are looking to:</p> <p>'benchmark the MINIMUM industry requirements and responsibilities for organisations and leaders conducting outdoor adventure activities for commercial and non – commercial groups'.</p> <p>but expecting organisations to adequately formally assess their leaders is fraught with danger. Many organisations struggle to find qualified leaders for their activities and it is just too risky to hope that they won't put a less than ideal leader in to get them out of trouble.</p>				
No I do not agree.	I am open to many other pathways including a WA State based version of NOLRS2.	I can live with this.	The key words above are 'pathways in combination'.	I can live with this.	Appendix A refers to units of competency from a Registered Training Organisation, are you saying that you support a VET only system? This does not make sense to me.
No I do not agree.	This is saying that the AAS will only recognize skills from within Australia which is limiting.	No I do not agree	I think that you DO need to have qualifications, again, I dont think it should be Australia-specific quals. I think we should have a system that recognizes international standards and quals.	No I do not agree.	see previous comments
I can live with this.	As long as the organisation has been qualified to make the assessment	Yes I agree	With clear requirements and organisations being qualified to make assessments	I can live with this.	Need to define what makes an organisation responsible
I can live with this.		I can live with this.	In kayaking/canoeing Aus.Canoeing is its own registration scheme. I do not think there is a need for more.	I can live with this.	
	Worried that some groups may end of "certifying " own leaders and not making people work up to a standard. How about makming organisations get otehr org to cerify or peer certify their staff?				
I can live with this.	DET is likely to not do anything as I it does not want to be responsible for certifying leaders.	Yes I agree	See my comments above.	Yes I agree.	

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
I can live with this.	I can see the sense of this approach for the current situation in WA - guides stay around for short periods, extreme levels of conservatism and turf protection by employers/providers and basically zero training opportunities and those that do exist are largely poorly attended. Interestingly training that has stuck around has often been in situations where you are required to have the qual eg SW rescue. So whilst making sense in the current scenario it is unlikely to take the outdoors sector forward to a more professional (for want of a better term) approach to training. A guide works for an organisation and does all their in-house training and this occurs at most organisations they work for. It ends up bitsy, there is also likely to be inconsistency in practice between employers and the guide will waste a lot of professional development time doing training at exactly the same level for each organisation they work for.	I can live with this.	I think that this approach has many advantages however it is unlikely to encourage training improvements as organisations simply do what they have always done. New ideas and methods do not filter through the sector or worse Chinese whispers occurs with new techniques. This happens because there is no pressure to send people to outside training. The lack of opportunities and high cost of training will see in house training as especially attractive. So I can't see how a guide will be rewarded for being involved in developmental training that is often expensive but also rigorously assessed. Once again this will not encourage the ongoing development of leaders in the outdoors.	I can live with this.	I like the idea of using someone else's standards - why reinvent the wheel especially as the sector in WA is far too immature to develop its own. Why Queensland? The scheme really needs to recognise qualifications gained internationally. I can see no reason as to why community and medium to large organisations will get involved in training or recognition schemes outside of their organisations. This recognises the current situation but it will not encourage participation in quality external training. A current problem that we have with training is lack of numbers and lack of opportunities. This scheme won't address this. My concern is that with so many options organisations will go - "good lots of options we can force fit what we currently do into one of them". Whilst the current situation with NORLS etc has not been a good one of the good things has been to get the message out that minimum standards exist and must be adhered to.
I can live with this.		I can live with this.	I note that the quals mentioned in appendix B are all Australian - what about quals obtained outside of Australia? So I hope those are just examples and not the only quals recognised.	I can live with this.	I note that the quals mentioned in appendix B are all Australian - what about quals obtained outside of Australia? So I hope those are just examples and not the only quals recognised. Otherwise we are not much better off than having only NOLS registration.
I can live with this.		I can live with this.		Yes I agree.	
I can live with this.		I can live with this.		No I do not agree.	
I can live with this.		Yes I agree	I do think that some organisations are not capable of handling this extremely important decision and responsibility. I believe that there should be some sort of a governing body which deem leaders competent or not competent. Also if it is solely up to an organisation to do peer recognition, there could be a number of people advancing into positions which they are not qualified or ready for - due to "mates being mates" and approving incompetent people.	Yes I agree.	

