

<i>Applicability:</i> <i>PWS wide</i>	PWS Policy and Procedures	<i>Issue Date:</i> 7 May 2004
	<i>Document Title and Reference No:</i> PWS Track Classification Scheme PWS P- 036	<i>Revision Date:</i> 15 th December 2014
<i>Status: Approved</i>		<i>Revision No: 4</i>

Walking Track Classification System

1. Statement of Intent

This policy sets out the PWS position on the relationship between the various extant track classification schemes, lists the elements of each scheme and clarifies the context in which they are most appropriately used.

2. Objective

To clarify and describe the appropriate use of walking track classification schemes by the PWS. The policy also clarifies the guidelines for the use of safety barriers on all walking tracks.

3. Background

Track classification schemes are management frameworks for specifying the levels and standards of development and infrastructure that are appropriate on walking tracks. Such schemes typically delineate both minimum and maximum limits for development – for example specifying both upper and lower acceptable widths for nature trails and high-grade tracks, but may also include criteria such as recommended party sizes or publicity.

3.1 *PWS Track Classification Scheme*

Following a recommendation of the 1994 *Walking Track Management Strategy for the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area*, the PWS adopted a seven-tiered track classification scheme. The scheme was slightly revised in 2003 as a result of a review by the Bushwalking and Track Review (BATR) Panel in partnership with the PWS to address concerns of key stakeholders about particular elements of the original specifications, and was adopted as the PWS's primary track classification system in 2004. The PWS classification scheme is prescriptive, ie. it specifies track standards as guidelines for management.

3.2 *Australian Standard Walking Tracks (AS-2156.1)*

A track classification scheme with a similar structure to the PWS scheme was adopted by Standards Australia in 2001. The previous version of this policy, adopted in 2004, attempted a correlation between the seven-tiered PWS scheme and the six-tiered Australian Standard scheme. This alignment was neither accurate (the two schemes have different numbers of levels and, in some cases, utilise differing elements for classification) nor appropriate (the two schemes were developed for different purposes). As a result, there has been considerable scope for PWS users of the schemes to be confused or misinformed.

3.3 *Other classification systems*

In 2010 the Victorian government's Department of Sustainability and Environment (DSE), in collaboration with other agencies, developed a five-tiered Australian Walking Track Grading System for grading the recreational difficulty of tracks and communicating that information to walkers. The grading system benchmarks to the AS 2156 classes (i.e. a Grade 3 walk corresponds to a Class 3 track), except that a Grade 5 walk corresponds to both Class 5 and 6 tracks.

The Tasmanian PWS has used the system on some Great Short Walk signs, and may adopt it more broadly at some stage in the future. However, this scheme is designed primarily as a system for conveying information to users, not as a technical basis for assessing and prescribing track conditions, and so would not replace either the PWS or AS 2156 schemes described above.

<i>Applicability:</i> <i>PWS wide</i>	PWS Policy and Procedures	<i>Issue Date:</i> 7 May 2004
	<i>Document Title and Reference No:</i> PWS Track Classification Scheme PWS P- 036	<i>Revision Date:</i> 15th December 2014
<i>Status: Approved</i>		<i>Revision No: 4</i>

3.4 Safety barriers

A PWS policy on safety barriers is necessary to address inconsistencies associated with existing standards and to provide a framework for assessing requirements for barriers that aligns with the PWS Visitor Risk Policy and is applicable to local conditions encountered in Tasmania. As this is integrally related to the relevant walking track's class it is included herein as part of the overarching Track Classification Scheme.

Existing standards for design of safety barriers include:

- Australian Standard AS 2156.2 - 2001 *Walking tracks – Part 2: Infrastructure design* (guidance).
- The Building Code of Australia (BCA), also known as the National Construction Code (NCC), Volume 1: Section D2.16 and Volume 2: Part 3.9. The BCA requirements are statutory for all Class 1 – 9 buildings.

