

Australian Meat Processing Training Package project



Summary of Validation Feedback, Responses and Actions

5 August 2019

This project includes the development of 13 new units of competency and three skill sets within the *Australian Meat Processing Training Package*. Draft materials were developed as a result of initial input from Subject Matter Experts and were made available for broader stakeholder consultation and feedback between 1 November 2018 and 19 November 2019. Prior to validation feedback was received via email, through online surveys, as well as in person at workshops or site visits, and by telephone. Input was received from 35 stakeholders around Australia, including 6 from Registered Training Organisations, 4 from Government bodies such as The Department of Agriculture and Water Resources, State Training Authorities and Training Advisory Bodies, and 25 industry representatives.

In December 2018 eight teleconferences were held with key Subject Matter Experts and industry stakeholders to validate the draft components. In January 2019 the drafts were made available on the Skills Impact website for two weeks for validation feedback.

As part of an independent quality assurance process for the project, it was identified by the project team, and supported by the Meat IRC, that major edits had been recommended for two units (*AMPA416 Oversee humane handling of animals* and *AMPA417 Conduct an animal welfare audit of a meat processing plant*), where it had previously been thought there would be only minor edits. The unit for developing and implementing a TACCP and VACCP plan also had further changes. As such, these three units also underwent consultation to bring them in line with industry requirements.

Draft versions of these three units were available between 12-26 March 2019. Feedback was received from two organisations, a registered training organisation, and a state government body. These drafts were revised and made available for validation and comment between 4-18 April 2019.

As a direct result of validation feedback received, some minor changes were made to the final components.

[Visit the Skills Impact website](#) to view a full list of the documents that were submitted for validation during this phase.

Below is a summary of the issues raised and how these issues have been dealt with. This involves a consideration of the information provided, views of industry stakeholders where known and views provided by the people who were part of the Subject Matter Expert Working Group process. Resolutions take into account the needs and views of stakeholders to the extent possible, and to comply with the *Standards for Training Package 2012*. The resolutions may represent a compromise on one or more stakeholder views with the aim of a workable outcome for industry, State and Territory Training Authorities (STAs) and training providers.

