

Advanced Wine Operations Skills Project



Summary of Feedback, Responses and Actions

15 October 2019

This project includes the development of eight new units of competency to be added to the electives of the existing *FBP30918 Certificate III in Wine Industry Operations* within the *FBP Food, Beverage and Pharmaceutical Training Package*. Draft materials were developed as a result of initial input from Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) and were made available for broader stakeholder consultation and feedback between 11 September – 3 October 2019. During this time feedback was received via email, the online feedback hub and webinars. Written submissions were received from eight stakeholders around Australia, including one from a registered training organisation, two from State Training Authorities, and five industry representatives.

As a direct result of feedback received, a number of changes were made to the documents under review. Mostly notably:

- The packaging rules in the Certificate III in Wine Industry Operations have had a statement added to limit the number of elective units selected that have outcomes that above Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) level 3 to not more than six units.
- Two new Performance Criteria have been added to FBPCEL4003 Coordinate wine operations filtration processes to cover testing of filters and flow rate performance.
- The addition of “routine and non routine problem solving” to the Knowledge Evidence of the five new Coordinate Wine Operations processes units.

[Visit the Skills Impact website](#) to view a full list of the documents that were submitted for consultation 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 are part of the Subject Matter Expert Working Group process. Resolutions on issues are constructed to 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.

The documents are now available to view and validate on the [Skills Impact website](#) until 1 November 2019

