

20 May 2025

AN OPEN LETTER TO INDUSTRY

Dear Colleagues,

While this letter is longer than is ideal, the volume of recent developments and multi-channel commentary by others has compelled the Alliance to respond in full and with the clarity the situation demands. The Scaffolding Training Alliance is not a 'breakaway' group from CISRS. It does not seek to replace CISRS, and it aims to maintain and improve the excellent work that CISRS has done to date. Its members are currently CISRS core scheme training providers that have come together to form a not-for-profit interest group.

The Scaffolding Training Alliance (STA) was formed in March 2025, as a learner provider network, in direct response to widespread and growing concerns shared by CISRS scaffolding training providers across the UK. These concerns relate to changes that have been confirmed for 01 June and to further changes that are proposed by NASC/CISRS. They also relate to the current governance arrangements at NASC/CISRS.

For many years, scaffolding training providers and CISRS have shared a good working relationship - one built on openness, honesty, respect, and trust. This mutual understanding led providers to believe that formal group representation was unnecessary. However, recent developments and decisions by CISRS have prompted providers to form an alliance, viewing it as the most effective way to uphold the wider industry's best interests, and to collectively seek answers to questions that individual member organisations had already been raising with NASC/CISRS, but which were simply ignored or unanswered.

Those without detailed knowledge of the CISRS scheme's history may not realise that many of its positive developments were originally proposed and implemented by training providers - often voluntarily and in the spirit of goodwill and including the frequent gifting of IP protected materials. It is the Alliance's aim to maintain positive links with industry leaders, but recent events, actions and statements from those leaders are now eroding decades of goodwill.

The Scaffolding Training Alliance is formed from members who give up their own time in pursuit of protecting the integrity and quality of the CISRS scheme, which, over the past 60 years or so, has evolved to be the gold standard for scaffolding training across the globe and is the envy of many other construction and engineering trades.

The Alliance is not a closed group - membership is open to all CISRS scaffolding training providers, with three tiers of membership as defined in its constitution. An elected Executive Committee, comprised of experienced training providers, governs the Alliance. Senior executives from NASC and CISRS have been advised of the Alliance's constitution and are fully aware of its member organisations. Any

suggestion to the contrary is simply untrue, and therefore, recent media articles should be considered inaccurate.

This letter aims to provide the industry with accurate information in response to recent inaccuracies circulated in the media and to provide an outline of our members' experiences to date. Whilst it is regrettable that the Alliance feels the need to communicate in this manner, the significant platforms enjoyed by NASC and CISRS require a proactive approach to safeguarding a scheme that is widely respected and valued. Furthermore, the Alliance believes that recent media reports seek to misrepresent the Alliance, and to cast it and its membership in a negative light, and we must therefore respond.

One such report quotes NASC as expressing '*disappointment with the public commentary.*' The article in question simply announces the formation of a new industry group (the Alliance) and outlines its objectives. We are genuinely puzzled as to why an announcement of this nature would provoke *disappointment*. NASC/CISRS have stated that they will no longer correspond with the Alliance. In an email exchange with the Alliance, they wrote: '*Further under advice CISRS and NASC has been advised that the construct that is Scaffolding Training Alliance is potentially a cartel, any dialogue could be consider [sic] price fixing or anti-competitive by other centres*' and: '*This will be our last correspondence with the Scaffolding Training Alliance.*' This unfounded and baseless allegation suggests to the Alliance that NASC/CISRS do not value, nor see the need for, consultation with the expert training providers that form its membership.

Many issues have been causing concern among scaffolding training providers, with a general and growing unease about the direction of the CISRS scheme over the past two years. Broadly, these concerns relate to:

- A lack of robust and transparent governance
- A degradation of standards and quality
- A lack of distinction between NASC and CISRS
- Poor communication with training providers
- Lack of meaningful consultation
- Failure to acknowledge and consider provider feedback
- Health and safety (in reduced specification centres and a lack of related training material)
- CISRS customer service delays
- Slow responses from CISRS arising from a lack of knowledgeable and competent resource

In recent months, NASC has made statements suggesting their ownership of CISRS. However, the Alliance understands NASC to be the custodian of CISRS, with ownership shared among trade unions and other industry stakeholders, through the Construction Industry Joint Council (CIJC). In the interests of transparency and good governance, the Alliance calls on NASC and CISRS to provide clear clarification regarding ownership, and the relationships between NASC and CISRS, and the various entities registered at Companies House with NASC/CISRS Directors/Officers, as many in the industry are now unclear as to what representation each of those organisations provides, and the governance structure under which they both operate.

