Position paper

**Nationally consistent regulation of pool barriers**

*Recommendations to reduce drowning in Australia by simplifying regulatory systems.*

---

**Executive summary**

Pool fences prevent drowning deaths. Mandatory pool fencing has reduced toddler drowning in Australia but more can be done. We have significant knowledge now about the design aspects that are most effective. These design aspects are incorporated into Australian standards that apply to new pools. However many older pools are not required to meet current standards and many pools remain unfenced because the laws are not easily enforced.

It is likely that drowning rates could be reduced further if regulatory systems were improved. Barrier requirements could be upgraded. Safer standards and design specifications are justified in some jurisdictions. Barrier requirements need to be simplified. It will help if there is less variation in the application of standards and greater national uniformity. Compliance needs to be increased. Regulatory systems should be reformed to include mechanisms that are known to boost compliance.

Research indicates that there are many opportunities to improve the regulation of pool barriers in Australia — systems to encourage compliance and barrier requirements that improve safety. A number of recommendations are proposed.

1. Encourage State and Territory regulators to simplify requirements by reducing the number of variations in the application of standards.
2. Encourage State and Territory regulators to include “upgrade” provisions within legislation so that all existing pool barriers in Australia meet one minimum standard by 2010.
3. Establish a nationally-agreed qualification for pool barrier inspectors.
4. Encourage State and Territory regulators to standardise requirements for pool fence inspectors and adopt nationally recognised qualifications.
5. Encourage State and Territory regulators to require certification of all pool barriers and to adopt simple systems for certification that can involve non-government inspectors.
6. Establish nationally consistent, publicly visible signage for certification of pool barriers.
7. Promote certification requirements and attached liability to property purchasers so that the risk and costs of purchasing a property with an unsafe pool (no certification) becomes an issue at point of sale and a bargaining point for purchasers.
8. Encourage regulators to support public health campaigns on the issue of pool safety.
9. Negotiate more consistent requirements for the configuration of pool barriers for new (four sided, no doorsteps) and existing (four sided, child resistant doorsteps) pools.
Introduction

This aim of this paper is to explore the issue surrounding nationally consistent regulation of pool barriers in Australia and to provide recommendations to reduce drowning in Australia by simplifying regulator systems.

The use of regulation in the prevention of drowning of injuries has been found to be effective when used in conjunction with other strategies. Scott notes that rules and regulation are commonly used in injury prevention because they work. Examples of their effectiveness are evidenced in the reduction of road traffic fatalities via regulation-heavy efforts such as the use of seat belts, child restraints, bicycle and motorcycle helmet use, speeding initiatives, and drink driving laws.

1. The value of pool fencing

The argument for mandatory pool fencing is compelling. Drowning is a major cause of death for Australian toddlers. In 2004/2005, 15 children under the age of five drowned in Australian swimming pools, over 50% of all drowning deaths. For every drowning death there are approximately three more children admitted to hospital as a result of an "immersion incident" and a significant proportion of these (5-20%) suffer brain damage. It has been shown that the lifetime costs per drowning death ranges form $370,000 to $610,467. The highest numbers of hospitalisations for near-drownings occur amongst the 1-3 year olds, and the majority of these involve a swimming pool. This indicates that pool fences can also prevent near-drowning events.

Mandatory pool fencing has been effective in reducing child drowning deaths. The drowning death statistics for toddlers indicate a 58% reduction over the last ten years.

Pool barriers are mandatory in most areas of Australia and uniform standards apply for construction of new barriers. Even so, the regulation of pool barriers varies greatly, both within and across jurisdictions. Different States have different rules about how the standards are applied and different local areas have different
inspection and enforcement processes. It is likely that even more deaths could be prevented if standards were applied consistently.

2. **The value of consistency**

Consistency would help to improve the standard of fencing and to increase compliance.

The standard of pool barriers varies because requirements have changed over time. The standard of pool barriers has improved over time but legislation in many jurisdictions does not require the upgrade of barriers built to earlier standards. Lack of consistency means we are tolerating designs that are known to be less safe.

