

# 21-10 Flour Milling project

## Summary of Feedback, Responses and Actions



### November 2020

A draft qualification and units of competency for the Flour Milling project were made available on the [Skills Impact website](#) for stakeholder review from 28 September to 4 November 2020. Please visit [the website](#) to view a full list of the documents that were submitted for consultation during this time.

Feedback was received from a variety of stakeholders around the country via email, the Skills Impact Feedback Hub, webinars, via phone and email, as follows:

	ACT	NSW	NT	Qld	SA	Tas	Vic	WA	National
<b>Industry (employer / employee)</b>	*		*						
<b>Industry association (includes feedback from Industry Advisory Bodies)</b>			*						
<b>Union</b>									**
<b>Registered Training Organisation (RTO)</b>	*		*						
<b>Government department</b>	*		*						

\*Feedback received from a national industry association and an Industry Training Advisory Body, as well as research undertaken by the project team, indicates no relevant stakeholders in the Northern Territory and Australian Capital Territory.

\*\* Relevant unions have been kept informed throughout the duration of this project, however none have provided feedback during this consultation period.

Feedback received during the 'drafts available' period for the qualification, skills sets and units of competency that have been developed for flour milling and stockfeed has been positive, with improvements made to terminology, other minor changes and updates suggested by stakeholders.

Below is a summary of the feedback raised for the draft qualifications and units of competency developed and reviewed for the Flour Milling project, and how these have been dealt with. This involves a consideration of the information provided, views of industry stakeholders and from people who are part of the Subject Matter Expert Working Group. Resolutions are constructed to consider 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.

**Acronyms - PC – Performance Criteria, PE – Performance Evidence, KE – Knowledge Evidence, AC – Assessment Conditions, SMEs – Subject Matter Experts**

Please use the menu below to navigate to the feedback you wish to view.

## Table of Contents

<b>Summary of feedback on draft qualification FBP3X120 Certificate III in Food Processing (Milling)</b>	<b>3</b>
Comments related to Core Units .....	3
General Qualification comments .....	3
<b>Summary of feedback on draft Skill Sets .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Summary of feedback on draft Units of Competency .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Revised units of competency .....	6
<b>General comments on units of competency .....</b>	<b>15</b>
Proposed units of competency for removal .....	15
<b>General feedback on 21-10 Flour Milling project .....</b>	<b>18</b>

## Summary of feedback on draft qualification FBP3X120 Certificate III in Food Processing (Milling)

Based on SMEWG feedback, the proposal is to remove the Certificate IV in Flour Milling from the National VET system as Millers prefer an existing international qualification for training at this level; it is well recognised and respected Worldwide. The recommendation of the SMEWG was to add a Milling specialisation to the *Certificate III in Food Processing*, in order to address skills gaps that exist at level 3.

### Comments related to Core Units

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
SMEWG; Industry employer/employee; Qld, WA, Vic, Industry Association; National, RTO; Qld	RE: Core units in Certificate III in Food Processing The units already included in this qualification will suit flour millers, providing there is a range of milling specific units in the specialisation and in general electives	<b>Noted.</b> Thank you.

### General Qualification comments

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry employer/employee; Vic	I agree with the change to the application statement, to include reference to 'under the direction of the head miller'.	<b>Noted.</b> Thank you.
Industry employer/employee; NSW	I am not sure that reducing the level of the Qualification from a Cert 4 to a 3 is good as well. I used to teach the cereal milling certificate at TAFE in NSW as a industry based teacher and am not sure how this level of education would be delivered as well. If you would like to discuss in more detail please feel free to give me a call, as I am happy to help and get involved.	<b>Noted.</b> However; after a follow up phone call as requested and further discussion with the SMEWG, there was confirmation was received that there is a well recognised and respected international qualification to address level 4 skills. The skills gaps that exist are at level 3.
Industry employer/employee; SA, Vic, TAS	Firstly I must say that it would be disappointing to delete Certificate IV in flour milling. Having said that, we can probably understand why. The reason it would be disappointing is that there has been a lot of effort over the	<b>Noted.</b> Thank you for your thoughts. In conjunction with discussions of the SMEWG, a Milling specialisation will be created within the Certificate III in Food Processing to include the relevant skills for mill operatives. The

