

**The Animal Welfare (Licensing of Activities Involving Animals) (England) Regulations 2018  
Risk Scoring Table**



Premises ..... Date of Assessment .....

Officer ..... Licence applied for .....

**Please Note: New businesses that do not have three years of compliance history with a local authority or a UKAS-accredited body are automatically considered as high risk as they have no operational history.**

	<b>Low (Score1)</b>	<b>High (Score 2)</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>
<b>Compliance History - inspections</b>	Documented evidence from formal inspections over the previous three years reveal consistent and high levels of compliance in terms of welfare standards and risk management.	Formal inspections over the previous three years reveal some degree of non-compliance that has required the intervention of the inspector for the business to ultimately recognise and address these. More serious breaches would attract other enforcement action: suspension, revocation, prosecution.		
<b>Compliance History – follow up action</b>	No evidence of follow-up action by local authority in the last year apart from providing the licence holder with a copy of the inspection report, or sending them a letter identifying some minor, administrative areas for improvement (e.g. minor record keeping issues).	Follow up action by the local authority, such as sending them letters, triggered by low level non-compliance that is not addressed, or the business does not recognise the significance of the need to address the non-compliance.		
<b>Compliance History – re-inspection</b>	No re-inspection necessary (apart from standard unannounced inspection) before next planned licence inspection / renewal	Re-inspection necessary to ensure compliance.		

<b>Complaint History – complaints to the LA</b>	No complaints received direct to the LA that are justified in relation to welfare standards or procedural issues during the previous three years.	Low level substantiated complaints identifying concerns over the business / licence holder have been received within the previous three years.		
<b>Complaint History – complaints to the business</b>	Licence holder records and documents any feedback received directly, in order to demonstrate compliance and willingness to address issues, and can provide evidence of this.	Licence holder does not record feedback received directly or show willingness to address any issues identified.		
<b>Appreciation of welfare standards - enrichment</b>	Sound understanding by the licence holder of relevant environmental enrichment applicable to the activity (guided by expert advice), with demonstrated implementation.	Little environmental enrichment present, inconsistently used and its importance not understood or really valued.		
<b>Appreciation of hazards / risks</b>	Licence holder clearly understands their role and responsibilities under the legislation. Hazards to both staff and animals clearly understood, properly controlled and reviewed with supporting evidence where applicable.	Licence holder not fully engaged with their role/responsibilities, lacks time to fulfil role, no system for review and reassessment of hazards to both animals and staff.		
<b>Appreciation of hazards / risks - maintenance</b>	A suitably planned maintenance, repair and replacement program for infrastructure and equipment is in place.	No planned maintenance program. Building, installations and equipment allowed to deteriorate before action is implemented.		
<b>Appreciation of hazards / risks –</b>	Staff have specialist and appropriate knowledge of the taxa	Key staff lack experience / knowledge of the species. Staff		

<b>knowledge and experience</b>	/ species that are kept. There is sufficient staff, time and resource for daily, adequate routine monitoring, evidenced through records and staff rotas.	appear overburdened and / or unsupported by management, corners being cut.		
<b>Appreciation of hazards / risks – dealing with issues</b>	Clear defined roles / responsibilities of staff, with clear processes for reporting and addressing any identified issues.	Lack of any process, or ownership and responsibility within the business to identify and deal with issues.		
<b>Welfare management procedures – written procedures</b>	Written procedures / policies clearly documented, implemented and reviewed appropriately.	Limited written procedures / policies. No overall strategic control or direction.		
<b>Welfare management procedures – supervision of staff</b>	Appropriate supervision of staff evident where applicable.	Inadequate supervision of staff evident on inspection or from the training records.		
<b>Welfare management procedures – record keeping</b>	All required records maintained and made available.	Poor standard of record keeping, records out of date or appear to be being manufactured – relevance of records not appreciated.		
<b>Welfare management procedures - training</b>	Planned training programme for staff to review and assess competency, with documented training records.	Little or no evidence of relevant training or system for review and reassessment.		
<b>Total Score</b>				

**Score of 17 or less = Low risk**  
**Score of 18 or more = Higher risk.**