Furthermore, the Alliance seeks clarity on how the recent constitutional changes at NASC/CISRS were made, particularly how the new role of CISRS Chair was established, and what governance processes supported its creation, as clear distinctions previously existed between the two organisations.

The Alliance is also concerned by the apparent lack of balance in current governance arrangements, as it steadfastly believes that the industry is best served by a transparent governance structure that includes representation from all stakeholders.

In the summer of 2024, under the headline '*NASC Publishes Scaffolding Training Report and Promises to Work with CISRS to Make Changes*', NASC released the results of what it described as a 'comprehensive survey' as to the industry's perception of CISRS training. [One headline](#) announcing the survey said: 'NASC and CISRS to Overhaul Scaffolding Training Following Eye-Opening 2024 Report'.

Based on responses from 97 organisations, the survey's depth and scope were questioned by several stakeholders within the training industry. While the data presented in the report was largely positive, there was a perception that the findings were framed in an unnecessarily negative light. This led to the view that the report may have been used to support proposed changes to the CISRS scheme, by the NASC executive. At this stage, some training providers expressed concern that the survey process appeared to be a *fait accompli*, and the limited evidence of open, balanced, and transparent consultation have contributed to that impression.

In October 2024 NASC subsequently commissioned a second independent survey, but despite requests from individual Alliance members, the full results from this survey have never been shared and those requests remain unanswered. Nevertheless, NASC/CISRS continues to advance proposed changes to the CISRS scheme – some of which the Alliance considers ill-conceived and regressive. The Alliance therefore calls upon NASC to publish the full and unredacted survey findings, and to engage in open and transparent dialogue with stakeholders to review the results and to jointly address any perceived areas for improvement.

The lack of transparency regarding NASC/CISRS's underlying motives and objectives remains a significant concern for the Alliance. Around the time of NASC's initial survey, the stated rationale centred on the need to expand capacity* at CISRS training centres in order to address the industry's skills shortage. However, this premise was challenged by training providers, many of whom reported that they had existing capacity and were not operating at full utilisation. Moreover, it is widely recognised that the root cause of the skills shortage lies not in training capacity, but in the limited number of individuals entering the industry. Recent government data supports this view, indicating a projected decline in demand for construction workers in the coming years - a trend attributed to the prevailing economic climate.

In the view of the Alliance, the current narrative from NASC appears to have shifted toward a focus on enhancing the quality of CISRS training. While the Alliance fully embraces the principle of continuous improvement and is supportive of genuine efforts to strengthen and modernise the CISRS scheme, its members are united in the belief that such developments must be pursued through a genuinely collaborative and transparent process - not through the perfunctory approach that has characterised engagement to date.

In a recent media post, a CISRS executive is quoted as saying: *“We believe change must be guided by those who use and rely on CISRS qualifications and not by commercial training providers with vested interests.”* That same executive is also quoted as saying: *“The changes that have been announced for CISRS and that are in development have been demanded by employers and cardholders, while some commercially interested training providers have resisted modernisation.”*

The Alliance refutes, in the strongest terms, that our members are resistant to modernisation. The Alliance is of the belief that statements of this nature expose NASC/CISRS’s approach to governance. While the quoted CISRS executive correctly asserts that commercial training providers should not have a unilateral voice in determining the direction or operation of the CISRS scheme, he fails to acknowledge that the same principle must also apply to commercial scaffolding contractors. Effective governance requires balanced representation and inclusive decision-making, not dominance by any single stakeholder group. In this context, that means both commercial scaffolding contractors and commercial training providers, amongst others.

In a recent letter to providers from CISRS, a senior executive announced that they are shortly forming a new Quality Committee and states, *“ASITO will no longer input into CISRS, instead the new committee which will be led by an independent chair, appointed by the CISRS board will draw from a select group of employers, qualified educationalists and centres.”* The Alliance is concerned that it will duplicate and potentially undermine the balanced governance function performed by the Access and Scaffolding Industry Training Organisation (ASITO). Furthermore, there is apprehension that it could introduce bias favouring the interests of NASC, who now control the Board and may influence the appointments to this new committee.