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution	
	<p>years in the creation and formation of this certificate IV level qualification. [company name] have played its part in this over the years at various levels. This morning I discussed your email with [colleague] – our head miller who is currently the “Tutor” for [external] milling course. Our opinion is mutual. [Company name] have and continue to use [external milling course] modules as our form of training in milling. We use this because of the structured approach to learning as well as this being what is recognised worldwide. We do, however, fully support the notion of the units of competency associated with the Cert IV not being lost and further support these units being incorporated into the Cert III in food processing. We believe this then can provide training at that level for individuals who elect these as a benefit to their overall training – hopefully in flour milling.</p>	<p>existing international qualification caters well for level 4 skills, the skills gaps exist at level 3.</p>
RTO; Vic	<p>The qualification appears to all be fine and appropriately deemed ‘not equivalent’ given the changes to the Packaging Rules. The AQF level appears appropriate and lower level qualifications are not ‘nested’ within the Certificate III.</p>	<p><b>Noted.</b> Thank you.</p>
Industry employer/employee; WA	<p>I believe the unit “Lead Shift Milling Operations” is above the Mill Operative and above the cert 3 qualification.</p>	<p><b>Noted and agreed.</b> Units have been recoded to reflect AQF4. They remain as general electives in the Certificate III in Food Processing.</p>
Industry employer/employee; WA	<p>All of the 7 units in Group G – Milling would be required of a mill operative on our site. (however understand this may be a necessity of the cert)</p>	<p><b>Noted.</b> Users would need to complete 5 of the units to achieve the specialisation, but they could complete all units in Group G if relevant as the qualification requires completion of 12 elective units. The packaging rules allow for some flexibility around elective unit choices.</p>
Industry employer/employee; Vic	<p>We support the proposal to remove the Certificate IV in Flour Milling from the national register and we support the creation of a Milling specialisation in the Certificate III in Food Processing.</p>	<p><b>Noted.</b> In conjunction with feedback from the Subject Matter Expert Working Group, the Certificate IV in Flour Milling is proposed for removal from the National Register.</p>

## Summary of feedback on draft Skill Sets

<b>FBPSSXXX05 Supervised Food Processing Skill Set</b>		
<b>Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues</b>		<b>Consideration and Proposed Resolution</b>
RTO; Vic	I note that all the new / revised units included in the proposed Skill Sets will be submitted for endorsement and will be appropriately 'housed' within qualifications.	<b>Noted.</b> Thank you.
<b>FBPSSXXX06 Food Processing Operator Skill Set</b>		
<b>Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues</b>		<b>Consideration and Proposed Resolution</b>
RTO; Vic	I note that all the new / revised units included in the proposed Skill Sets will be submitted for endorsement and will be appropriately 'housed' within qualifications.	<b>Noted.</b> Thank you.

## Summary of feedback on draft Units of Competency

### Revised units of competency

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FBPGRA3XX2 Operate and monitor grain conditioning</b>		
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Application, first paragraph, point to 'adding' add water to achieve optimum milling results.	<b>Adopted.</b> Thank you.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence 'typical additives used in grain conditioning' Not in flour milling	<b>Adopted.</b> Reference to additives removed.
RTO; Vic	RE: Equivalence New Performance Criteria have been added and new Elements, e.g.PC2.3 Take and test samples. These are additional work outcomes to those described in the units to be superseded and therefore such units cannot be deemed equivalent. I request you review the equivalence of all units that have had new Performance Criteria added that alters the work outcome	<b>Noted</b> , though the changes are minor and the outcomes of which can be mapped to the previous version. 'Take and check samples' is implied in 'Monitor' the process. Changes have been made to clarify the task, not to change what is done. (And monitoring was already included in the previous version.) All unit mapping checked as requested, and outcomes are deemed equivalent.
Industry employer/employee; WA	RE: Application Replace 'one batch of grain' with 'at least one silo of grain'	<b>Adopted (partly).</b> The volume and frequency of performance has been updated across all units to 'operated on at least one occasion' to meet specifications. So the word 'batch' has been removed.
Industry employer/employee; WA	RE: Knowledge Evidence query on main equipment components Very diverse area. Would avoid enumeration.	<b>Adopted (partly).</b> Some detail added around main equipment components - mainly about knowing how and where adjustments can be made.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Application Suggest to add 'at the required parameters' to first paragraph and to end the final sentence of second paragraph at 'processes'.	<b>Adopted.</b> First paragraph sentence now reads; <i>to condition grain by adding water at the required parameters to achieve optimum milling results.</i> Second paragraph final sentence now reads; <i>It typically targets the production worker responsible for applying operating principles to the operation and monitoring of grain conditioning equipment and processes.</i>