Note: Australian Standard AS 1657 – 1992 *Fixed platforms, walkways, stairways and ladders - Design, construction and installation* is generally not applicable to visitor infrastructure (this standard is intended for provision of safe workplaces for employees in a workplace context).

There are a number of issues with AS 2156.2:

- AS 2156.2 provides a framework for specification of barriers on walking track structures but appears to exclude other tracks (specifically on natural ground or fill). This interpretation is not entirely clear; the term 'walking track structures' is not precisely defined.
- For the higher track classes (Class 1- 2), the guidance given by AS 2156.2 actually *exceeds* the requirements of the BCA. For example, AS 2156.2 recommends Type A barriers for effective fall heights over 1.5m on Class 1 tracks, whilst the BCA requires non-climbable (effectively Type A) barriers on buildings only where the effective fall height exceeds 4m.
- The guidance provided by AS 2156 can be overly conservative, particularly for tracks of Class 3 – 4 when compared to the outcomes of PWS visitor risk assessments.

<i>Applicability:</i> <i>PWS wide</i>	PWS Policy and Procedures	<i>Issue Date:</i> 7 May 2004
	<i>Document Title and Reference No:</i> PWS Track Classification Scheme PWS P- 036	<i>Revision Date:</i> 15th December 2014
<i>Status: Approved</i>		<i>Revision No: 4</i>

4. Policy

4.1 Alignment with the Australian Standard (AS 2156)

Classes 1-6 of the AS 2156 scheme correspond broadly (but not exactly) to the W1, W2 and T1-T4 classifications of the PWS scheme, as illustrated in the following diagram, with the correlation increasingly divergent for lower class tracks. Furthermore, the PWS scheme also includes routes, defined as walking corridors that are largely track-free although they may include some pad development (a pad being a visibly-trampled corridor with largely intact litter or vegetation cover).

Detailed specification tables for the two schemes are compiled on the following pages.

Comparison of the PWS and AS 2156 track classification schemes

PWS	W1	W2	T1	T2	T3	T4	R
AS 2156	1	2	3	4	5	6	

4.2 Use of the track classification systems

The PWS scheme is better suited for prescribing the conditions of many Tasmanian walking tracks, particularly the extensive network of unimproved tracks, mainly because the AS scheme lacks detail, for low-grade tracks and routes in particular. (For example, in the AS scheme the specifications for Grades 4-6 provide no guidelines for track width, and the scheme has no category for routes, both necessary for the effective management and monitoring of such tracks). However, the AS scheme is useful for assessing and specifying the condition of high-grade tracks, and particularly of track infrastructure such as elevated structures, because it is nationally recognised as an industry standard and links to other Australian Standards such as building specifications.

For these reasons the PWS will use both schemes as tools for the planning, provision and maintenance of walking tracks across lands managed by PWS, the choice of scheme depending on the context and application.

The AS 2156 documentation notes the primary elements for classification are track conditions (surface and drainage), gradient, signage, infrastructure and terrain, and describes how to utilise these. The risk management, management intervention and publicity specifications are provided as “guidance for managers” only and, in the case of PWS, are more appropriately defined by the Service’s Visitor Risk Management Policy (P-002) and Reserve Standards Framework (RSF), drafted in 2008.

The PWS’s Information Management System (IMS) records both classifications for each track with the AS-2156 class listed as a walking track asset sub-type and the PWS class listed on the metadata tab for the relevant track.

4.3 Safety barriers

This PWS policy is intended to extend and clarify the guidelines for barriers on all walking tracks and associated structures, in a manner that is practical to implement in the majority of situations and is consistent with outcomes from the PWS Visitor Risk Calculator. It is intended to provide consistency between track infrastructure and the BCA for the higher track classes. The policy utilises the principles of AS 2156.2 relating to design of barriers and calculation of effective fall heights. In particular:

<i>Applicability:</i> <i>PWS wide</i>	PWS Policy and Procedures	<i>Issue Date:</i> 7 May 2004
	<i>Document Title and Reference No:</i> PWS Track Classification Scheme PWS P- 036	<i>Revision Date:</i> 15th December 2014
<i>Status: Approved</i>		<i>Revision No: 4</i>

- Barrier types A, B, C and E are as described in AS 2156.2 (note that Type D barriers are excluded from PWS policy as they are not considered safe for children).
- Effective fall heights are calculated as per AS 2156.2.
- Structural design of barriers (for strength) should comply with AS 2156.2.