Summary of feedback on units of competency

Abattoir Sector units

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AMPA414 Manage the collection, monitoring and reporting of animal health data from a meat processing plant	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validation teleconference 4/12/2018 • Industry, NSW x 2 • Industry, ACT • Industry QLD • Government, SA 	<p>Five industry stakeholders attended the meeting. The attendees determined that adequate and appropriate consultation had been undertaken, the newly created unit had been placed within appropriate qualifications and that the draft for the unit be approved with the following changes:</p> <p>The need for the following changes to be made were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Header box – unit code required • Element 1 and PC 1.1 Change ‘Identify’ to ‘Nominate’ • PC 1.1-1.4 need to be renumbered correctly • PC 4.6 needs to be numbered • Performance evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New dot point 4.5 (additional) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ compared the on-plant data collection system with the national standard ▪ participated in performance discussions with participating meat inspectors ○ change current dot point 6 from: ‘utilized animal data as part of the verification of the accuracy of the data collected’ to ‘verify the accuracy of the data collected’ • Knowledge evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Add new (additional) dot point 7: ‘disease grading as specified in the national standard’. <p>There was also discussion about the following, although no changes were decided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relationships with inspectors • discussion about the new standard
	<p>All changes were adopted.</p> <p>Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, Vic 	<p>Element 1: Suggested changing 'Identify the relevant animal disease for data collection' to 'Summarise animal health data responsibilities'</p> <p>PC 1.2 Suggested replacing 'Identify the standard to be applied to the recording of diseases and conditions at ante and/or post mortem' to 'Comply with diseases and conditions at ante and/or post mortem recording standards'</p> <p>PC 1.3 Suggested replacing 'Identify' with 'Summarise'</p> <p>PC 2.2 Suggested replacing 'Establish' with 'Maintain'</p> <p>PC 2.3 added 'according to plant procedures' to the end of the sentence</p> <p>PC 2.4 Suggested replacing 'Establish and implement the procedures for verifying the accuracy of the data collected' with 'Monitor and evaluate procedures for verifying the accuracy of the data collected'</p> <p>PC 3.2 suggested replacing 'Establish' with 'List'</p> <p>PC 3.3 the word 'Document' is not explicit enough, does it require the person to write SOP's or keep a log of the SOP's?</p> <p>PC 3.4: What is the point of difference to the element? And this P.C needs to be expressed as a standard.</p> <p>"PC 4.1 Isn't the Purpose explicit in P.C 4.2 and 4.3? Or is the P.C actually related to applied knowledge of national animal health data policy and standards and therefor included at 5.1? If so... specify what the performance would be"</p>	<p>The TAC reviewed the feedback and as this is in a planning stage decided that changing to 'summarise' did not meet the requirements of this stage of the task.</p> <p>The TAC reviewed the feedback and decided that as this is in a planning stage, compliance is not required for this Element</p> <p>The TAC reviewed the feedback and decided 'identify' fits the needs of the task as 'Summarise' is a much more formal process than identification</p> <p>The TAC reviewed the feedback and decided that the individual would be establishing the procedures not maintaining as suggested.</p> <p>Change to PC 2.3 Adopted.</p> <p>The TAC reviewed the feedback and confirmed that as this is a new process – the individual would have to establish not monitor.</p> <p>Adopted.</p> <p>The TAC reviewed the feedback. There may not be a documented SOP in some places, so an SOP may need to be documented, in other cases not.</p> <p>PC reworded to 'Oversee the uploading of animal health data to a database to ensure compliance with data base requirements'</p> <p>The TAC reviewed the feedback and provided the following rationale for retaining the PCs as they are. For each plant there will be different motivations for gathering data. In some cases plants will be paid to gather data, assess the livestock from individual producers in order to ensure the quality and profitability of stock being wholesaled/retailed using a brand, assessing the disease status of stock from particular properties or Local Government areas, or assessing the impact of particular diseases on profitability.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<p>PC 4.4 Suggested adding 'to rectify' at the end of the sentence</p> <p>PC 4.5 Fixed capitalisation of first word</p> <p>PC 4.6 Suggested changing ' Estimate the impact of individual diseases and conditions on the processor' to 'Evaluate the impact of individual diseases and conditions on the processor and producer'</p> <p>Element 5 Suggested replacing 'Report animal health data to relevant parties' with 'Establish animal health data reporting requirements'</p> <p>PC 5.2 Suggested replacing 'Establish a format for the reporting of animal health data to relevant plant personnel, producers and their third parties' with 'Design and develop animal health data reports for a range of audiences'</p> <p>Wording on PC 5.3 unclear.</p>	<p>The TAC reviewed the feedback and provided the following response. This is not a case of rectifying, it is a way of validating data which is outside the norm e.g. an unusually high incidence of a disease in a group of animals</p> <p>Adopted.</p> <p>The TAC reviewed the feedback and felt the word producer was not appropriate. The project had previously eliminated the producer as outside the scope of this unit and decided the word 'Estimate' more accurately represents the job role.</p> <p>The TAC reviewed the feedback and confirmed that establishing reporting requirements is only one component of this PC and were happy for the PC to remain in its current format.</p> <p>The TAC reviewed the feedback. The format for reporting is usually the remit of the database owners e.g. Livestock Data Link, National Sheep health Monitoring Program or The SA Enhanced Abattoir Surveillance program. The role of the on plant data manager is mainly to establish what format is to be used.</p> <p>Adopted, wording changed to "Manage the reporting of animal health data to ensure reporting and data standards are complied with".</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	Looks ok.	Stakeholder thanked for their support.
AMPA3137 Operate biogas collection facilities		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation teleconference 4/12/2018 Industry, VIC RTO, QLD Industry, QLD x 2 	Four industry stakeholders attended the meeting, including one member of the Meat IRC. The attendees determined that adequate and appropriate consultation had been undertaken, the newly created unit had been placed within appropriate qualifications and that the draft for the unit be approved without change.	Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	Looks ok.	Stakeholder thanked for their support.
AMPA411 Manage biogas collection facilities		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation teleconference 4/12/2018 Industry, VIC RTO, QLD Industry, QLD x 2 	Four industry stakeholders attended the meeting, including one member of the Meat IRC. The attendees determined that adequate and appropriate consultation had been undertaken, the newly created unit had been placed within appropriate qualifications and that the draft for the unit be approved without change.	Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	A minor typographical error regarding the appearance of the unit code within the unit was identified.	Error corrected.
AMPA3138 Identify secondary sexual characteristics - beef		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation teleconference 4/12/2018 Industry, NSW Industry, QLD RTO, VIC Government, ACT 	<p>Four industry stakeholders attended the meeting. The attendees determined that adequate and appropriate consultation had been undertaken, the newly created unit had been placed within appropriate qualifications and that the draft for the unit be approved with the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combining Performance Criteria 1.3 and 1.4 for clarity Amending the wording of Performance Criteria 4.2 for clarity Removing any reference to Range of Conditions Changing minimum number of carcasses in the Performance Evidence from three to five Allowing for a simulated environment in the Assessment Conditions 	<p>All changes adopted.</p> <p>Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	Different unit downloaded when clicking the link on the website	Error corrected