<b>Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues</b>		<b>Consideration and Proposed Resolution</b>
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Performance Criteria 1.4 Suggest to replace 'Fit' with 'Set up'.	<b>Adopted.</b> PC 1.4 now reads; <i>Set up and adjust machine components and related attachments according to operating requirements</i>
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Performance Criteria 3.1 Suggest replace 'Identify' with 'Follow'.	<b>Noted.</b> However, advised by SMEWG that 'identify' is more appropriate here.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Performance Criteria 3.4 Not sure this is relevant, but will not hurt to leave.	<b>Noted.</b> Thank you. PC 3.4 remains.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Foundation Skills Not all plants have digital interface. Use the word 'grist' in place of 'wheat'.	<b>Adopted.</b> <i>'and/or paper based formats'</i> added. Grist replaces wheat. Now reads; <i>Calculate water addition to suit machine and grist type.</i>
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Performance Evidence Suggest to add 'to required specifications'	<b>Adopted.</b> Now reads; <i>checking moisture content of grist meets product specifications.</i>
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence Agree with deletions made and have made suggestions for additions including; visually inspecting conditioned grain, testing moisture levels and checking silo allocations are correct.	<b>Adopted.</b> All suggestions added, thank you.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Assessment Conditions: Add 'correct use of' to 'personal protective equipment'	<b>Adopted.</b> Thank you.
<b>FBPGRA3XX3 Operate and monitor grain cleaning</b>		
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Application, first paragraph prior to and following the conditioning process	<b>Adopted.</b> Application updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence, bullet points 9 & 10 'purpose of the break rolls, how and why the separation of endosperm takes place' This is not relevant to this section	<b>Adopted.</b> Dot points removed.

<b>Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues</b>		<b>Consideration and Proposed Resolution</b>
Industry employer/employee; WA	RE: Knowledge Evidence 'purpose of the break rolls' and 'how and why the separation of endosperm takes place' do not belong in grain cleaning, they belong in break roll.	<b>Adopted.</b> Dot points removed.
<b>FBPGRA3XX4 Recieve and handle grain in a storage area</b>		
RTO; Vic, Govt; Vic	RE: Equivalence New Performance Criteria have been added and new Elements, e.g. element 1. These are additional work outcomes to those described in the units to be superseded and therefore such units cannot be deemed equivalent. I request you review the equivalence of all units that have had new Performance Criteria added that alters the work outcome.	<b>Adopted.</b> Unit deemed 'Not equivalent', agree that the additional elements have added to the outcomes of the unit.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence, 2nd bullet point Understand the need to identify grain which is either out of specification or unsound. Understand the escalation procedure for this OoS grain. Understand the wheat receival charts including common defects...	<b>Adopted.</b> Content added
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence, 4th bullet point protein, moisture, screenings, hectolitre	<b>Adopted.</b> Content added
Industry employer/employee; WA	RE: Application, first paragraph Not always in a confined space, can this be removed?	<b>Adopted.</b> Reference to 'confined space' in first sentence removed.
Industry employer/employee; WA	RE: Performance Evidence Suggest replace 'batch' with 'load'.	<b>Adopted (partly).</b> The volume and frequency of performance has been updated across all units to 'operated on at least one occasion' to meet specifications. So the word 'batch' has been removed.
Industry employer/employee; WA	RE: Knowledge Evidence Perhaps: Operating principles of grain receival and storage equipment (Augers, elevators, drag chains). Cleaning and segregation procedures for organic grain.	<b>Adopted.</b> Dot point added
<b>FBPGRA3XX6 Operate and monitor sifting and grading</b>		