The barrier standards tabulated on the following page represent a range of installations that will likely comply with (or exceed) the requirements of a PWS Visitor Risk Assessment. Where a risk assessment undertaken in accordance with the Visitor Risk Management Policy (P-002) determines that a safety barrier is to be installed the barrier should be of a type specified in Table 1.

Important: Where there is potential for installation to incur high capital cost, have significant environmental impact or compromise the visitor experience, the proposal must be considered in the context of a site-specific Visitor Risk Assessment and the Reserve Activity Assessment (RAA) process. The outcome of either of these processes may take precedence over this policy.

Applicability:	PWS Policy and Procedures	Issue Date: 7 May 2004
PWS wide	Document Title and Reference No:	Revision Date: 15 th December 2014
Status: Approved	PWS Track Classification Scheme PWS P- 036	Revision No: 3

Application to safety barriers

Generally barriers on built structures (e.g. viewing platforms, bridges and walkways) should comply with the requirements of Track Class T1 or higher, as appropriate. The recommendations for barriers on Track Classes T2, T3, T4 and R generally apply to “natural” fall heights associated with the terrain being traversed.

The PWS Visitor Risk Policy and risk calculator underpins this policy. Where required a visitor risk assessment should be undertaken to verify the appropriate installation of barriers on tracks or built structures.

Table 1

PWS Acceptable Risk Level										
					Severe					
				Substantial						
Neutral			Moderate							
PWS Track Class										
H _{eff} (m)	W1 (& BCA)	W2	T1	T2		T3	T4		R	
0 – 1.0	None	None	None	None		None	None		None	
1.0 – 1.5	B	C	None	None		None	None		None	
1.5 – 3.0	B	C	C*	None		None	None		None	
3.0 – 5.0	A	B	C	C*	E	None		None		None
5.0 – 10.0	A	A	C	C*	E	E	None	None		None
10.0 +	A	A	C	C*		E	None	E	None	None
Built structures & built tracks				Tracks						
Application										

- Type A: Max. opening 125mm, does not facilitate climbing, min. height 1000mm
- Type B: Max. opening 125mm, min. height 1000mm
- Type C: Max. opening 500mm, minimum height 900mm
- Type C*: Barrier required one side only (generally side with greatest fall height)
- Type D: N/A
- Type E: Handhold (e.g. chain or rope), generally on opposite side to fall height

For barrier details refer to AS 2156.2

<i>Applicability:</i> <i>PWS wide</i>	PWS Policy and Procedures	<i>Issue Date:</i> 7 May 2004
	<i>Document Title and Reference No:</i> PWS Track Classification Scheme PWS P- 036	<i>Revision Date:</i> 15th December 2014
<i>Status: Approved</i>		<i>Revision No: 3</i>

5 Procedures

5.1 Factors to consider when classifying a track

The PWS Track Classification Scheme is intended as a prescriptive classification, specifying track standards as guidelines for management (see following table). These include physical factors (width, surface & drainage, gradient, infrastructure) which are primary elements of the scheme and important to consider when constructing or upgrading a track; but no less important are the guidelines for subsequent management of visitor use.

In considering the appropriate class for a track, contextual factors are also important. What does/will the track provide in terms of recreational opportunities and how does this relate to or differ from other tracks in the region? Environmental values and impacts, and management practicality must also be considered.

When classifying existing tracks, existing conditions must be considered.