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution	
AMPA3139 Prepare market reports – cattle		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation teleconference, 4/12/2018 Industry, SA Industry, QLD Industry, NSW x 2 	<p>Four industry stakeholders attended the meeting. The attendees determined that adequate and appropriate consultation had been undertaken, the newly created unit had been placed within appropriate qualifications and that the draft for the unit be approved with the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Element 2.1: Classify stock according to AUS-MEAT categories Performance evidence: second line changed to: Assessment must include one full day of saleyard trading on all categories of traded cattle. Assessment conditions: relationships text changed to: stock and station agents, Auctions Plus assessors, abattoirs assessors and livestock buyers, MLA Livestock Market Officers, and buyers Additional point in the knowledge evidence: stock abnormalities which may affect stock price and potentially affect carcass value 	<p>All adopted.</p> <p>Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, VIC 	<p>Performance evidence: 'Assessment must include one full day of saleyard trading on all categories of traded cattle'. Suggest adding phrase - "at a minimum"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> recognise livestock abnormalities assess and calculate livestock numbers conduct assessments in adverse weather conditions. <p>Not permissible to add evidence requirements that are not required under the Elements and PCs</p> <p>The last bullet point would be more appropriately placed in the assessment conditions field</p>	<p>The TAC reviewed the feedback and decided this is already implied by the words 'must include'.</p> <p>Many of the performance requirements for both units related to market reports do relate to the PCs - they are part of the AUS-MEAT system. The draft was edited to provide some clarification. Last bullet point added to assessment conditions.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> standard classifications of livestock breeds and sex methods of determining age <p>Not required under any PC therefore not acceptable here</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> stock abnormalities which may affect price and potentially affect carcass value <p>Referring to stock abnormalities as a PC seems necessary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> assessment requires access to an operating saleyard, abattoir facility or farm <p>Is it possible to meet Element 3 without attendance at a saleyard?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> competency must be identified and sustained over a period of time <p>This is a very vague statement that may cause issues during audit of RTOs. Also if Performance Evidence was 'collected' by activities at one 'sale' this requirement would not be met.</p>	<p>Both bullet points are part of the AUS-MEAT classification system in PC 2.1</p> <p>It is part of PC 2.1</p> <p>The suggestion was discussed at length by the TAC members who determined it is possible to meet Element 3 without attendance at a saleyard because purchase and assessment for reports can occur during an on-farm assessment for purchase, or with an exchange in an abattoir lairage.</p> <p>Statement retained. It must include one day of saleyard trading; this statement adds the requirement of consistency of performance over time</p>
Government, WA	Looks ok.	Stakeholder thanked for their support.
AMPA3140 Prepare market reports - sheep		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation teleconference, 4/12/2018 Industry, SA Industry, QLD Industry, NSW x 2 	<p>Four industry stakeholders attended the meeting. The attendees determined that adequate and appropriate consultation had been undertaken, the newly created unit had been placed within appropriate qualifications and that the draft for the unit be approved with the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Element 2.1: Classify stock according to AUS-MEAT categories 	<p>All adopted.</p> <p>Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance evidence: second line changed to: Assessment must include one full day of saleyard trading on all categories of traded cattle. Assessment conditions: relationships text changed to: stock and station agents, Auctions Plus assessors, abattoirs assessors and livestock buyers, MLA Livestock Market Officers, and buyers <p>Additional point in the knowledge evidence: stock abnormalities which may affect stock price and potentially affect carcase value</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, VIC 	<p>Performance evidence: 'Assessment must include one full day of saleyard trading on all categories of traded cattle'. Suggest adding phrase - "at a minimum"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> recognise livestock abnormalities assess and calculate livestock numbers conduct assessments in adverse weather conditions. <p>Not permissible to add evidence requirements that are not required under the Elements and PCs</p> <p>The last bullet point would be more appropriately placed in the assessment conditions field</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> standard classifications of livestock breeds and sex methods of determining age <p>Not required under any PC therefore not acceptable here</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> stock abnormalities which may affect price and potentially affect carcase value <p>Referring to stock abnormalities as a PC seems necessary</p>	<p>The TAC reviewed the feedback and decided that this is already implied by the words 'must include'.</p> <p>Many of the performance requirements for both units related to market reports do relate to the PCs - they are part of the AUS-MEAT system. The draft was edited to provide some clarification. Last bullet point added to assessment conditions.</p> <p>Both bullet points are part of the AUS-MEAT classification system in PC 2.1</p> <p>It is part of PC 2.1</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> assessment requires access to an operating saleyard, abattoir facility or farm <p>Is it possible to meet Element 3 without attendance at a saleyard?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> competency must be identified and sustained over a period of time <p>This is a very vague statement that may cause issues during audit of RTOs. Also if Performance Evidence was 'collected' by activities at one 'sale' this requirement would not be met.</p>	<p>The suggestion was discussed at length by the TAC members who determined it is possible to meet Element 3 without attendance at a saleyard because purchase and assessment for reports can occur during an on-farm assessment for purchase, or with an exchange in an abattoir lairage.</p> <p>The TAC reviewed the feedback and the statement was retained. It must include one day of saleyard trading; this statement adds the requirement of consistency of performance over time</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	Looks ok.	Stakeholder thanked for their support.