Summary of feedback

General feedback

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
General Feedback		
Industry VIC	<p>Components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FBPBPG3008 – Operate an automated carton packing process • FBPBPG3009 – Operate an automated palletising process • FBPBPG4001 – Coordinate wine operations packing process <p>These electives are essentially around the operations of running and managing a bottling line and associated processes. The only feedback I have on these electives is that it would only be relevant to those students looking at entering a contract bottling line facility or a larger winery that operates its own bottling line.</p>	<p>The Subject Matter Expert Working Group (SMEWG) advised that the three new units have been designed to meet the needs of larger or more automated wineries and packaging centres. It is also noted that there are existing carton packing and palletising units that suit smaller wineries.</p>
Govt WA	<p>All components.</p> <p>On behalf of the STA thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback however we have nothing to add at this point and look forward to seeing the second draft.</p>	<p>Thank you for the feedback.</p>
Industry SA	<p>Units of competency for Cellar Operations.</p> <p>FBPCEL3019 Prepare and apply additions and finings</p> <p>Adds and Finings proposed changes are welcomed even though we do not do this at current time (winemakers interviewed)</p> <p>The Coordination units also were welcomed as something we would use (when needed) also no issues as this is within duties of Leading Hands.</p>	<p>Thank you for the feedback. Your support is noted</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution	
General Feedback		
Govt VIC	<p>I have not had a chance to locate any Victorian wine training specialists to advise me on the Draft 1 materials. So these observations are my own more related to the 'structure' rather than content of the proposals;</p> <p>1. Seems eminently sensible to be introducing training for the galloping automation that is sweeping through all sectors of Australian industry,</p> <p>2. I am concerned that there seems to be some AQF / qualification creep in the proposed Certificate III. 'Coordinating' the work of others is at Certificate IV level not Certificate III. In a sense you are acknowledging this because the units are coded with a 4 which generally signifies the qualification within which they are initially packaged. I do of course appreciate that units do not have an AQF level.</p> <p>My suggestion would be to create an appropriate Certificate IV for the wine sector, including these units and also make them available as a Skill Set. In this way the alignment with the AQF would be robust and workers might upskill with the whole Certificate IV or the Skill Set or partially by importing some of the 'coordinate' units into the Certificate III,</p>	<p>The following statement has been added to the Packing Rules of the existing Certificate III to prevent AQF creep:</p> <p>"no more than 6 units may be selected that are coded with an AQF indicator above level 3 or reflect outcomes above AQF level 3"</p> <p>The SMEWG advised that a Certificate IV Wine Industry Operations and skill sets (aligned to AQF level 4) are not required.</p>
Govt VIC	<p>Performance Evidence in all new units</p> <p>3.From a quick review of units I am concerned at some 'over-specification' of Performance Evidence e.g. Assessment requirements for FBPBPG3008 Operate an automated carton packing process</p> <p>There must be evidence that the individual has independently set up, operated, and shut down two automated packing processes for different work orders. Each process must use a conveyor fed automatic case packing machine (capable of packing at least 15000 containers per hour), and include at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • divider inserter • case sealer • check weigher or other quality inspection device • conveyer controls 	<p>The SMEWG advised not to alter the Performance Evidence noting the evidence had been strategically designed to be robust and specific, and still allow for flexibility for different wineries.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
General Feedback	
<p>One process must package 12 container cartons and the other process must package 6 container cartons.</p> <p>I imagine that these 'numbers' are fairly standard but I always worry about such specifics in units. Should the usual industry practice change the units need re-writing, should new technology emerge the units may go out of date very rapidly. For me the Elements and PCs are what is important and the Assessment Requirements should be largely ignored or at least kept as open as is possible to ensure flexibility of unit usage and future proofing. I personally made a lot of noise in opposition when ARs were introduced under the Standards because they were always going to be inappropriately used and therefore problematic.</p>	
<p>Govt VIC</p> <p>Also in the Performance Evidence field of this unit there are 'non-assessable' items;</p> <p>communicated effectively with a supervisor at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • maintenance team member • laboratory team member • bottling and packaging team members • logistics team members <p>Ignoring the typo I am not sure what 'evidence' presented for assessment would confirm this performance? Also this requirement does not derive from a PC and is therefore not permissible.</p> <p>Knowledge Evidence – a very long list (each item of which must of course be assessed several times by the assessor). I am concerned that some evidence has been listed that again does not derive from the PCs e.g. 'rework and waste processing'. The Assessment Requirements field is not supposed to be used to add in additional performance criteria but to document the evidence that must be presented to an assessor to confirm that the Performance Criteria have been achieved.</p>	<p>The typo has been corrected and the statement now reads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • communicated effectively with a supervisor <u>and</u> at least one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • maintenance team member • laboratory team member • bottling and packaging team members • logistics team members <p>The SMEEWG advised that communication is a necessary part of the units and in FBPBPG3008 Operate an automated carton packing process, communication is required by Performance Criteria such as –</p> <p>2.6 Report major process problems and products that do not meet specifications</p> <p>3.3 Coordinate team members to assist with change over</p> <p>4.7 Report issues requiring maintenance by technicians</p> <p>The need for communication is further explained in the Foundation Skills. For example, the following descriptor for as</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
General Feedback	
	<p>Oral communication provides both learners and assessors with more clarity of what is required for competent performance –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use industry terminology to communicate with team members <p>The SMEWG also advised that 'rework, reuse and waste processing' are required in the Knowledge Evidence in light of PC 4.6 Dispose of waste according to workplace and environmental procedures</p>
Govt VIC	<p>Also a little concerned with the Assessment Conditions in this example unit. It states for example;</p> <p>“the equipment stipulated in the performance evidence”. There is no equipment stipulated in the Performance Evidence and so there may be issues at audit because of ambiguity here. It would appear that an attempt is being made to mandate assessment in a particular plant with particular machinery. This may drastically limit the usability of the unit and the ability of the training sector to provide the industry with the skilled workers they are seeking.</p> <p>Happy to discuss but may I request that you review all of the units to ensure appropriate usage of the Assessment Requirements / Conditions fields.</p> <p>The Performance Evidence does specify equipment in the following statement –</p> <p>Each process must use a conveyor fed automatic case packing machine (capable of packing at least 15000 containers per hour), and include at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • divider inserter • case sealer • check weigher or other quality inspection device • conveyer controls <p>The equipment required therefore is an automatic case packer that has at least 2 of the 4 pieces of machinery listed above. The SMEWG strategically designed the statement to allow for some flexibility of assessment. The Assessment conditions have been written as “the equipment stipulated in the performance evidence” allow the same flexibility, while ensuring the evidence is collected in suitable work environment.</p>

FBP30918 Certificate III in Wine Industry Operations

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FBP30918 Certificate III in Wine Industry Operations		
RTO SA	<p>Packaging Rule</p> <p>The packaging rules state that:</p> <p>“up to 4 units may be selected from any currently endorsed Training Package or accredited course that are coded with an AQF indicator above level 2 or reflect outcomes above AQF level 2.”</p> <p>There should be more control of the number of units above AQF level 3.</p> <p>This could result in exploitation of trainees expected to perform at AQF4 or diploma level</p>	<p>Currently the qualification lists seven units that have an AQF level 4 identifier. It is possible to select these seven and import another four units that reflect AQF level 4, which could mean a person completes the qualification with 11 of 19 units at AQF level 4. Though highly unlikely, the SMEWG advised to add the following statement to packaging rules to ensure that graduates achieve a qualification that aligns with AQF level 3 –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “no more than 6 units may be selected that are coded with an AQF indicator above level 3 or reflect outcomes above AQF level 3”
RTO SA	<p>There was a precedent set during the FDF30411 Review where 4 'Coordinate' units were removed from WGG and condensed into one unit that could be applied to coordination over multiple vineyard coordination roles. The same interpretation should be applied to cellar operations.</p>	<p>The suggestion to merge the four proposed new “Coordinate wine operations processes’ units was raised with industry stakeholders during the Workforce functional analysis, and the advice provided was to develop four separate coordinate units. The SMEWG has also confirmed that all four units are discrete and required.</p>