Lack of consistency also reduces compliance and compliance is a major issue. In some jurisdictions, over half of existing pool barriers can be non-compliant. Research indicates that complexity in regulatory systems works against compliance\textsuperscript{15}. If the rules aren’t simple then people are far less likely to comply. If it is too hard to understand what is needed and too hard to comply then people don’t comply. Greater compliance with pool fencing laws might be achieved if the rules were simpler and more consistent across and within jurisdictions\textsuperscript{16}.

3. **Best practice regulation**

Findings about best practice regulation give us some insight into the sort of regulatory reforms that could be employed to increase compliance\textsuperscript{17,18,19,20}.

Many of the problems found in regulatory systems\textsuperscript{21} apply to Australia’s systems for the regulation of pool barriers: insufficient emphasis on advisory services, excessive paperwork, lack of effective enforcement options, lack of built-in incentives for compliance and inefficient organisational arrangements.

It is also useful to review Australia’s regulatory systems in the context of the identified causes of regulatory failure. Regulatory failure occurs due to (i) poor design of regulations, (ii) poor capability of institutions to monitor and enforce and (iii) lack of inbuilt incentives to drive compliance\textsuperscript{22}. Inconsistency increases complexity which contributes to regulatory failure:

- Information availability — If regulation is inconsistent and complex then clear, simple information about requirements is not readily available.
- Availability of skilled staff — If inspection regimes and qualification requirements vary then it is difficult to hire suitably qualified officers to monitor and enforce requirements.
- Unclear or mixed regulatory authority — Complex regulation increases confusion about regulatory authority for enforcement of pool fencing and other building requirements.
- Contradictory or overlapping objectives — Inconsistency means that there is overlap, in some jurisdictions, between general building approval objectives and pool fencing objectives.
- Lack of flexibility — Standards may be too inflexible to encourage compliance.
- Inadequate investment in monitoring and enforcement — If regulation is complex then inspection and enforcement is costly. Local authorities may not have the resources to invest in these activities.
- Inadequate investment in education — Complex regulation requires greater investment in inspection services and leaves less money for investment in public education. The public may not be aware of what is required and why.
- Affordability of regime in relation to benefits — The existing regulatory system may be so expensive to administer that it is not affordable for local authorities.

Inconsistency complicates inspection and makes it more expensive. Hampton\textsuperscript{23} links this with the failure of regulators to communicate requirements effectively. Regulators often don’t give enough emphasis to
providing advice on compliance because systems for inspection and enforcement are so costly and inefficient that money isn’t available to support advisory services.

Hampton\textsuperscript{24} also notes that institutional arrangements can impact on compliance and many problems are exacerbated by complex regulatory structures. The existence of many small regulators works against economies of scale. Fragmentation occurs when local authorities with small regulatory service departments are not adequately resourced to monitor and enforce regulation. Smaller regulators have fewer resources and find it harder to recruit qualified staff. Small regulatory service departments are also more expensive to run which increases the pro-rata cost of inspections. Small regulators undertake fewer inspections and have higher pro-rate inspection costs.

Institutional structure can improve regulatory outcomes\textsuperscript{25}. Some competition in regulatory bodies is healthy to drive system efficiencies. If local authorities can’t do things efficiently and effectively then it might be best to expand the range of people who can do inspections\textsuperscript{26}.

4. Factors that drive compliance

Regulatory systems can also be reviewed in the context of factors that are known to drive compliance. Hampton\textsuperscript{27} recommends assessment against the Table of Eleven factors that increase the likelihood of compliance, including those that support spontaneous compliance:

1. Knowledge of the requirements
2. Costs of compliance
3. Degree of popular acceptance
4. Natural obedience of stakeholders
5. Extent of informal monitoring.

Aspects of the monitoring and enforcement regime that promote compliance are: probability of report through information channels, probability of inspection and probability of detection.

5. Opportunities to reform legislation and systems

Findings in relation to best practice suggest many options to improve both (i) the structure of Australia’s pool fencing legislation and (ii) aspects of administration, monitoring and enforcement that are known to promote compliance.