Cross Sector units

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AMPX230 Undertake pest control in a food processing establishment		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation teleconference, 4/12/2018 Industry, NSW RTO, VIC Government, SA 	<p>Three industry stakeholders attended the meeting. The attendees determined that adequate and appropriate consultation had been undertaken, the newly created unit had been placed within appropriate qualifications and that the draft for the unit be approved.</p>	<p>Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	Looks ok.	Stakeholder thanked for their support.
AMPX430 Develop, implement and evaluate a pest control program in a meat processing premises		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation teleconference, 4/12/2018 Industry, NSW RTO, VIC Government, SA 	Three industry stakeholders attended the meeting. The attendees determined that adequate and appropriate consultation had been undertaken, the newly created unit had been placed within appropriate qualifications and that the draft for the unit be approved.	Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	Looks ok.	Stakeholder thanked for their support.
AMPX428 Plan, conduct and report a workplace incident investigation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation teleconference, 6/12/2018 RTO, NSW Industry, ACT Industry, QLD 	Three industry stakeholders attended the meeting. The attendees determined that adequate and appropriate consultation had been undertaken, the newly created unit had been placed within appropriate qualifications and that the draft for the unit be approved, with the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance criteria 2.2 reworded to change forming a team into consulting with appropriate workplace persons Element 4 reworded to 'Evaluate information and develop corrective actions' Minor wording change to last point in Performance Evidence 	All changes adopted. Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	Looks ok.	Stakeholder thanked for their support.
AMPX429 Develop and implement a TACCP and VACCP plan		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation teleconference, 4/12/2018 RTO, WA Industry, NSW x 2 Government, QLD 	<p>Four industry stakeholders attended the meeting. The attendees determined that adequate and appropriate consultation had been undertaken, the newly created unit had been placed within appropriate qualifications and that the draft for the unit be approved.</p>	<p>Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	<p>Looks ok.</p>	<p>Stakeholder thanked for their support.</p>
<p>AMPX219 Follow electronic labelling and traceability systems in a food processing establishment</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation teleconference, 4/12/2018 Industry, NSW x2 RTO, QLD 	<p>Three industry stakeholders attended the meeting. The attendees determined that adequate and appropriate consultation had been undertaken, the newly created unit had been placed within appropriate qualifications and that the draft for the unit be approved, with the following change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> change reference to frozen and chilled to frozen and/or chilled. 	<p>Change adopted.</p> <p>Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	<p>Looks ok.</p>	<p>Stakeholder thanked for their support.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industry, Vic 	<p>Request to make the unit more generic so as to apply to food processing qualifications: "I was looking at your newly developed unit "AMPX219 Follow electronic labelling and traceability systems in a meat processing establishment" and comparing it to what the food and beverage industry have been asking for in their request for an increase in skills and knowledge about traceability, recall procedures and contamination and food fraud.</p> <p>This unit, apart from several minor references to meat and to importing, is very close to what the food processors want. The project that we are proposing for 2019 will involve developing</p>	<p>The word 'meat' was replaced with 'food' in the title and unit as it does not change the outcome for the meat processing industry.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues

Consideration and Proposed Resolution

the Certs I, II and III in Food Processing. Part of this will be about increasing the skills and knowledge of the industry around traceability in packaging, labelling and tracing ingredients, contaminants, allergens, food fraud etc. ""

In light of the requirement to reduce the overall number of units of competency in the system, is there anyway that this unit could remove the word "meat" and replace it with food or something generic so that this unit could apply to meat processing, beverage processing, various forms of food processing and even pharmaceutical processing? I am thinking that it could be rewritten to still meet the needs of the meat processors as well as many other industries, reducing the need to create another new unit.

The importing of products would also be a problem to the food manufacturers that are currently using the food processing qualifications.

Here's a quick summary (highlit) of the Elements and Perf Criteria that would be an issue in using this unit in food processing. Is it all too hard?

- 1. Confirm traceability requirements 1.1 Identify and explain regulatory requirements for meat product traceability
- 1.2 Identify and explain customer requirements or importing country requirements for meat product traceability
- 1.3 Explain the purpose of traceability systems for meat products
- 1.4 Explain how traceability is maintained throughout the production and processing cycle.
- 2. Label product 2.1 Generate product labels using workplace electronic labelling system
- 2.2 Apply labels to product according to customer requirements and workplace policies and procedures
- 2.3 Scan product and send to load out area for despatch.
- 3. Record labels and product 3.1 Ensure records of all product are maintained according to workplace policies and procedures

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<p>3.2 Check records for accuracy and completeness</p> <p>3.3 Report and rectify any errors or mislabelled product according to workplace procedures, regulatory requirements and customer requirements."</p>	
AMPX314 Handle meat product in cold stores		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation teleconference, 4/12/2018 Industry, NSW x2 RTO, QLD 	<p>Three industry stakeholders attended the meeting. The attendees determined that adequate and appropriate consultation had been undertaken, the newly created unit had been placed within appropriate qualifications and that the draft for the unit be approved, with the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> change reference to frozen and chilled to frozen and/or chilled rewording of some performance criteria for clarity 	<p>Both changes adopted.</p> <p>Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	Looks ok.	Stakeholder thanked for their support.
AMPX315 Follow hygiene, sanitation and quality assurance requirements when handling meat products		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation teleconference, 4/12/2018 Industry, NSW x2 RTO, QLD 	<p>Three industry stakeholders attended the meeting. The attendees determined that adequate and appropriate consultation had been undertaken, the newly created unit had been placed within appropriate qualifications and that the draft for the unit be approved, with the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> change reference to frozen and chilled to frozen and/or chilled rewording of some performance criteria for clarity, addition of performance criteria in element 3 to cover checking transport vehicle. 	<p>All changes adopted.</p> <p>Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	Looks ok.	Stakeholder thanked for their support.

Additional units of competency

As part of an independent quality assurance process for the it was identified by the project team, and supported by the Meat IRC, that major edits had been recommended for two units (AMPA416 Oversee humane handling of animals and AMPA417 Conduct an animal welfare audit of a meat processing plant). The unit for developing and implementing a TACCP and VACCP plan also had further changes. As such, these three units also underwent consultation to bring them in line with industry requirements.