This doesn't mean a track cannot be prescriptively classified differently to what the on-ground situation suggests (e.g. managed to a lower class), but the track's existing physical condition, use and the likely management input required to affect this change must be considered. If a downgraded classification isn't likely to be practical then there is little point in prescribing it.

It is important to be mindful of the relationship between track classes and the PWS Reserve Standards Framework (RSF) categories for the site(s) containing the track, which themselves specify other standards for management.

5.2 How to change the class of a track

While a track's class is intended to be prescriptive and so guide management, in circumstances where a track's use or level of development has become incompatible with its prescriptive class, or such a change is proposed, then a change of track class may be considered.

A proposal to change a track class (upgrade or downgrade) requires assessment and approval in accordance with the RAA system (Environmental Risk Management Policy).

This may be a RAA specifically for this purpose or form part of a RAA for the related activity that is driving the need to consider a track class change.

The track classification must be consistent with the Reserve Standards Framework (RSF) zoning.

In considering changes to track classes, one must be mindful also of the Reserve Standards Framework (RSF) context as each RSF category only provides for a limited range of track classes (i.e. a proposed change to a track class may also require a change to RSF category, or vice versa). Such changes may also have ramifications for other assets or plans related to the site; consider this carefully.

5.3 Explanatory notes

It should be noted that the Walking Track Classification System has considerable flexibility built in; as such, the system provides for discretion and consideration of contextual factors in its application. However, such flexibility should be exercised consistently and equitably. Examples of this built flexibility are:

Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water & Environment	PWS Track Classification Scheme Policy <i>PWS P- 036</i>	Page 6 of 13
--	--	--------------

Applicability: <i>PWS wide</i>	PWS Policy and Procedures	<i>Issue Date:</i> 7 May 2004
	<i>Document Title and Reference No:</i> PWS Track Classification Scheme PWS P- 036	<i>Revision Date:</i> 15th December 2014
Status: Approved		<i>Revision No:</i> 3

- party sizes are “*recommended*” sizes only; and,
- campsite specifications state that “*in suitable localities an area might have more than one campsite*”.

The following text provides an explanation of the intent and interpretation of various other elements in the following specifications table.

Gradient

The Gradient specifications are provided as ‘guidance for managers’ to assist them in the design and modification of walking tracks. As such, the specifications with respect to track gradients must be applied with a degree of flexibility, for two main reasons:

- Much of the existing track network was established prior to the development and application of a track classification system. Indeed, the path of many tracks evolved as the result of walkers following a line of convenience in negotiating terrain that is often steep, and by its topographic nature restrictive of alternate routes of lesser incline; and,
- Exact specifications would be impractical to implement – for example it would be impractical to ensure that every metre of every T2 track was at a gradient of less than 20°.

Width

Similar to the above, it would be impractical to ensure every part of every track was less than the maximum width specified for the relevant track class, at least for unimproved tracks. Hence, while the width specifications must also be interpreted with a degree of flexibility, extended over-width sections should be avoided or addressed by some kind of management intervention. Preferably no more than 10% of any five kilometre track section (or 10% of total length for shorter tracks) should exceed the maximum prescribed width.

Furthermore, as a general rule, no part of any track other than designated “walks” (W1 and W2) should exceed 2 metres in width in the long term.

The width prescribed by the track’s classification should generally be considered the tread width: that is, the total width of the trampled corridor (on unimproved tracks) or designated walking surface (on structures such as boardwalk).

Some types of constructed track (benching, turnpiking) necessarily require peripheral features such as top or side drains, batters, etc. In these cases these peripheral features are not considered part of a track’s width as far as the track’s class is concerned. It is envisaged that such construction is unlikely to be undertaken on tracks of class T3, T4 and Routes.

As a general principle, the total width of the disturbed corridor occupied by a track should be minimised.

Depth

The depth and extent of erosion considered acceptable for any track must take into account the visual and ecological impact of such erosion in the environment in question.