5.1 Increase consistency and simplify requirements

If Australia’s pool fencing legislation was simpler and easier to understand it is likely that it would be more effective. The clearest message from existing research is that “less is more”\textsuperscript{28}. Compliance is reduced by complexity. Complexity of regulation and lack of consistency across regulators is a major problem for regulatory systems. Fragmentation means lack of consistent advice and confusion about how to comply. It also increases the cost of compliance and the cost of regulation.

5.2 Build in other factors that drive compliance

Opportunities also exist to improve other aspects of the regulatory system for pool fencing known to drive compliance:

- To improve communication of requirements. Reform legislation so that it is simpler and easier to understand. Communicate requirements clearly to the community.
- To build in incentives. Build in processes to recognise and reward compliance.
- To boost popular acceptance of regulation. Promote the compelling arguments for regulation.
- To increase informal monitoring. Build in mechanisms that promote self-monitoring and monitoring by community members.
- To make use of existing market forces. Build in processes that use market forces to drive compliance.
- To reduce costs of monitoring and enforcement. Increase consistency in the application of standards and introduce competition between regulatory authorities.

6. Conclusions about consistency

Consistency is good because it helps to keep things simple. Complex regulatory systems are costly, inefficient and work against compliance\(^{29}\). Inconsistency frustrates compliance\(^{30}\) and increases the cost of regulation.

An effective system of regulation involves (i) clearly articulated requirements, (ii) a system for monitoring compliance and (iii) a suite of effective enforcement measures.

Consistent requirements make it easier for people to comply. Knowledge about requirements is critical to achieve compliance and simple, consistent requirements are easier to know. **People would be more likely to comply with pool fencing requirements if fencing standards were applied more consistently within and across jurisdictions.**

Consistent monitoring and enforcement is also required to ensure that regulation is effective. Where many small local authorities are involved in monitoring and enforcement, there is often significant variation in inspection regimes, approaches to regulation, application of standards and enforcement action\(^{31}\). The result is a "safety lottery". **Compliance levels would be improved by a common approach to monitoring and enforcement.**

Consistent requirements and systems reduce the cost of regulation because consistency allows for economies of scale. Consistent pool fencing laws would make it possible to fund national awareness and education campaigns. Consistent qualification requirements for inspectors would make it cheaper and easier to build a suitably qualified workforce and to access qualified staff. **Greater consistency in the application of pool fencing standards would allow for economies of scale in public education, training, inspection and enforcement. Savings could be channelled into advisory services.**

7. Moving towards greater consistency

Uniformity in standards has been achieved through Australian Standards (AS1926) for pool fencing and through standards documented in the Building Code of Australia. A sensible, next-step would be to make the application of these standards more uniform across and within jurisdictions.

Step by step approach to increase consistency:

1. Reduce inconsistency within jurisdictions.
2. Remove inconsistency, nationally, in qualification requirements for pool barrier inspectors.
3. Remove inconsistency, nationally, in certification requirements for pool barriers.
4. Require publicly visible signage to verify that pool barriers are compliant and pools are safe.
5. Support a nationally consistent approach to public education that engages market forces to drive compliance.
6. Promote the importance of effective pool barrier regulations.
7. Reduce inconsistency across jurisdictions — Move towards uniform national standards for existing and new pools.

8. **Existing legislation**

Uniformity in standards has been achieved through Australian Standards (AS1926) for pool fencing.

All Australian states and territories have pool fencing legislation and all have adopted the agreed national standards (BCA) for construction of new barriers. However regulatory systems vary significantly and standards are applied differently across jurisdictions.

National standards for building pool fences (BCA) are adopted and applied differently in each jurisdiction. Across jurisdictions there are many different models for regulation of pool barriers — different legislative frameworks, different applications of the national standard, different standards for existing pools and different organisational arrangements to monitor compliance and take enforcement action.

