

Poultry Processing Project



Summary of Feedback, Responses and Actions

April 2020

This project includes the review of one unit of competency, as well as the development of three units of competency and eight skill sets within the AMP Australian Meat Processing Training Package. Consultation undertaken determined that subsequently four units were needed and the number of skill sets increased from five to ten. The final draft materials were developed as a result of feedback provided by stakeholders and Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) during the validation period 4 December – 9 March.

A validation meeting was held on the 14 January at which all documents were validated. During this meeting increased engagement with industry stakeholders who had not yet provided feedback on the project occurred and a great deal of feedback was received. This required the skill sets and units to be significantly revised. Following this, two consultation meetings were held with two key processors, as well as phone calls and emails. The drafts were then revised and emailed to the SME Working Group for final validation.

Validation feedback was also received from a variety of stakeholders around the country via phone and emails. The table below provides an overview of the groups and jurisdictions that have provided feedback during this phase of the project.

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

** Note: Email reminders about the validation phase were sent to all SMEs and stakeholders who had registered their interest in the project, but this project was impacted due to the bushfires, floods and COVID-19. Some stakeholders who did respond to the reminder emails stated that where their industry has a representation on the Technical Advisory Committee they are happy to leave the validation sign-off in their hands, having already provided their feedback during the first draft public consultation stage.*

Below is a summary of the issues raised for the draft units of competency and skill sets developed and reviewed for the Poultry Processing project, and how these issues 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 process. 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

Summary of validation feedback on Skill Sets.....	3
New skill sets.....	3
Summary of validation feedback on Units of Competency	8
New units of competency	8
Proposed units of competency for deletion.....	15