Summary of feedback on units of competency

Specific feedback was received on six of the eight new units. The feedback was discussed in detailed by the SMEWG and changes have been made to the unit and their assessment requirement as guided by the SMEs. A summary of the feedback responses is provided in the tables below. A recurring theme of the feedback was not to make the units limited to larger wineries. Skills Impact worked with the SMEWG to design the Performance Evidence in a way that ensures competency can be demonstrated by individuals across a range of different wineries. While aware of the need for flexibility, it was also noted that there are existing wine operations units that suit smaller wineries. The new units have been designed to meet the needs of larger or more automated wineries that currently lack elective choices to meet their needs when their workers undertake the existing FBP30819 Certificate III in Wine Industry Operations.

AHCARB206 Operate and maintain stump grinding machines		
No feedback received		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FBPBPG3008 Operate an automated carton packing process		
Industry VIC	<p>Performance Evidence</p> <p>One point on FBPBPG3008 – Operate an automated carton packing process, was that under ‘Performance Evidence’ it outlines packaging in 12 container cartons and 6 container cartons. In regards to the 6 container cartons, nothing was mentioned regarding these 6 packs being either laydown or stand up. From my own experiences with bottling lines and packaging, these 6 pack configurations can be tricky and cause major down time/delays on bottling lines. Another point, being glue vs tape on these lines.</p> <p>The point regarding the type of 6 pack used also will have an impact on the ‘Performance Evidence’ in the elective FBPBPG3009 – Operate an automated palletising process.</p>	The SMEWG advised to leave the Performance Evidence as is as the automated packing machines do not do horizontal packaging or use tape.
Govt Vic	Refer to comments on this unit under the section on General Feedback above.	Refer to responses to comments on this unit under the section on General Feedback above.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FBPBP3009 Operate an automated palletising process		
Industry VIC	Refer to comments above for FBPBP3008 Operate an automated carton packing process relate to the orientation of the 6 pack cartons (horizontal or vertical)	Refer to the response above for FBPBP3008 Operate an automated carton packing process relate to the orientation of the 6 pack cartons (horizontal or vertical)

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
BPBP4001 Coordinate wine operations packaging processes		
	No feedback received	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FBPCEL3019 Prepare and apply complex additions and finings		
Industry NSW	General comment All looks good	Thank you for the feedback. Your support is noted
Industry Vic	<p>Range of Conditions</p> <p>Under the heading 'Range of Conditions' and sub heading 'Additions must include five of the following' the fining agents Caramel, Ascorbic Acid and Hydrogen Peroxide are questionable in their relevance and function. I know no wineries that are using caramel, although this product is more likely to be found in the production of fortified wines, and ascorbic acid may still be used in some of the larger commercial wineries. Hydrogen Peroxide is a tricky one, as only used to strip out sulphur dioxide (largely due to an error of addition occurring in the winery) – my main feedback on these was just the relevance they have in the industry today.</p>	<p>The SMEWG advised that additions and finings listed, including caramel, are used by a wide variety of wineries. The SMEWG reviewed the lists of Additions and Finings and made the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'ammonium bisulfite and erythorbic acid' have been added to the Range of Conditions for Additions • 'gelatine and potassium sorbate' added to the Range of Conditions for Finings, and the number of finings to be selected reduced from four to three • 'ammonium bisulfite and potassium sorbate' have been included in the choice of additives and finings in the Performance Evidence

	Research is being heavily carried out in this area at the moment to develop more plant based fining agents/additives as more importance is placed on sustainability and the 'vegan' wine market	
Industry SA	<p>Performance Criteria</p> <p>PC 1.1 Check incoming materials against documentation and place in quarantine area</p> <p>Looked at the Adds and Finings the one area of concern is where it has for the cellar-hand to put item into Quarantine. At Berri our Quality Technician puts only a few items into Quarantine and release them e.g. Oak.</p> <p>All our suppliers go through a procurement process to ensure they have Food Safety accreditation and a COA and ensure they meet food safety standard so the cellar-hands don't get involved with quarantine unless they see a damaged Bag or something unusual.</p>	Quarantine has been removed from PC 1.1 and it now states - "Check incoming materials against documentation and place in storage area"

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FBPCEL4001 Coordinate wine operations vintage processes		
	No feedback received	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FBPCEL4002 Coordinate wine operations clarification processes		
Industry Victoria	<p>Performance Evidence</p> <p>The processes and equipment outlined in the 'Performance Evidence' section are again more aligned to larger commercial wineries. Only these larger wineries would have equipment such as a centrifuge which would allow you to</p>	<p>The list of equipment in the Performance Evidence has been modified to add "racking and cold settling equipment" and 'pumps'</p> <p>The SMEWG also noted that there are existing cellar operations units that suit smaller wineries. The four new units have been designed to meet the needs of larger or more automated wineries.</p>