Depth limits are not specified for particular track classes but, notwithstanding the aforementioned flexibility, as a general rule, erosion depths exceeding 25cm should be avoided where possible. Active soil erosion on lower class tracks may be acceptable if it is expected to stabilise or be arrested by future track work before the depth exceeds 25cm.

<i>Applicability:</i> <i>PWS wide</i>	PWS Policy and Procedures	<i>Issue Date:</i> 7 May 2004
	<i>Document Title and Reference No:</i> PWS Track Classification Scheme PWS P- 036	<i>Revision Date:</i> 15 th December 2014
<i>Status: Approved</i>		<i>Revision No: 3</i>

Surfacing and drainage

The prevention or repair of muddy sections of track will generally be given a lower priority than the prevention or repair of erosion or track widening except where mud churning is causing or is associated with track widening or erosion.

The repair or re-routing of sections of excessively deep (ie. >25cm) mud-bowls may be undertaken on tracks of T2, T3 and T4 standard, and even on localised sections of designated routes, as a low priority in the long term. Such repair should be undertaken using techniques compatible with the track classification, eg. using rock infill or single-width planking.

6. Policy Owner

Grant Dixon

Track Monitoring Officer

APPROVED / ~~NOT APPROVED~~

 17/12/2014

Peter Mooney

General Manager

Tasmania Parks and Wildlife Service

Applicability: <i>PWS wide</i>	PWS Policy and Procedures	Issue Date: 7 May 2004
	Document Title and Reference No: PWS Track Classification Scheme PWS P- 036	Revision Date: 15th December 2014
Status: Approved		Revision No: 3

PWS Tasmanian track classification scheme details

The following table list specifications for the various elements of the Tasmania Parks and Wildlife Service track classification scheme. The scheme is prescriptive, ie. it specifies track standards as guidelines for management.

	W1	W2	T1	T2	T3	T4	Route
Overview	Wheelchair standard nature trail	Standard nature trail	Bushwalking track, may be extensively hardened.	Rough bushwalking track, limited surfacing.	Rough bushwalking track, mostly unimproved.	Often indistinct tracks.	Largely free of tracks.
Length	750m return / 1.5k loop	1.5k return / 3k loop	No limit.	No limit.	No limit.	No limit.	N/A
Width	1.2-2.5m, preferably 1.5-2.0m. Wheelchair passing bays. Ramps 1020 mm with handrails both sides.	0.6-2.5m, preferably 1-2m over most of track.	>500 mm, generally >750 mm. <1.2m. Width variable.	>500 mm but short sections < 500 mm acceptable. Max 1m.	<750 mm.	< 500 mm.	< 500 mm. Pads or tracks to be kept to an absolute minimum.
Surface & drainage	"Shoe" standard. Firm, even, well drained. Edges clearly defined.	Well drained, "shoe" standard. Reasonably firm.	"Boot" standard. May be rocky and uneven in places. Some mud and water acceptable. Extensive hardening acceptable.	"Wet boot" standard. Stabilisation & drainage mainly for environmental purposes but some concessions to user comfort. May be rough over extended sections. Mud up to 200 mm deep acceptable in places.	Improved surfacing/drainage minimal - for environmental purposes only.	Improved surfacing/drainage minimal - for environmental purposes only.	Improved surfacing/drainage minimal - for environmental purposes only.
Gradient	Max 5° (1:11); mostly <2°.	Mostly <8° (or 1:7 or 14%), max 15° (or 1:3.7 or 27%) over short (30 m) sections.	Mostly < 15° (or 1:3.7 or 27%) but may be steeper in places.	Mostly < 20° (or 1:2.8 or 36%) but may be steeper in places.	Limited by environmental considerations only.	Limited by environmental considerations only.	No restrictions.
Steps	No steps; ramps < 1:14	Steps and stairs may be included.					
Vegetation clearance	300 mm at ground, 500 mm at shoulder level, 2.2m height. No obstacles.	300 mm at ground, 500 mm at shoulder level, 2.2m height. No obstacles.	Clear across width and to above head height. Obstacles rare.	Mostly clear across width. Occasional obstacles.	Fairly easy navigation under normal conditions. Some obstacles.	Minimal; sufficient for navigation.	None.