CISRS provides qualifications for the entire scaffolding industry - not just NASC members. This has always been the basis for NASC’s appointment as custodian of the scheme by the Construction Industry Joint Council (CIJC). Historically, the day-to-day operational management of the scheme has been the responsibility of the Scheme Manager, (a role which no longer exists) under the oversight of the Board of Directors. Responsibility for industry consultation and the ratification of significant changes to the scheme has been vested in the ASITO.

The ASITO committee comprises a broad cross-section of industry stakeholders, including representatives from CITB, trade unions, employers (via trade bodies such as the NASC and, more recently, the Scaffolding Association), and training providers. The ASITO Chairperson also serves on the NASC Council, acting as a formal two-way conduit to ensure that the views of NASC Council representatives are communicated, and that updates on industry training and qualifications are effectively relayed.

Formed in 2004, ASITO succeeded the NASC Training Committee and became a CITB-funded National Specialist Training Group, with a mandate to represent the interests of the scaffolding sector. Operating as a not-for-profit organisation, ASITO has historically played a key role in providing balanced governance for the CISRS scheme and its nationally and internationally recognised industry qualifications.

In 2023, NASC established a new Training and Qualifications Committee, primarily composed of representatives from its full contracting members. In the view of the

Alliance, this committee lacks sufficient representation from individuals with training and educational expertise. Historically, issues related to improving training and expanding qualifications within the industry would have been addressed by ASITO.

The Alliance recognises that NASC, as a trade body, is fully entitled to develop training and education initiatives for the benefit of its members and the wider industry. However, the work and outcomes of the NASC committee should not undermine the governance role of the industry wide CISRS scheme, which is overseen by ASITO. Instead, the Alliance believes that NASC should utilise its representation on ASITO to consult and seek ratification of any proposals concerning CISRS, in line with the transparent governance framework the scheme requires. The Alliance acknowledges that the Chair of the NASC committee has attended ASITO meetings and has raised questions, which were promptly addressed by experienced experts present.

Secretariat support for ASITO was traditionally provided by CISRS staff but has more recently been handled by NASC. In the experience of our members, ASITO meetings have progressively suffered from deteriorating communication and inadequate secretariat support for its representative members - for example, receiving meeting confirmation notices only three days before the scheduled date. Additionally, the last 'in-person' meeting was scheduled at short notice on a Friday in central London, which posed accessibility challenges for many, particularly for owners of training businesses who deliver training. Record-keeping has also been problematic, with inaccurate minutes and significant delays in their distribution. When members have requested access to minutes, they were informed that these would only be circulated immediately before the next meeting - a practice the Alliance considers ineffective and inefficient, as it impedes timely progress on agreed actions.

Presentations by NASC at the ASITO meeting on 4 April 2025 included extracts from the independent survey as a mandate for NASC-imposed changes to the CISRS scheme. Despite repeated requests from ASITO members and others, NASC has failed to share the full independent research findings with ASITO members. The letter to providers states, "*...changes identified from the qualitative independent research must start to take place...*". It is clear therefore, that the changes are being imposed without the balanced consideration that ASITO would historically have provided.

The Alliance was shocked to learn this week, that the NASC-controlled ASITO have formally notified the Scaffolding Association that they have had their seats at ASITO removed, for alleged inappropriate behaviour. Alliance members present at the meeting report that they were not aware of any such behaviour, and that they believe this to be further evidence of a dictatorial approach to governance.

The centre specification changes that become effective on 01 June 2025, (along with the 18-month moratorium imposed by CISRS for outdoor centres), have never been presented to ASITO members; consequently, the wider industry's views were neither consulted nor considered. This represents another example of the traditional governance process being bypassed and highlights a lack of transparency by NASC and CISRS. The Alliance believes that this approach is far from transparent and open, and that it could be viewed by some external observers as undemocratic.

NASC/CISRS frequently asserts that the changes already implemented - and those currently under consideration - have been the result of 'extensive consultation'. However, the experience of Alliance members differs from the stated position. From our members' standpoint, the consultation process has been far from extensive or fair, leading to a growing sense of frustration and concern regarding the transparency and inclusivity of stakeholder engagement.

The Alliance is extremely disappointed that all of their feedback has been ignored. Whilst an 18-month moratorium and an increase in accreditation fees for outdoor training will be implemented, the changes to the scheme will still disadvantage those that have invested £millions and have long-term commitments to existing indoor centres. The 18-month moratorium is being sold as a form of commercial compensation to existing providers, however, it is the view of the Alliance that the increased audit fees are in no way compensatory for the commercial advantage that would be enjoyed by new providers. To suggest so is insulting to those that have demonstrated commitment and loyalty to the scheme over several decades.