	<p>carry out the process of centrifuging. The process of 'racking after cold settling' is the most relevant to smaller-mid sized wineries.</p> <p>This filters down into the equipment area, again those looking at the processes of centrifuging, flotation and rotary vacuum would need the associated equipment which would only be found in large scale wineries.</p> <p>Most wineries would be only using one of these processes, thus the evaluation of the student requiring them to use 'two' of these processes and 'three' of the equipment would limit where they could be trained and assessed.</p>	
--	---	--

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FBPCEL4003 Coordinate wine operations filtration processes		
Industry VIC	<p>Performance Evidence</p> <p>Earth filtration is being phased out by a lot of wineries due to the earth component being a known carcinogen – thus relevance is brought into question here.</p> <p>Most wineries will only have one method (maybe two) of filtration, for example we have a crossflow as our main method for filtration and a small pad filter which we use for smaller volumes. Therefore it may be hard to assess the student on two filtration processes depending the winery that they will be assessed at.</p> <p>Reverse Osmosis is a highly specified and expensive unit, again it would only be very large commercial wineries that would own a unit. Companies such as Memstar, have built there business from providing these services to wineries as a mobile unit. Therefore, relevance comes into question and the ability for assessment may be difficult.</p>	<p>The SMEWG acknowledged there are work health and safety risks associated with the use of Diatomaceous earth filtration, but the substance is still widely used and needs to be covered in the unit. Advice will be provided in the Companion Volume Implementation Guide that RTOs will need to ensure health and safety risks associated with earth filtration are managed, including the use of alterative materials (perlite).</p> <p>The SMEWG also advised the other filtration methods are commonly used and therefore need to be provided as an option, and also added 'pad' filtration to the Performance Evidence as another alternative.</p> <p>It was also note that there are existing cellar operations units that suit smaller wineries. The four new units have been designed to meet the needs of larger or more automated wineries.</p>

Industry NSW	<p>Element 1</p> <p>Add another PC after 1.7 to state -</p> <p>Complete Integrity Testing as required on filters, understand tolerance limits and actions.</p>	<p>A new Performance Criteria has been added –</p> <p>1.8 Ensure integrity testing on filters is carried out to meet required parameters</p>
	<p>Element 2</p> <p>Add another PC after 2.8 to state -</p> <p>Assess flow rate and Differential pressures and determine when filters are compromised. See also next comment.</p>	<p>A new Performance Criteria has been added –</p> <p>2.5 Ensure flow rates and differential pressures meet production requirements and determine when filters are compromised.</p>
	<p>Element 4</p> <p>PC 4.3 Ensure filter change outs are completed when filter media are expired.</p> <p>Expand on this point as a separate Element as follows: Element 5. Coordinate Filter change out.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Determine when filters have reached end of life and coordinate change out. 2. Confirm supply of correct filter type and stock code to exchange. 3. Confirm end of run has been completed and housings safely depressurised. 4. Oversee fitment of new filters ensure they have been installed correctly. 5. Test housing for leaks 	<p>The SMEWG advised that a new element is not required as the outcomes are already largely covered in the Performance Evidence and Knowledge Evidence. "Integrity testing of filters" has been added to the Performance Evidence</p> <p>The following have been added to the Knowledge Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "filter change out, integrity testing of filters, filter parameters and actions required to rectify" • "flow rates and differential pressures and actions to take when filters are compromised" • "routine and non routine machine and equipment faults, and their rectification" • equipment "pressure testing" • "typical problems related to consumables, including, insufficient supplies, preparation, quality, and identification"
	<p>Performance Evidence</p> <p>"• checking filtration performance parameters"</p> <p>Add - Including: Flow rates, differential pressures, Integrity Test results</p>	
	<p>Performance Evidence</p> <p>Add - "effectively coordinated a filter change out" at the end of the Performance Evidence</p>	

	<p>Knowledge Evidence</p> <p>“•equipment and vessels, including:”</p> <p>Add "vessel pressure rating' as a bullet point under</p>	
--	--	--

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FBPCEL4004 Coordinate general cellar operations processes		
<p>Industry Victoria</p>	<p>General</p> <p>Overall this unit covers most winery operations, however there is a lack of focus on barrel work and barrel hygiene. Attention to detail in barrel work and hygiene is crucial to the overall health of the winery and ensuring the quality of the wines is not compromised.</p>	<p>The following requirements have been added to the Knowledge Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “vessels including tanks and barrels” • “routine and non routine machine and equipment faults, and their rectification” • “vessel maintenance, cleaning and sanitation, including oak storage”