Most variation relates to:
- Application of standards to existing pools
- Inspection requirements
- Enforcement provisions.
8.1 Elements of variation – Application of standards within jurisdictions

Pool fencing legislation could be improved by simplifying requirements within jurisdictions\(^3\). Requirements within jurisdictions vary, primarily, due to changing requirements over time (Table 8.1). Unless legislation includes some sort of “upgrade” provision then requirements vary depending on when the swimming pool was built. This means that in some jurisdictions there can be up to 4 different acceptable fencing configurations (Figure 8.1). Exemptions and flexibility options may also apply. A flexibility option is an allowed variation that accommodates circumstances where compliance is impractical. Flexibility is known to promote compliance where it is required to accommodate exceptional circumstances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>QLD</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Feb 1991 4 sided with protected openings.</td>
<td>Pre1993 pools &lt;5m(^2) surface area, &lt;0.3m deep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Feb 1991 4 sided with protected openings. Plus local law, if more onerous.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemptions</td>
<td>Pools on: - Waterfront properties - Large properties &gt;2 ha</td>
<td>Pools with depth &lt;300mm</td>
<td>Portable wading pools (&lt;450mm deep, &lt; 2000l, no filter)</td>
<td>Pre1993 pools &lt;5m(^2) surface area, &lt;0.3m deep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Local government can grant exemptions if compliance impractical.</td>
<td>On application for disabled occupants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation 1</td>
<td>Variation 2</td>
<td>Variation 3</td>
<td>Variation 4</td>
<td>Variation 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WA</strong></td>
<td>Since November 2001</td>
<td>Pre Nov 2001</td>
<td>Pre June 1992</td>
<td>Portable wading pool (&lt;300mm deep) Depth &lt;300mm not included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS1926 or local government approved.</td>
<td>4 sided, child resistant doorsets</td>
<td>Must upgrade by December 2006 or on sale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 sided, no doorsets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAS</strong></td>
<td>AS 1926.1/2</td>
<td>1986-</td>
<td>Pre 1986</td>
<td>Max surface area &lt;9m² AND depth &lt;300mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 sided, child resistant doorsets</td>
<td>Barrier that complies with national standard</td>
<td>Fence that restricts access from outside the property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT</strong></td>
<td>Since 1997</td>
<td>1986-</td>
<td>Pre 1986</td>
<td>Pool depth &lt;300mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1926.1</td>
<td>Barrier that complies with national standard</td>
<td>Fence that restricts access from outside the property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 sided, child resistant doorsets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NT</strong></td>
<td>Since January 2003</td>
<td>Pre January 2003</td>
<td>&quot;Non-standard safety provisions&quot;</td>
<td>Pools on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Modified Australian Standard&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Community Safety Standard&quot;</td>
<td>• &lt;300m² premises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS1926.1/1926.2</td>
<td>4 sided with doors.</td>
<td>• Waterfront</td>
<td>• premises &gt;1.8 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 sided, no doorsets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hotel/Motels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• holiday accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-standard safety provisions where compliance impractical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8.1. Complexity of regulation (variation in requirements and application of standards), within jurisdictions (as at May 2006).

It is likely that compliance would be increased in most jurisdictions if requirements were simplified.

Recommendation 1
Encourage State and Territory regulators to simplify requirements by reducing the number of variations in the application of standards

Recommendation 2
Encourage State and Territory regulators to include “upgrade” provisions within legislation so that all existing pool barriers in Australia meet one minimum standard by 2010.

8.2 Elements of variation – Qualification requirements for inspectors

Different jurisdictions have different qualification and training requirements for pool fence inspectors. Within jurisdictions there is also variation between qualifications required for certification of new fences and qualifications required for certification of existing fences.

This variations adds a degree of complexity which frustrates inspection and enforcement. It makes it harder to source qualified inspectors and it makes it more expensive to train inspectors. If one national qualification was accepted for pool fence inspectors then national training programs could be developed and economies of scale would reduce training costs. The pool of qualified inspectors would also be increased for all regulators and qualified staff would be easier to source.