<b>Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues</b>		<b>Consideration and Proposed Resolution</b>
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Application Are we talking about break sifters only?	Yes.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Performance Evidence, third bullet point old out dated name (break stock is far better and modern)	<b>Adopted.</b> Break stock used.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence This entire section looks like a copy paste with no specific information on sifting itself. It appears to need a fair bit of work.	<b>Adopted.</b> Detail refined following lengthy discussions with industry experts from the SMEWG.
<b>FBPGRAGRA3XX9 Monitor a purification process</b>		
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Application Purification process. To effectively separate break or sizing stocks into clean semolina (endosperm), composite stock (endosperm with bran adhering) and branny stocks.	<b>Adopted.</b> Application updated as suggested.
<b>FBPGRA3X10 Monitor scratch and sizing</b>		
RTO; Vic, Govt; Vic	RE: Equivalence New Performance Criteria have been added and new Elements, e.g.PC 3.4 Waste disposal These are additional work outcomes to those described in the units to be superseded and therefore such units cannot be deemed equivalent. I request you review the equivalence of all units that have had new Performance Criteria added that alters the work outcome	<b>Noted.</b> However, the changes are minor and the outcomes of which can be mapped to the previous version. 'Waste disposal' is implied in 'Maintain the work area'. Changes have been made to clarify the task, not to change what is done. Equivalence status of all units checked, as requested, and outcomes are deemed equivalent.
RTO; Vic, Govt; Vic	RE: Application This unit appears to have virtually the same application as FBPGRA3X11 Monitor a break roll process. I may be showing my lack of milling knowledge here but perhaps a slight rewording would highlight to stakeholders the different outcomes to be achieved through training against the two units.	<b>Adopted.</b> Application of all units updated to include detail of the job task.

<b>Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues</b>		<b>Consideration and Proposed Resolution</b>
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Application, first paragraph Adjust so that there is good separation between endosperm and bran for further processing.	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Application, reference to Head Miller Miller/Head Miller.	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Performance Criteria 2.4 "test" probably better worded as "check" instead. Endosperm is admixed with bran, so we really need to see that the "bran is not adhering to endosperm" and that minimal flour is produced at this step.	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Performance Evidence Milling is not a batch process so no need to mention batch.	<b>Adopted.</b> The volume and frequency of performance has been updated across all units to 'operated on at least one occasion' to meet specifications. So the word 'batch' has been removed.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence, bullet point 7 'quality requirements of materials and effect of variation on scratch and sizing process performance' Not sure what is meant by this.	<b>Adopted.</b> Dot point removed.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence, bullet point 11 reference to 'recording requirements' Not sure what this would be.	<b>Adopted.</b> Dot point removed.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Assessment Conditions Not keen on "batch", better "job" or "run" or "grist".	<b>Adopted.</b> The volume and frequency of performance has been updated across all units to 'operated on at least one occasion' to meet specifications. So the word 'batch' has been removed.
Industry employer/employee; WA	RE: Application, first paragraph Suggest replace 'adjust' with 'monitor' (mill operative only)	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
<b>FBPGRA3X11 Monitor a break roll</b>		
Industry employer/employee; Vic	I agree with the addition of 'under the direction of the Head Miller' as an addition to the Application statement.	<b>Adopted.</b> Thank you.

<b>Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues</b>		<b>Consideration and Proposed Resolution</b>
RTO; Vic, Govt; Vic	RE: Application This unit appears to have virtually the same application as FBPGRA3X10 Monitor a scratch and sizing process. I may be showing my lack of milling knowledge here but perhaps a slight rewording would highlight to stakeholders the different outcomes to be achieved through training against the two units.	<b>Adopted.</b> Application of all units updated to include detail of the job task.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Application, second paragraph 'under the direction of the Head Miller' common for all units miller/head miller	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Performance Criteria 2.4 'met and bran is separated from endosperm' Correct break release is achieved for each passage.	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Performance Evidence, third bullet point Ensure correct break release is achieved for each break passage. Maximise yield while also maximising flour quality.	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence 'measuring and testing as required by the process' and performing break releases correctly.	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Assessment Conditions replace 'break roll' with 'milling'.	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Performance Evidence Suggest replace 'batch' with 'grist'.	<b>Adopted (partly).</b> The volume and frequency of performance has been updated across all units to 'operated on at least one occasion' to meet specifications. So the word 'batch' has been removed.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Performance Evidence, third bullet Suggest reword to 'ensured break releases have been carried out to meet required yield and flour quality'.	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.