The perfunctory nature of consultation and engagement has also been evident in the approach taken by NASC/CISRS regarding the contracts they are seeking to *impose* on training providers. To date, Alliance members have not experienced any meaningful dialogue with either NASC or CISRS on this matter. Members report that while draft contracts were circulated for comment, the feedback provided was almost exclusively ignored. Because some providers had not received the first draft due to a CISRS administration error, a second draft was subsequently issued by NASC/CISRS, incorporating only one substantive change: an extension of CISRS' proposed payment terms from 14 days to the more standard 30 days. All other comments and queries raised by members remained unaddressed.

One Alliance member reported returning their feedback to the second draft contract with over 30 comments and queries. None of these were addressed by NASC/CISRS, and less than 48 hours later, the member received the 'final' contract electronically, accompanied by the following message from an NASC executive: ".../ *acknowledge that there are potentially questions and I would be happy to answer them [sic]. I look forward to you signing the final contract **that will not be amended from here.***" (Bold text added for our emphasis.)

It is deeply disrespectful to our members - who collectively possess centuries of experience in scaffolding, training, and the wider industry - to suggest that this approach is anything other than a top-down directive. Moreover, it reinforces the perception that the proposed and soon-to-be changes are/were a *fait accompli*, rather than the result of genuine consultation.

A significant concern within the contract is the one-month termination period, which states: "*Any termination would be based on the rules defined by the training manual.*" This clause effectively grants CISRS/NASC the right to terminate agreements for even the most minor of infractions, which our members - many of whom have invested in CISRS for decades - find unacceptable. While our membership acknowledges the necessity of a termination clause, we believe it should align with standards seen in Government contracts, allowing for a remediation and correction period, which serves to protect the interests of learners, who would be severely disadvantaged if a centre's 'CISRS licence' was revoked. The

notion that a long-standing provider with an unblemished record could have their contract terminated on such short notice is, quite frankly, unreasonable.

In the experience of Alliance members, the overarching issue of inadequate consultation has been exacerbated by NASC/CISRS's delayed and inconsistent communication efforts. Whilst some inquiries from Alliance members have received responses, others appear to have been completely disregarded. In early March 2025, CISRS wrote to all providers. The letter, signed by an NASC executive, opened with the paragraph: *“As you are aware, following the independent research and following our most recent presentation, there have been significant problems with training capacity in CISRS centres. It is therefore vital for us to address this in a way that is both fair and open.”* As we have outlined previously, Alliance members do not consider there to be an issue with capacity, and therefore, they dispute the basis of the letter.

The letter describes CISRS's current training centre specifications as a 'barrier to entry' and 'anti-competitive', and goes on to propose several alternative options for these requirements:

- Retain 10m in height
- Reduce height to 8m
- Open air centres with increased auditing and cost requirements
- 70m² minimum training area retained (three delegates per 70m²)
- Mix of 8m and open air for advanced courses, with increased auditing and cost requirements

Our membership responded, and provided detailed feedback, which outlined concerns about an overall degradation in standards and potential impact on the safety of scaffolding trainees. No acknowledgement or response was provided by NASC, and instead providers received a letter, which advised that the changes 'proposed' would be implemented on 01 June 2025.

The feedback provided by our members included:

- Concerns about the apparent lack of good governance at NASC/CISRS
- Safety-related concerns about delivering scaffolding training outdoors
- The reduced height specification using current training materials is potentially unsafe
- Practical advice on the difficulty on rescheduling training that has been abandoned because of inclement weather
- Concerns that existing providers had made significant investment into building 10m high centres, or that they had long-term leases for 10m high centres, and that by reducing the required centre height to 8m, any new providers would be given an unfair commercial advantage, as buildings lower in height are less expensive to build and lease

NASC's decision not to respond to these points further reinforces the perception that the changes were a fait accompli, and that the 'consultation' process was merely a box-ticking exercise. Moreover, although some of the revised specifications are set to take effect on 1 June 2025, CISRS has yet to update its training materials to reflect the use of reduced-height scaffolding structures in courses. As a result,

reference materials will be outdated. The Alliance sees this as further evidence of a rushed and poorly considered implementation.