Lack of clarity about training requirements also leads to variation in acceptable standards across regulators. Australia's system for regulation of pool fencing involves a large number of small regulators (councils) responsible for inspection and enforcement activities. These small regulators, exercising discretion about the qualifications required by inspectors, will need to consider potential liability for certificates issued in error. It would be useful for regulators to have a nationally agreed standard for training of inspectors and a nationally recognised qualification that could be used to verify an officer's expertise.
Table 8.2: Elements of variation — Qualification requirements for pool fence inspectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Certification of new fences</th>
<th>Inspection/Certification of existing fences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Council/Accredited Certifier</td>
<td>Discretionary for local governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>Municipal or Private Building Surveyor</td>
<td>No provision for on-going inspections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>Building certifier AIBS qualification plus registration</td>
<td>Discretionary for local governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Building certifier</td>
<td>Authorised officers appointed by Minister or Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Discretionary for local governments.</td>
<td>Discretionary for local governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>Building surveyor</td>
<td>No provision for on-going inspections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Building surveyor</td>
<td>No provision for on-going inspections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is likely that inspection and enforcement systems would be more efficient if there was greater uniformity in the qualification requirements for pool fence inspectors.

**Recommendation 3**

Establish a nationally-agreed qualification for pool barrier inspectors.

**Recommendation 4**

Encourage State and Territory regulators to standardise requirements for pool fence inspectors and adopt nationally recognised qualifications.

### 8.3 Elements of variation – Certification requirements and systems

Different jurisdictions have different certification processes and requirements. Certification of new fences often occurs as part of the building approval process but this certification is not specific to the pool fence. Rather it is general to the building work that includes the pool and fence construction. Certification of existing fences is frequently complicated and systems for inspection and certification vary from one local government area to the next.

Research indicates that compliance is likely to increase if the system of certification of fences is easy-to-know, standard across jurisdictions and familiar to homeowners across Australia. Compliance would also be increased if the system for certification of fences had some in-built mechanism to reward compliance, promote public awareness of requirements and to encourage public reporting of non-compliance. The certification system for pool fences offers an ideal opportunity to build in these mechanisms.

A system of nationally consistent, publicly visible signage, verifying pool fence certification, would help to increase compliance. It would reward compliance by making a publicly visible statement about the responsibility taken by homeowners. It would build public awareness of fencing requirements. It would also support public notification of pools without safe fences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Inspection</th>
<th>Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Construction certificate and final inspection at time of construction.</td>
<td>Councils grant certificates of compliance. Issued on application from property owner.</td>
<td>Councils must register pools and appoint inspectors. Councils granted powers of entry.</td>
<td>Councils must order compliance, as required. Penalties apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>Municipal or private building surveyor.</td>
<td>Certificate of final inspection from building surveyor. This certificate is NOT evidence that construction complies.</td>
<td>No provision for ongoing inspections.</td>
<td>Emergency order can be issued by Municipal building surveyor. Penalties apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Council/Private certifier.</td>
<td>Statement of compliance issued once constructed.</td>
<td>Councils with building inspection policies not specific to pools. Councils required to keep statistics on compliance for inspected pools.</td>
<td>Councils required to take action if dangerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Building surveyor</td>
<td>Certificate of completion once constructed. No certification specific to swimming pools or barriers.</td>
<td>No provision for ongoing inspections</td>
<td>No provision for enforcement of pool fencing requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>Inspection for compliance by Building Surveyor. Council must be notified.</td>
<td>Certificate of final inspection issued by building surveyor. Certificate of Completion issued by council or permit authority.</td>
<td>No provision for ongoing inspections.</td>
<td>Council enforcement role only in relation to building work. No provisions specific to swimming pools. A swimming pool is however considered “building work”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisational arrangements vary. In most jurisdictions the role of monitoring and enforcing compliance lies with local governments. In some jurisdictions private certifiers are responsible for assessing and approving building work.
Inspection requirements vary. In some jurisdictions inspection regimes are legislated and councils are required to inspect at stated intervals. In other jurisdictions inspection requirements are at the discretion of councils. In some jurisdictions legislation states that councils can charge a fee for inspections. In other jurisdictions councils must pass their own local laws if they wish to charge a fee. Local governments in New South Wales have called for a standardised certification process to improve regulation of pool fences.