<b>Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues</b>		<b>Consideration and Proposed Resolution</b>
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Performance Evidence, fourth bullet point Suggest 'adjusted rolls when deed appropriate to do so'.	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence, first bullet point Suggest remove the word 'process' in all instances, just say 'break roll'.	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence, second bullet point Suggest to add 'including any level control system, feed roll, feed gate, main rolls, roll adjustment, scrapers' Remove 'equipment operating capacities and applications'.	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence, fifth bullet point Suggest replace 'roll process' with 'system'.	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence Not sure what 'quality characteristics to be achieved by the break' is saying?	<b>Adopted.</b> Thank you following clarification, this bullet point has been removed.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence Suggest remove bullet points seven and eight 'quality requirements...' and 'operating requirements...'	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence Suggest remove 'or breaches' from 'symptoms of chokes, blockages or breaches'.	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence Suggest to add series of sub bullet points following 'methods used to monitor the break rolls' - Visual inspection of inlet product for variation in granulation across the roller length and presence of any unexpected stock or flour - Visual inspection of outlet product for semolina production and bran clean-up without excessive damage to bran	<b>Adopted.</b> Suggested content included.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Visual inspection to pre-check rolls are parallel</li> <li>- Temperature check of roll stocks on back of hands</li> <li>- Break release procedure, correct sampling technique, weighing, sifting and calculating</li> </ul> Suggest to remove; 'process, including inspecting, measuring and testing as required by the process' and 'inspection of test points....'	
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence Suggest to add bullet point; 'Techniques to adjust the rolls including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Feed gate adjustment to achieve feed across the entire rollerlength</li> <li>- Feed level adjustment (where applicable)</li> <li>- Main roll adjustment to achieve correct break release and parallel adjustment.</li> </ul>	<b>Adopted.</b> Suggested content included.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence Suggest to replace 'of variation and corrective action required' with 'of poor or inadequate grind including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- worn flutes</li> <li>- inappropriate conditioning</li> </ul>	<b>Adopted.</b> Suggested content included.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence Suggest add sub bullets; 'production stop, routine mill shutdown and unexpected production stop' under 'requirements of different shutdowns...'	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence Remove 'routine' leave 'emergency'	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence Add bullet point 'What to do in case of a change of grist on the mill'.	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Knowledge Evidence Suggest remove 'basic operating principles of process control...', 'procedures to track traceability....' and 'procedures to ensure biosecurity...'	<b>Noted.</b> However, ' <i>basic operating principles of process control...</i> '; ' <i>procedures to track traceability....</i> ' and ' <i>procedures to ensure biosecurity...</i> ' have been identified as important knowledge that needs to be addressed in training and assessment by the SMEWG.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Performance Evidence, query on 'flour and its relevance to stockfeed'. Flour yield and quality no. That is a problem of having a catch-all training package for flour milling and feed milling (they are rather different businesses). Can you provide me with some details on what is expected here?	<b>Noted.</b> Units of competency should be contextualised to suit learners needs and workplace requirements. Feedback was received from experts in both stockfeed and flour milling so the unit should be able to be adjusted to suit either stock feed or flour milling outcomes.  <i>Note: Stakeholder was provided additional detail by phone and Zoom.</i>
Industry employer/employee; Vic	RE: Performance Evidence, query on volume and frequency We could say, complete at least 2 break releases perhaps	<b>Adopted (partly).</b> The volume and frequency of performance has been updated across all units to 'operated on at least one occasion' to meet specifications. So the word 'batch' has been removed.
Industry employer/employee; WA	RE: Application 'adjust' must be replaced with 'monitor'. Consensus at SME workshop was for operatives not to be adjusting equipment.	<b>Adopted.</b> Wording updated.
Industry employer/employee; WA	RE: Knowledge Evidence Please review inclusion of 'High drive motor amperage'.	<b>Adopted.</b> Added to Knowledge evidence.
Industry employer/employee; WA	RE: Knowledge Evidence Please review 'break release procedure, correct sampling technique, weighing, sifting and calculating' as nothing currently mentions checking break releases are balanced at each end of the roll.	<b>Adopted.</b> Content updated.