Applicability: <i>PWS wide</i>	PWS Policy and Procedures	Issue Date: <i>7 May 2004</i>
	Document Title and Reference No: PWS Track Classification Scheme PWS P- 036	Revision Date: <i>15th December 2014</i>
Status: Approved		Revision No: 3

	W1	W2	T1	T2	T3	T4	Route
Infra-structure	Bridges to full width, signposts, interpretation facilities, viewing platforms. Shelters and benches are acceptable but not picnic tables. Track markers are unnecessary.	Bridges to full width, signposts, interpretation facilities, viewing platforms. Shelters and benches are acceptable, but not picnic tables. Track markers are unnecessary.	Bridges over all major creeks and rivers. Stepping-stones acceptable; fords acceptable where water generally less than 100 mm deep.	Bridges over major creeks and rivers not normally safely fordable <500 mm deep. Bridges OK to minimise erosion. Log crossings, cable bridges, flying foxes & swing bridges acceptable. Some fords may be flood-prone.	Bridges or other constructed crossings generally not required if major creeks and rivers are normally safely fordable, except for environmental purposes. Rough log bridges acceptable but not necessary. Flying foxes acceptable over rivers which cannot normally be forded, but some fords may be flood-prone. Delays may be expected under abnormal conditions.	Bridges or other constructed crossings generally not provided, except for essential environmental purposes. Natural crossings preferred. Flood delays acceptable.	None except for essential environmental purposes. Natural crossings preferred.
Safety barriers (refer to policy section 4.3.2 for details)	Safety barrier generally required for fall heights >1m.	Safety barrier generally required for fall heights >1m.	Safety barrier generally required for fall heights >1.5m.	Safety barrier generally required for fall heights >3m.	Safety barrier may be required for fall heights >5m.	Safety barrier may be required for fall heights >10m.	None required.
Signs	Directional & interpretive signs provided.	Directional & interpretive signs provided.	Directional signposts at start of track and junctions with tracks of grade T3 or higher; otherwise signs should refer to main (T1) track only (junctions with T4 tracks generally unsigned). Interpretive signs in existing structures only. Other signs may be installed for management and safety purposes.	Directional signposts at start of track and junctions with tracks of grade T3 or higher; otherwise signs should refer to main (T2) track only (junctions with T4 tracks generally unsigned). Interpretive signs in existing structures only. Other signs may be installed for management and safety purposes.	Directional signposts at start of track and junctions with tracks of grade T3 or higher; otherwise signs should refer to main (T3) track only (junctions with T4 tracks generally unsigned). Other signs may be installed for management and safety purposes.	Limited signs and only for management purposes.	Signs generally not provided.

Applicability: <i>PWS wide</i>	PWS Policy and Procedures	Issue Date: 7 May 2004
	Document Title and Reference No: PWS Track Classification Scheme PWS P- 036	Revision Date: 15th December 2014
Status: Approved		Revision No: 3