Draft versions of these three units were available between 12 – 26 March 2019. Feedback was received from two organisations, a registered training organisation, and a state government body. These drafts were revised and made available for validation and comment between 4-18 April 2019.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AMPA416 Oversee humane handling of animals		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	The STA has reviewed the three units for validation and have no further feedback.	Stakeholder thanked for their support.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, Vic 	<p>Including foundation skills in the unit</p> <p>Performance evidence: "Most of these bullet points are not forms of evidence that confirm that the Performance Criteria have been met. Most are additional PCs or a restatement of PCs. They are not evidence of performance ie. What evidence does a trainer need to view, collect and record to meet the statement ""ensure stress in animals is minimised through correct handling"" This is a statement of performance. If specific evidence is called for it might be something such as ""candidate provides stock handlers with written / verbal instructions and ensures such instructions are followed throughout the sale"". This is evidence that an assessor can view/ read and document and retain to confirm a Performance Criteria has been met."</p>	<p>Foundation skills added.</p> <p>The TAC reviewed the feedback. The line prefacing the bullet points in the Performance Evidence 'The candidate must:' has been expanded to 'The candidate must demonstrate that they are able to:' The rest of the bullet points are unchanged. The unit is well established unit and has been written to satisfy specific industry requirements and has been used for many years without issue. The unit averages around 500 enrolments per year, and market access, particularly in the EU, hinges on accredited animal welfare training - any changes may inadvertently impact this. For similar reasons, Foundation skills and minor wording changes to PE (changing to past tense) have also been adopted for AMPA417.</p>
AMPA417 Conduct an animal welfare audit of a meat processing plant		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	The STA has reviewed the three units for validation and have no further feedback.	Stakeholder thanked for their support.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AMPX429 Develop and implement a TACCP and VACCP plan		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	The STA has reviewed the three units for validation and have no further feedback.	Stakeholder thanked for their support.

General comments on all units of competency

These comments cover all of the units of competency in the project

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
All units of competency covered by the project		
Government, VIC	<p>I have now reviewed all 15 of the draft units.</p> <p>AMPA3140 Prepare market reports – sheep has the same issues as AMPA3139 Prepare market reports – cattle.</p> <p>For the remainder of the units I have concerns about the Performance Evidence field in most of the units. The field is either merely populated with an unnecessary and unhelpful summary of the PCs and/or contains evidence requirements that have no relationship with any of the PCs. Such requirements are not appropriate. The Performance Evidence field should document ‘evidence’ that can be sighted, collected reported in order to confirm the achievement of the Performance Criteria. I trust these comments will assist with a review of these draft materials to ensure that they best support quality training outcomes for the meat processing sector.</p>	<p>The TAC reviewed the feedback. Many of the performance requirements for both units related to market reports do relate to the PCs - they are part of the AUS-MEAT system. Some comments have been adopted, others not. More details can be found further in this report in relation to these two units specifically.</p> <p>All other units developed in this project were reviewed to ensure the performance evidence is related to the PCs - in a number of instances to someone not familiar with the industry it could appear as though there is no relation, however industry RTOs qualified to deliver the units would understand why they were there. Where this was not the case and knowledge or performance evidence that was repetitive of a performance criteria or did not relate to the performance criteria it was removed.</p>

Summary of feedback on skill sets

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
General Skill Set feedbackAMPSS00062 Food Processing Pest Control Skill Set		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation teleconference, 4/12/2018 Industry, NSW RTO, VIC Government, SA 	An industry validation committee met via teleconference and discussed the draft skill set after the period of consultation and agreed that it was appropriate and met industry requirements.	Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	Looks ok.	Stakeholder thanked for their support.
AMPSS00063 Meat Processing Warehouse Operator Skill Set		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation teleconference, 4/12/2018 Industry, NSW x2 RTO, QLD 	An industry validation committee met via teleconference and discussed the draft skill set after the period of consultation and agreed that it was appropriate and met industry requirements, with the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> removal of AMPR210, AMPX213, TLIA3017, TLID2010 and AMPX206 minor changes made to wording in the description and suggested words for statement of attainment sections. 	Changes adopted. Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government, WA 	Missing unit code for AMPCOR204.	Correction made.
AMPSS00064 Meat Processing Warehouse Supervisor Skill Set		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation teleconference, 4/12/2018 Industry, NSW x2 RTO, QLD 	An industry validation committee met via teleconference and discussed the draft skill set after the period of consultation and agreed that it was appropriate and met industry requirements, with the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> removal of BSBINM401 and AMPCOR402 minor changes made to wording in the description and suggested words for statement of attainment sections. 	Changes adopted Validation committee thanked for their assistance and support.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Government, WA	Looks ok.	Stakeholder thanked for their support.