## General comments on units of competency

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry employer/employee; Vic	The reduction system is not represented in existing documentation. This is an essential skill and should be covered fully.	<b>Noted.</b> New unit created. <i>FBPGRA3X12 Monitor a reduction system.</i>

## Proposed units of competency for removal

Identified during the initial scoping of this project as possibly being suitable for inclusion in Certificate IV in Flour Milling qualification. However, feedback received at the initial SME workshop resulted in the proposal for the Certificate IV in Flour Milling to be removed from the National Register.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FBPGRA3003 Lead flour milling shift operations</b>		
RTO; NSW	RE: Retention We have developed these units very recently and during this process industry consultations were done by the teacher and incorporated their feedback in these two units development. So yes they suit the current industry needs.	<b>Noted.</b> Unit reinstated on request. The unit code has been updated to reflect AQF 4 and minor changes made - refer to mapping document for detail. New code and title, <i>FBPGRA4XX1 Lead flour milling shift operations</i>
RTO; NSW	RE: Retention The terminology in the current state is fine as this has been considered during the units development. According to [name] the Product Specialist who developed these two units the standard is advanced and above AQF level 3 as these two units are supervisory positions relating to 'leading' mill workers and 'controlling' mill performance.	
RTO; NSW	RE: Retention I have just sat and went through the unit assessment tools for both the flour milling units FBPGRA3003 Lead flour milling shift operations and FBPGRA3004 Control mill processes and performance as well as the student workbook. I feel the information in the workbooks capture the process very well and gives a good sound knowledge base for these units. Likewise,	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<p>the assessments will allow the assessor to determine the underpinning knowledge and the skill level of the student. I don't think there is anything to be added or taken away from these documents that would improve the overall outcome of the assessment.</p>	
<b>FBPGRA3004 Control mill processes and performance</b>		
RTO; NSW	<p>RE: Retention We have developed these units very recently and during this process industry consultations were done by the teacher and incorporated their feedback in these two units development. So yes they suit the current industry needs.</p>	<p><b>Noted.</b> Unit reinstated on request. The unit code has been updated to reflect AQF 4 and minor changes made - refer to mapping document for detail. New code and title, <i>FBPGRA4XX2 Control mill processes and performance</i>.</p>
RTO; NSW	<p>RE: Retention The terminology in the current state is fine as this has been considered during the units development. According to [name] the Product Specialist who developed these two units the standard is advance and above AQF level 3 as these two units are supervisory positions relating to 'leading' mill workers and 'controlling' mill performance.</p>	
RTO; NSW	<p>RE: Retention I have just sat and went through the unit assessment tools for both the flour milling units FBPGRA3003 Lead flour milling shift operations and FBPGRA3004 Control mill processes and performance as well as the student workbook. I feel the information in the workbooks capture the process very well and gives a good sound knowledge base for these units. Likewise, the assessments will allow the assessor to determine the underpinning knowledge and the skill level of the student. I don't think there is anything to be added or taken away from these documents that would improve the overall outcome of the assessment.</p>	



<b>Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues</b>		<b>Consideration and Proposed Resolution</b>
<b>FBPGRA2002 Recognise mill operations and technologies</b>		
SMEWG; Industry employer/employee; Qld, WA, Vic, Industry Association; National, RTO; Qld	This unit is no longer deemed not suitable for this project. The content is covered within other units. No need for this stand alone low level unit of competency.	No feedback requiring action. Unit will be removed.
<b>FBPGRA4001 Control power and automation for milling processes</b>		
SMEWG; Industry employer/employee; Qld, WA, Vic, Industry Association; National, RTO; Qld	This unit is no longer deemed not suitable for this project. The Certificate IV in Flour Milling is proposed to be removed from the National Register and this unit is not appropriate for the Certificate III in Food Processing (Milling) that is being developed	No feedback requiring action. Unit will be removed.
<b>FBPGRA4002 Supervise testing processes for wheat and flour</b>		
SMEWG; Industry employer/employee; Qld, WA, Vic, Industry Association; National, RTO; Qld	This unit is no longer deemed not suitable for this project. The Certificate IV in Flour Milling is proposed to be removed from the National Register and this unit is not appropriate for the Certificate III in Food Processing (Milling) that is being developed	No feedback requiring action. Unit will be removed.
<b>FBPGRA4003 Manage mill logistics and support services</b>		
SMEWG; Industry employer/employee; Qld, WA, Vic, Industry Association; National, RTO; Qld	This unit is no longer deemed not suitable for this project. The Certificate IV in Flour Milling is proposed to be removed from the National Register and this unit is not appropriate for the Certificate III in Food Processing (Milling) that is being developed	No feedback requiring action. Unit will be removed.
<b>FBPGRA4004 Establish and supervise dust control procedures in a grain processing enterprise</b>		
SMEWG; Industry employer/employee; Qld, WA, Vic, Industry Association; National, RTO; Qld	This unit is no longer deemed not suitable for this project. The Certificate IV in Flour Milling is proposed to be removed from the National Register and this unit is not appropriate for the Certificate III in Food Processing (Milling) that is being developed	No feedback requiring action. Unit will be removed.