	W1	W2	T1	T2	T3	T4	Route
Track markers	Unnecessary	Unnecessary	Where necessary to ensure that direction is obvious except under extreme conditions.	Where necessary to ensure that direction is obvious except under extreme conditions.	Where necessary to ensure that direction is obvious except under extreme conditions.	Low-key. Track may be difficult to follow in places.	For essential management purposes only.
Campsites	Not applicable	Not applicable	At major camping nodes, sites for up to 25 tents preferably dispersed in groups of up to five tents. Enclosed toilets to be provided at sites of more than 10 tents, or where necessary for environmental or health purposes.	Up to 12 tents, preferably dispersed in groups of up to four tents. Toilets to be provided at sites of more than 10 tents, or where necessary for environmental or health purposes.	Up to 8 tents, preferably dispersed in groups of two to four tents. Toilets of minimal design to be provided where necessary for environmental or health purposes.	Visibly impacted (long-term) sites for up to 4 tents. Toilets of minimal design to be provided only where necessary for environmental purposes.	Formation of campsites to be avoided where possible. Visibly impacted sites for up to four tents, preferably at least partially vegetated, are acceptable where unavoidable or desirable for environmental purposes. No toilets provided unless essential for environmental purposes.
Usage levels	No restrictions.	No restrictions.	To be defined where required for social, environmental and management purposes.	To be defined where required for social, environmental and management purposes.	To be defined where required for social, environmental and management purposes.	To be defined where required for social, environmental and management purposes.	To be defined where required for social, environmental and management purposes.
Max party size	Recommended max 25.	Recommended max 25.	Recommended max 13; may be increased to a maximum of 17 for specific tracks upon investigation and assessment. While recognising circumstances for group sizes up to 13 persons, for environmental and crowding reasons, party sizes of 6 or fewer will be encouraged.	Recommended max 13; may be increased to a maximum of 17 for specific tracks upon investigation and assessment. While recognising circumstances for group sizes up to 13 persons, for environmental and crowding reasons, party sizes of 6 or fewer will be encouraged.	Recommended max 8. Party sizes of less than 6 will be encouraged.	Recommended max 6. Party sizes of four will be encouraged. Up to 8 acceptable on some T4 tracks in robust areas, subject to environmental conditions.	Recommended max 6. Party sizes of four will be encouraged. Up to 8 acceptable in some demonstrably robust areas, subject to environmental conditions including pad and track formation.

Applicability: <i>PWS wide</i>	PWS Policy and Procedures	Issue Date: 7 May 2004
	Document Title and Reference No: PWS Track Classification Scheme PWS P- 036	Revision Date: 15 th December 2014
Status: Approved		Revision No: 3

	W1	W2	T1	T2	T3	T4	Route
Guided tours	Licences required. Client to Guide ratio 24:1 with max group size of 25.	Licences required. Client to Guide ratio 24:1 with max group size of 25.	Permitted but licences required and numbers of trips may be restricted. Walks up to 2 hours duration: Client to Guide ratio 24:1 with max group size of 25. Day and overnight walks: Client to Guide ratio 5:1 with a minimum of 2 guides per group unless prior approval received.	Permitted but licences required and numbers of trips may be restricted. Walks up to 2 hours duration: Client to Guide ratio 24:1 with max group size of 25. Day and overnight walks: Client to Guide ratio 5:1 with a minimum of 2 guides per group unless prior approval received.	Permitted but licences required and numbers of trips may be restricted. Client to Guide ratio 6:2 with a minimum of 2 guides per group.	May be permitted. Client to Guide ratio 4:2 with a minimum of 2 guides per group.	May be permitted under stringent conditions. Client to Guide ratio 2:2 with a minimum of 2 guides per group.
Publicity	No restrictions.	No restrictions.	No restrictions - may be included in maps, tourist brochures etc	Generally no restrictions, but may be discouraged if (for eg) overall usage restrictions are necessary.	Low-key publicity preferred. T3 tracks may be included on maps.	Discouraged. Not included on maps except for PWS management purposes. Authors encouraged to keep route descriptions vague.	Discouraged. Not included on maps except for PWS management purposes. Authors encouraged to keep route descriptions vague.
Route guides	No restrictions.	No restrictions.	Acceptable but authors encouraged to consult with PWS. Published info to be compatible with management objectives.	Acceptable but authors encouraged to consult with PWS. Published info to be compatible with management objectives.	Acceptable if sparsely written. Consultation encouraged.	Discouraged.	Discouraged.