The Alliance fully embraces the principle of continual improvement, and our members remain open to discussing any changes that would enhance scaffolder training in the UK. History demonstrates this commitment, with providers consistently leading efforts to improve the scheme. However, in recent times, proposals for meaningful enhancements have largely been ignored. For example, during a meeting with NASC in early March, one of our members suggested developing a pre-apprenticeship programme for 18 to 24-year-olds, aligning with the NASC/CISRS initiative to attract more young people to the industry. To date, no feedback on this proposal has been received.

The lack of responsiveness and delays in handling enquiries now extend beyond executive-level interactions, with our members increasingly frustrated by the growing wait times their administration teams face when seeking clarification on card and training matters. Historically, our members' administration teams could call CISRS and receive immediate support. Today, however, they are instructed to submit email enquiries, with responses often taking five days or more. These delays not only inconvenience a training provider's customers, but they also reflect poorly on training providers, as customers are often left with the impression that the fault lies with the provider.

In addition to delays in handling general administrative enquiries, CISRS card delivery times have also increased. Previously, completed card applications, including delivery, were often processed within seven working days. However, over the past four weeks, delivery times have stretched to as long as 25 days.

To be clear, these comments are not directed at individual CISRS team members. The Alliance believes they reflect the broader staffing changes at NASC and CISRS in recent times, which have been significant, and which have resulted in a significant loss of industry knowledge.

On 13 May 2025, (two weeks or so after NASC's communication with the Alliance) our members were dumbfounded to learn of the formation of two new businesses at Companies House. Both businesses have one officer – the NASC CEO. These businesses are:

[Scaffolding Training Alliance Ltd](#)
[Scaffolder Training Alliance Ltd](#)

The Alliance is at a loss as to why NASC/CISRS would use both time and money to register names closely resembling the Scaffolding Training Alliance, and we invite readers to draw their own conclusions as to why this might be. For transparency, we intend to formally change and register our (new) name in the near future to prevent any further attempts at confusion or imitation. Regardless of the name that we choose, the Alliance is here to stay, and our members will continue to advocate for meaningful improvements in the scaffolding industry.

As a matter of record, as a voluntary, non-commercial and not-for-profit Alliance of learner providers, our membership has never felt the need to register as a Limited Company at Companies House. The Alliance disagrees that not registering the name

at Companies House shows a '*lack of professionalism*', instead, we would say it demonstrates a lack of understanding on the part of those making such statements. The Alliance is not for profit, and it is not a limited company, so there is no reason for it to be registered in this way.

The Alliance is aware of recent internal communications circulated by CISRS to NASC council members. In those communications, CISRS suggest there is no trading agreement or service levels between CISRS and training providers.

The Alliance accepts that there has never been a formal written contract between CISRS and providers. However, in lieu of a formal written contract, providers and CISRS have historically operated under a licensing arrangement through audited compliance with the CISRS CAP specifications, and it is simply not true to infer that providers have operated without boundaries, direct requirements and sanctions.

In a letter to CISRS centres, dated 29 April 2025, (the day prior to the end of the consultation period) confirming CISRS scheme changes to providers, CISRS' Chair of the Board stated: *"To support these changes, a new contract will shortly be issued to all approved centres for approval via docu sign. This contract has been designed to be balanced and proportionate, reflecting both our mutual obligations and shared commitment to excellence. Of course, it remains your choice whether to enter the contract. However, any centre that is not under contract by the time of renewal will, regrettably, cease to be CISRS-approved."* We are aware that this 'sign or cease to deliver CISRS training' edict has also been communicated to Councillors. The Alliance believes this to be further demonstration of an autocratic approach to Governance.

Alliance members remain open to formalising a contract with NASC/CISRS, and they view CISRS' desire to do so as a reasonable course of action. However, the contract must be agreed by all parties, and not simply imposed, without proper negotiation.

The Alliance is aware that NASC Councillors have also been advised that there are 'over 11 variations' of CAP publications, specifying the scheme rules. Confusingly, in a recent podcast, the NASC CEO made reference to 17 CAP documents. Alliance members are aware of only 6 CAP documents, and not the inflated numbers referred to by NASC executives. Regardless, these publications have historically provided the performance standards for the CISRS and the providers working within the scheme, and as stated above, these have recently been merged by NASC/CISRS. The current 'all encompassing' CAP document, which NASC/CISRS refer to as both a 'handbook' and a 'manual', stands at a staggering 229 pages in length. The 'new' publication is littered with poor grammar and contains multiple instances of information duplication, along with other errors, which some would say is indicative of a hasty and ill-thought-out approach. Our members have taken the time to report these errors to NASC/CISRS and have even offered to form a working group to assist with a full review, but those offers have yet to warrant the courtesy of a response.