## General feedback on 21-10 Flour Milling project

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry employer/employee; NSW	After discussions with [colleague] we suggest you continue with your proposal.	<b>Noted.</b> Thank you.
Industry employer/employee; NSW	The documents you have sent look generally OK, but I will need more time to review them properly. At 1st look they appear to discuss equipment operation but without development of the fundamental engineer / Physical principals that under pin the machine design and operations.	<b>Noted.</b> Followed up with phone discussion. Details addressing fundamental principles have been added across units to address typical equipment problems and adjustments that need to be made to ensure quality outcomes.
Industry employer/employee; QLD Industry employer/employee; WA	Only one broad problem: The mill operative should NOT be adjusting milling systems – I think this was the consensus in our teleconference (SME workshop). I believe the unit “Lead Shift Milling Operations” is above the Mill Operative and above the cert 3 qualification.	<b>Adopted.</b> The introductory sentence in the Application of the units that refers to 'adjust' has been changed to 'monitor'. The ' <i>Lead shift milling operations</i> ' unit has been re-coded to reflect AQF level 4.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	Comments made in Knowledge Evidence section of Break Roll unit apply to all units where applicable, more detail to come.	<b>Adopted.</b> Further detail refined in units after follow up Zoom conference.
Industry employer/employee; Vic	I have one burning question about the units and trying to be relevant to both the flour milling and feed milling – they are rather different from a technical standpoint. How do we write a document to cover both? I see it as very difficult/impossible.	<b>Noted.</b> However, units should be contextualised for delivery in different settings. At AQF level 3, this is an appropriate approach, as discussed over the phone.
RTO; Vic	I note that all the new / revised units included in the proposed Skill Sets will be submitted for endorsement and will be appropriately 'housed' within qualifications.	<b>Noted.</b> Thank you.
RTO; Vic	The units are well structured and provide clear requirements for trainers and assessors. However in some instances the required Knowledge Evidence is extensive and not always aligned with the Performance Criteria e.g. FBPGRA3X10 requires knowledge of 'good manufacturing practices (GMP), cross contamination, lock out and tag out procedures, relationship between control panels and systems. I am certain that these topics are relevant to grain processing but they add considerable extra training requirements that are not directly related to the achievement of the work outcomes as described	<b>Adopted (partly).</b> Knowledge Evidence dot points have been reviewed by subject matter experts and refined throughout all units to ensure they are relevant and necessary.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	in the Performance Criteria. I request that all the units are reviewed and where listed Knowledge Evidence is essential to the achievement of the work outcome then the Performance Criteria are amended appropriately. Should aspects of the listed Knowledge Evidence not be essential then I request those unnecessary aspects are removed.	
RTO; Vic	It appears that some of this required Knowledge Evidence was not in the units to be superseded therefore these additions may have an impact on determination of equivalence.	<b>Noted.</b> On the whole, the changes to Knowledge Evidence are about refining/clarifying the detail, for example adding examples of typical problems or how product quality can be checked. The outcomes of the units are equivalent in most cases. The status of <i>FBPGRA3XX4 Receive and handle grain in a storage area</i> , has been changed to 'Not equivalent'.
Industry Association; National	The units are written to cover both stock feed and flour, so just avoid adding too much detail about flour grades.	<b>Noted.</b> Thank you.