Applicability: <i>PWS wide</i>	PWS Policy and Procedures	Issue Date: 7 May 2004
	Document Title and Reference No: PWS Track Classification Scheme PWS P- 036	Revision Date: 15 th December 2014
Status: Approved		Revision No: 3

Australian Standard: Walking Tracks (AS 2156.1-2001)

The following table summarises specifications for the various elements of the *Australian Standard – Walking Tracks (AS-2156.1)*. It is provided here for comparative purposes, but note that (as explained previously) there is no direct correlation between the PWS and AS classes below class 3/T1 and the schemes are best used independently for different purposes. The PWS class 'Route' has no corresponding class in the AS scheme.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Overview	<i>High use, easy access, suitable for wheelchair use, interpretation provided</i>	<i>High use, easy access, interpretation provided</i>	<i>Slightly modified environments, moderate numbers</i>	<i>Slightly modified environments, moderate numbers</i>	<i>Minimal facilities, few encounters</i>	<i>Often indistinct tracks in remote areas.</i>
Terrain	<i>No previous experience required.</i>	<i>No previous experience required.</i>	<i>No bushwalking experience required. May encounter steep slopes, water crossings, etc. Users responsible for own safety.</i>	<i>Users need to be self-reliant.</i>	<i>Users need to be self-reliant.</i>	<i>Users need to be self-reliant.</i>
Width	<i>>1.2m.</i>	<i>>900mm.</i>	<i>Generally <1.2m, variable.</i>			
Surface & drainage	<i>Broad, surfaced track suitable for wheelchairs.</i>	<i>Generally a modified or hardened surface.</i>	<i>Generally a modified surface, sections may be hardened.</i>	<i>Generally distinct without major modification.</i>	<i>Limited modification to natural surfaces. Alignment may be indistinct in places.</i>	<i>No modification of the natural environment.</i>
Gradient	<i>As per AS 1428; <1:14 (or 4° or 7%). Steps only with alternate ramp access.</i>	<i>Generally <1:10 (or 6° or 10%), minimal steps.</i>	<i>Generally <1:10 (or 6° or 10%), but may exceed 1:10 for short sections.</i>	<i>Limited to environmental and management considerations</i>	<i>May include steep sections of unmodified surfaces</i>	<i>May include steep sections of unmodified surfaces</i>
Infra-structure	<i>May include platforms, seats and barrier rails.</i>	<i>May include platforms, seats and barrier rails.</i>	<i>Generally only for specific safety and environmental considerations.</i>	<i>Generally only for specific safety and environmental considerations.</i>	<i>Generally only for specific safety and environmental considerations.</i>	<i>Generally not provided</i>
Signs	<i>Frequent.</i>	<i>Frequent.</i>	<i>OK for direction, management and interpretation purposes.</i>	<i>Minimal, for management and directional purposes.</i>	<i>Limited, for management purposes.</i>	<i>Not provided</i>
Weather	<i>Not applicable</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>	<i>Severe weather may affect navigation and safety.</i>	<i>Severe weather may affect navigation and safety.</i>	<i>Severe weather may affect navigation and safety.</i>	<i>Severe weather may affect navigation and safety.</i>
Risk management	<i>Tracks and built facilities managed for public risk and inspected at 30 day intervals.</i>	<i>Tracks and built facilities managed for public risk and inspected at 3 month intervals.</i>	<i>Built facilities managed for public risk and inspected at 6 month intervals.</i>	<i>Built facilities managed for public risk and inspected at 6-12 month intervals.</i>	<i>Built facilities managed for public risk and inspected at 6-18 month intervals.</i>	<i>Not be managed for public risk. Users responsible for personal safety.</i>
Management intervention	<i>High</i>	<i>Moderate to high</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Low to moderate</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Negligible</i>
Publicity	<i>Will normally appear on maps.</i>	<i>Will normally appear on maps.</i>	<i>Will normally appear on maps.</i>	<i>May be shown on maps</i>	<i>May be shown on maps</i>	<i>Will not be marked on maps</i>