While CISRS has claimed that the handbook/manual is simply a merged version of the existing CAP documents, it also includes 'final' information related to the amended centre specifications. At the time of the handbook/manual's release, these specifications were still under 'consultation', which leads the Alliance to conclude that the process was consultative in name only. This suggests that CISRS had no

genuine intention of considering the views of its expert training providers, as outlined previously in this letter.

The Alliance understands that in communications with the Council, NASC has advised Councillors that there is no current system for approving centres, and that approval decisions were based on personal relationships. In the experience of Alliance members, this is categorically not the case. Indeed, our members report that the historic application process was subject to audit and part of a larger robust process. Historically, it was common for those opening new centres to be supported by established providers in hosting centre visits and sharing information and experiences with would-be providers. Those showing interest in opening a CISRS centre (and their subsequent audit status) always formed part of ASITO discussions, and it appears to be a misrepresentation for NASC to suggest this was not the case.

Over the past 12 months, NASC has actively promoted the idea of converting the existing Overseas Scaffolder Training Scheme (OSTS) into an industrial scaffolder scheme. During meetings this year, executives have claimed that approximately 400 OSTS cardholders are currently working in the UK. However, this figure is unsubstantiated and cannot be independently verified, and the Alliance remains sceptical about the accuracy of these claims.

It is important to note that OSTS was established exclusively to offer industry-recognised qualifications outside the EU and UK. It was never intended to serve as a pathway into the UK scheme for OSTS cardholders, as this would risk creating a two-tier system of occupational qualifications for the same trade within the UK. Moreover, OSTS training is not directly comparable to the UK scheme for several reasons, the most significant being:

- There is no CSCS affiliation
- OSTS does not contain vocational assessment (NVQ/SVQ)
- OSTS does not include skills testing
- The various levels are not comparable, i.e. OSTS level 2 is similar to UK Part 1 (Trainee Scaffolder)

In response to concerns raised at CISRS meetings, both UK and international providers proposed that NASC/CISRS conduct a mapping exercise and develop a conversion course to align OSTS with the standards of the UK CISRS. This process would typically involve a gap analysis, the completion of an NVQ, and a skills test, ensuring that overseas standards are elevated rather than compromising the integrity of UK standards.

A pragmatic long-term solution proposed by providers was to elevate OSTS standards to a level comparable with the UK scheme, without compromising UK occupational performance standards. A formal statement confirming CISRS's position is expected in November 2025. However, the Alliance is concerned that this approach could lead to a reduction in the standards applied to individuals trained and employed within the UK industrial sector.

In light of the above, the Alliance considers it to be an imperative for NASC and other scaffolding industry stakeholders, to issue a statement to raise awareness of this anomaly.

The Alliance maintains that current UK CISRS standards should apply uniformly to all scaffolders, across all industry sectors. The introduction of a two-tier system is considered wholly unacceptable and would represent a significant erosion of established UK standards.

The Alliance is concerned that NASC/CISRS Board members are proposing to introduce wider constitutional change to give more powers to the executive Boards of both NASC and CISRS, and thereby remove opportunities for representative Council members to question and challenge the decision-making processes, and the strategic direction of the respective organisations. We understand that this is a proposed motion at a meeting in June.

In closing, we wish to reiterate the fact that the Alliance is not a 'breakaway' group. It does not seek to replace CISRS, and it aims to maintain and improve the excellent work that CISRS has done to date.

It is the shared view of Alliance members that our recent experiences are an indication of the dilution of standards at NASC/CISRS, which are being packaged as something altogether different. This is evidenced through the undemocratic approach to the changes made/being proposed, the imposition of a contract, and without any of the proposed amendments to the handbook/manual, all without proper consultation and in a backdrop of diminishing governance.

The Alliance calls for proper governance and proper consultation and a pause to the proposed changes to the CISRS scaffold training scheme, until proper consultation has been carried out. This pause will enable comprehensive consideration of diverse stakeholder perspectives, ensuring that all parties collaborate effectively to advance scaffolding training and safeguard the broader interests of UK scaffolders.

Yours faithfully,

The Scaffolding Training Alliance.

*** Notes on Capacity**

Alliance members acknowledge that CISRS training spaces may be limited at short notice, as they strive to fill courses, a concept based on fundamental economic principles. Reserving places 'just in case' is simply not viable. Much like booking with airlines, securing a spot requires as much notice as possible.