

Response ID ANON-PS6S-9932-3

Submitted to **Review of the mandatory safety standards for portable fire extinguishers**
Submitted on 2019-10-03 15:38:07

Introduction

1 What is your name?

Name:
Robert Hall

2 What is your email address?

Email:
robert@fireworld.com.au

3 What is your organisation?

Organisation:
Fireworld Australia

Key questions

4 What is your preferred option and why?

Please provide your comments:

1. What is your preferred option and why?

Option 2 – Make a new mandatory standard for non-aerosol fire extinguishers and maintain the current mandatory standard for aerosol fire extinguishers

This would be the best solution from the three options outlined. With a referral that Australian Standard AS/NZS 1841.1-2007 as the compliance standard for non-aerosol fire extinguishers be adopted, as it is the later and more current version.

1.1 What have I found benefits of suppling an Australian Standards approved product?

1.1.1 The proven performance of fire testing and ongoing manufactures Audits...

Fireworld have select suppliers in China and Brazil. We have imported fire Extinguishers from them and dealt them with many years. As an importer of product it is still refreshing to have a stringent Australian Standard for fire extinguishers. We know that the product we have meets and often exceeds the requirements of the Australian Standards.

But, I welcome the ongoing audits by the Certifying companies to my suppliers. This is done by both SAI global and Global Mark Australia. This is the checking and double checking that the product that has been certified meets the Australian Standard. This gives me the assurance that there is no difference to the fire extinguishers which we first tested and had approved, to the product that receive today. These audits are transparent and occur twice every year, it is mandatory.

With an Australian Standard the Australian public have assurances on the quality of the fire extinguisher which they have purchased, has been through a process. There can be not substitute when it comes to the quality and reliability of fire extinguishers. This product must work first time all the time

5 Do you agree with our assessment of the international standards?

Please provide your comments:

Yes, very detailed.

6 Would option 2 change your compliance costs for non-aerosol extinguishers?

Please provide your comments:

No,
Our certifiers are already working to Australian Standard AS/NZS 1841:2007 .
So the change would not increase costs at all.

7 Is there any reason the mandatory standard for non-aerosol extinguishers should not reference the latest voluntary Australian standard AS/NZS 1841:2007?

Please provide your comments:

No.

Released under FOI

The mandatory standard for non-aerosol extinguishers should reference the latest voluntary Australian standard AS/NZS 1841:2007. This is the latest version of the standard and should be used

8 Is there any reason the mandatory standard should not be adjusted so that it only applies to the supply of new non-aerosol fire extinguishers and to avoid the current regulatory overlap for routine servicing?

Please provide your comments:

The standard should only apply to brand new non-aerosol fire extinguishers. The service standard AS1851-2012 is for the servicing of fire extinguishers. The two functions should not overlap but remain separate.

An example dry chemical ABE fire extinguisher to be recharged by a service company. The fire extinguisher service is no longer relevant to AS 1841.1 it is being refilled, not manufactured. This is a function is covered by the Australian Standards AS1851-2012.

9 Are there any other options the ACCC should consider?

Please provide your comments:

The publication is very detailed and the three options given are the three best options, for this issue.

This is without other options which may result in the discussion going on different tangents, to things which are not relevant.

10 Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

Please provide your comments:

There is confusion on what is an approved product to AS 1841.1. This is happening in many parts of Australia.

A lot of fire companies are unaware or ignorant that there is now three "compliance assessment bodies" SAI Global, Global mark and the BSI Group. These three organisations are intern, are accredited by JAZ-ANZ, to certify to the Australian Standards.

If the ACCC is publicising the Australian Standards, which relate to the Fire Protection Industry, it would be good if they can inform the general public, who are approved to certify products. This is of the hierarchy of the approval process both the Government and Private Company's involved. Again the Australian Standards for any product has the general public intentions in mind at all time. It would be good for the general public, to see the process, which is in the back ground policing the Australian Standards for there safety.