Recommendation 5
*Establish nationally consistent, publicly visible signage for certification of pool barriers.*

Recommendation 6
*Encourage State and Territory regulators to require certification of all pool barriers and to adopt simple systems for certification that can involve non-government inspectors.*

Recommendation 7
*Promote certification requirements and attached liability to property purchasers so that the risk and costs of purchasing a property with an unsafe pool (no certification) becomes an issue at point of sale and a bargaining point for purchasers.*

Recommendation 8
*Encourage regulators to support public health campaigns on the issue of pool safety.*

### 8.4 Elements of variation – Requirements across jurisdictions

All Australian states and territories adopt the Australian Standard for the construction of barriers around swimming pools however this standard is applied differently across jurisdictions. The current Australian Standards (AS1926.1/AS1926.2) provide for flexibility in the configuration of barriers around pools and configuration requirements vary in different jurisdictions.

The legislation in each jurisdiction specifies how barriers must be constructed in relation to other buildings on-premises and, in particular, in relation to the place of residence (Table 8.4). Descriptions for these configurations include:

- **Isolation.** A four sided barrier with all unrelated pool ancillary structures excluded from the pool area.
- **Four sided. No doors.** A four sided barrier that restricts access to the pool by a young child. The barrier may include child resistant windows but not doors.
- **Four sided. Doors allowed.** A four sided barrier and a child resistant doorset restricts access to the pool by a young child and the barrier may include child resistant windows.
- **Perimeter.** Barriers primarily located along the property boundary with no child resistant doorsets or windows from the house to the pool.

Recent research indicates that some barrier configurations are more effective than others at preventing pool access. Specifically three-sided and perimeter barriers have been found to be less effective than isolation or four-sided barriers. Four sided barriers are required in most jurisdictions for new pools but the required configuration for older barriers varies. Safety could be improved if the required configuration for barriers was more consistent and of a high standard in terms of preventing access.

Recommendation 9
*Negotiate more consistent requirements for the configuration of pool barriers for new (four sided, no doorsets) and existing (four sided, child resistant doorsets) pools.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Separation from buildings</th>
<th>Australian Standard</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Barrier specifications</th>
<th>Doors and Windows</th>
<th>Gates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>Highest standard</td>
<td>AS1926.1</td>
<td>Four sided, but can include doors and windows.</td>
<td>As per standard.</td>
<td>As per standard.</td>
<td>Self-closing, self-locking and open outwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Act 1993 Building (Interim) Regulations 2005</td>
<td>Minimal standard</td>
<td>AS1926.1</td>
<td>Barrier to restrict access to part of allotment containing the pool. Can include doors and windows.</td>
<td>Defined in regulation.</td>
<td>Requirements for doors and windows defined in regulations.</td>
<td>Self-closing, self-locking and open outwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Act 1975 Standard Building Regulation 1993</td>
<td>Minimal standard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barrier built to inhibit access by a young child. Openings “protected”.</td>
<td>May have horizontals closer than 900mm. Could have effective height &lt;1200mm.</td>
<td>Openings protected.</td>
<td>Openings protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Highest standard</td>
<td>AS1926.1</td>
<td>Barrier surrounds pool. Can include building walls with child resistant doorsets.</td>
<td>AS1926.1</td>
<td>Child resistant doors and windows.</td>
<td>Self-closing, self-locking and open outwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation from buildings</td>
<td>Australian Standard</td>
<td>Configuration</td>
<td>Barrier specifications</td>
<td>Doors and Windows</td>
<td>Gates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAS</strong>&lt;br&gt;Building Code of Australia applies</td>
<td>Highest standard&lt;br&gt;AS1926.1/.2</td>
<td>4 sided. Barrier can include doors and windows.</td>
<td>AS1926.1</td>
<td>Child resistant and comply with AS 1926.1</td>
<td>Self-closing, self-locking and open outwards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