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
I can live with this.	I can live with this. The intrusion of external bodies into accreditation for outdoor activities such as caving and bushwalking in Western Australia - which has one of the most benign environments on the planet (and having travelled and caved extensively in some of the less benign environments I can vouch for that) - has for far too long been an inappropriate and stifling intrusion into the freedom of the individual to develop their character and enter into a full appreciation of the outdoor environment by undertaking activities that present some level of risk. I would be even happier if Outdoors WA was proposing to wind itself up and disappear after concluding this survey, but that is probably too much to hope for.	I can live with this.	As for Qu 1!	I can live with this.	I can live with this, provided that it is made clear in the wording that the Queensland AAS list (what on Earth would Douglas Mawson or Hubert Wilkins think about that lot?) is NOT intended to set a minimum standard, and is NOT intended to limit the ingenuity of any organisation in finding ways to recognise its leaders. I would also prefer that Outdoors WA should, in any case of dispute with a particular organisation about the adequacy of a list or of the qualifications of an individual, defer to the wishes and experience of that organisation.
I can live with this.	But, What can be done to an organisation that abuses the system? What will DEC accept to book sites?	Yes I agree	Some employers over East will only accept statements of attainment.	Yes I agree.	I welcome the consideration of multiple pathways. Generally this discussion and recommendations are heading in the right direction. The current system is cumbersome, expensive and generally unworkable if you are a volunteer or part time leader in multiple disciplines. We just need to be sure we are not exchanging one over controlling system for another. I think the industry needs to develop an interactive web tool to help leaders and organisations maintain their leadership qualifications, documentations and logs in a generally common format to allow individuals to move around the industry.
I can live with this.		I can live with this.		I can live with this.	
I can live with this.	As a Bronze Examiner for Royal Life, I see their standards as very workable. One, two and three year renewals ensures maintainance of required fitness, skills and knowledge. If my child is engaged in an aquatic activity, I want a leader who is fit, current and familiar. Small groups may not have the scope of ongoing experience to engage regular requalification. E.G. Roping industry in WA has many potential assessors.	Yes I agree	Like Q1, I feel Royal Life have it right with Organisational Accreditation and Formal Training. However, my SES membership shows me how an inflexible system will not recognise my prior learning and SRT quals. The SES General Leadership qualification is an excellent blueprint for all AAS's.	Yes I agree.	As long as the competencies are not purely peer assessed. Each leader needs to regularly demonstate competence. E.G. SRT with Brett Huntly each 3 years kept us all current.
I can live with this.		I can live with this.		I can live with this.	

Qu 1	Q1.	Qu 2	Qu 2.	Qu 3	Qu 3.
I can live with this.	Organisations have ALWAYS (legally) been "responsible for ensuring and determining the suitability of leaders through a documented framework" The implementation of this 'whatever' it is.....is nothing new. All companies, organisations have always been RESPONSIBLE for determining the suitability of their own leaders....through whatever process (documented or otherwise, they would be foolish not to!)	I can live with this.	No comment.....seems pretty obvious, hasn't this realistically ALWAYS been done by most organisations, schools, campsites, contractors, companies??? If not - why not???	I can live with this.	Seems obvious enough?
I can live with this.	One thing that made NORLS ideal for DEC was the fact that DEC did not have to review each person who wanted to work on DEC land them self's, NORLS did this for them. My concern is who is going to review each organisation's paper work if DEC again do not wish to do this?	Yes I agree		Yes I agree.	
I can live with this.	...but who will ensure that the paperwork is done consistently so organisations like DEC and EDWA recognise it? If this can't be achieved then I can't see how anything will improve for my organisation.	I can live with this.	I can live with this only if Commercial Organisations are not targeted as the exception to the rule as has happened in the past where volunteers have made the rules for professionals in Industry. Both permanent staff at Shaw HoriZons are NOLRS registered. Shaw HoriZons is currently going through a compulsory accreditation with the WA Tourism Assoc as required by DEC before I can renew it's Tour Operator's License.. How many registrations, qualifications, licenses and accreditations are needed for this industry? It's got a bit silly.	I can live with this.	I can live with this if it doesn't require current NOLRS registered people to have to add competencies to their current qualifications. I have had enough of having to update skills and qualifications to find that the system now calls for more and more registrations and statements of attainment before I can continue working in a job I have been doing sucessfully for almost 30 years....