Summary of validation feedback on Skill Sets

New skill sets

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
General comments		
Government department, Western Australia	<p>Via email (post validation meeting)</p> <p>Many thanks for sending through the information for validation for the following meat processing projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diploma and Advanced Diploma in Meat Processing Project; • Game Harvesting Auditing Project; • Halal Meat Project; and • Poultry Processing Project. <p>The STA has distributed the information to stakeholders in Western Australia. We have not received any feedback on the projects.</p> <p>If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	Thank you for the feedback.
AMPSS00067 Poultry Processing Quality Assurance Skill Set		
<p>Validation committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government body, National • RTO, QLD • Industry, National x 3 	<p>It was queried if corrective action was covered by this skill set – project team confirmed that yes this was covered within AMPCOR402.</p> <p>The question was raised by the project t should AMPX209 Sharpen knives be included in this skill set? Committee members confirmed that yes, it should.</p> <p>It was highlighted that allergens awareness might be an area of future development, but was not required for this skill set.</p>	<p>AMPA3123 Perform ante and post-mortem inspection – Poultry removed and replaced with AMPA3002 Handle animals humanely while conducting ante-mortem inspection</p> <p>AMPX310 Perform pre-operations hygiene assessment added to the skill set</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<p>It was raised the fact that the QA person doesn't conduct post-mortem inspection of the poultry, this is usually done on the line by an operator, so AMPA3123 is not appropriate for the skill set. This could be replaced by AMPA3002 Handle animals humanely while conducting ante mortem inspection.</p> <p>After later discussion relating to the Poultry Processor Supervisor Skills Set, the group agreed that AMPX310 Perform pre-operations Hygiene assessment should be added to this Skill Set</p>	
AMPSS00068 Poultry Pre-processing Skill Set (Electrical Stunning)		
<p>Validation committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government body, National • RTO, QLD • Industry, National x 3 	<p>There was quite a bit of discussion regarding the different types of stunning (electrical or gas) used by different organisations and that this would affect which units should be included in this skill set. Gas-stunned bird are still required to be hung, but it's a different task to hanging a live, conscious bird which is then electrically stunned.</p> <p>It was determined that it would be more appropriate to have two skills sets – one for gas stunning and one for electrical</p> <p>It was queried if manual culls were covered in this skill set – the project team confirmed that this was addressed in AMPA3002</p>	Change made to title to reflect this skill set was for electrical stunning
AMPSS00069 Poultry Stunning, Bleeding, Scalding and De-feathering Skill Set		
<p>Validation committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government body, National • RTO, QLD • Industry, National x 3 	There were no issues with this skill set, the draft was considered to be suitable.	No changes made
AMPSS00070 Poultry Evisceration Skill Set		
<p>Validation committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government body, National • RTO, QLD 	Evisceration and pre-washing occurs in this role, but not chilling. AMPP206 Operate a poultry washing and chilling process should be removed	Title changed to remove washing.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industry, National x 3 	<p>Poultry washing and chilling are two separate tasks at one company – the unit AMPP206 Operate a poultry washing and chilling process may need to be split into two separate units</p> <p>The project team queried if the unit AMPX317 Monitor product flow in an automated process was appropriate for this skill set – attendees agreed that yes it was</p>	<p>Unit <i>AMPP206 Operate a poultry washing and chilling process</i> removed from skill set</p>
AMPSS00071 Poultry Processing Boning and Filleting Skill Set		
<p>Validation committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government body, National RTO, QLD Industry, National x 3 	<p>Deboning and filleting is quite automated, however it also still happens manually, so AMPP302 is an appropriate unit.</p> <p>The project team queried if the new unit Monitor product flow in an automated process was relevant – attendees agreed that this unit was valid for this skill set.</p> <p>The project team queried if this skill set contained too many units or if there were any that weren't relevant to the skill set – Baiada suggested that AMPP301 Operate a poultry carcass delivery system could be removed."</p>	<p>Unit <i>AMPP301 Operate a poultry carcass delivery system</i> removed</p>
AMPSS00072 Poultry Further Processing Skill Set		
<p>Validation committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government body, National RTO, QLD Industry, National x 3 	<p>The project team queried whether a packaging unit was required one company responded that there are so many different packaging options it makes it difficult to include this in the skill set.</p> <p>Attendees were satisfied with the draft for this skill set as it is.</p>	<p>No changes made</p>
AMPSS00073 Poultry Processing Waste Disposal Skill Set		
<p>Validation committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government body, National RTO, QLD Industry, National x 3 	<p>One industry representative commented that it was great to see that monitoring product being sent to rendering was being recognised as important.</p> <p>Another queried if manual handling was covered in this skill set – the project team responded that it was not, and recommended AMPCOR204 Follow safe work policies and procedures be added.</p> <p>Attendees were otherwise satisfied with this skill set.</p>	<p>Unit <i>AMPCOR204 Follow safe work policies and procedures</i> added</p> <p>Unit <i>DFOP2032A Work in a clean room environment</i> removed</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<p>Immediately after the meeting one person contacted the project team with some additional feedback on this skill set</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AMPA2161 appeared to cover only waste water, but solid waste disposal is also important. AMPX318 might address this, but also may need to be expanded as it only covers contamination (but is this not how solid waste is disposed of – sent to rendering?). Also, AMPA2161 can actually include recovery of solid waste • The unit FDFOP2032A Work in a clean room environment would not be used by Baiada and could be removed from the skill set • AMPCOR206 Overview the meat industry is not relevant for this skill set – it's too comprehensive for this role. However more discussion is needed regarding this context of social responsibility important, and is a basic Core unit 	
AMPSS00074 Poultry Processing Supervisor Skill Set	
<p>Validation committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government body, National • RTO, QLD Industry, National x 3 <p>An early draft of this unit had considered a longer list of supervisory units but it had been pared down since then. One attendee raised that conflict resolution is very important for supervisors in their organisation. AMPX412 Build productive and effective workplace relationships will be added. Someone recommended that AMPX310 Perform pre-operations hygiene assessment be removed from this skill set as this is typically a QA officer role, not a supervisor. As a result the unit was added to the Quality Assurance Skill Set. The project team queried if AMPX423 Supervise new recruits should be included – attendees agreed yes it should be added. Further discussion then raised other units that should also be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AMPA3071 Implement food safety program • AMPCOR401 Manage own work performance 	<p>The following units were removed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AMPX310 Perform pre-operations hygiene assessment • AMPX422 Develop and implement work instructions and SOPs • BSBLDR401 Develop teams & individuals <p>The following units were added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AMPA3071 Implement a food safety program • AMPCOR401 Manage own work performance • AMPCOR403 Participate in workplace health and safety risk control process • AMPX423 Supervise new recruits

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMPCOR403 Participate in workplace health and safety risk control process. 	
AMPSS00075 Poultry Pre-processing Skill Set (Gas Stunning)		
Validation committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government body, National RTO, QLD Industry, National x 3 	Discussion determined that there was a need for another pre-processing skill set to be developed to cover gas stunning. This is because birds are not shackled for CAS stunning and so AMPP207 is not appropriate and there is still a need for a new unit for bird receipt (AMPP209) to cover premises that use gas stunning. The units included in this skill set are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMPCOR202 Apply hygiene and sanitation practices AMPCOR204 Follow safe work policies and procedures AMPCOR205 Communicate in the workplace AMPA3002 Handle animals humanely while conducting ante-mortem inspection AMPP209 Operate the bird receipt process 	New skill set created.
AMPSS00076 Poultry Processing Initial Chilling Skill Set		
Validation committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government body, National RTO, QLD Industry, National x 3 	Discussions determined that there was a need for another skill set to be developed to cover the chilling process, which would contain the following units: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMPCOR201 Maintain personal equipment AMPCOR202 Apply hygiene and sanitation practices AMPCOR203 Comply with Quality Assurance and HACCP requirements AMPCOR204 Follow safe work policies and procedures AMPP206 Operate a poultry washing and chilling process (and take a closer look at this unit to determine if this unit needed to be separated into two processes) AMPX317 Monitor product flow in an automated process" 	New skill set created

Summary of validation feedback on Units of Competency

New units of competency

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AMPP209 Operate the live bird receival process	
<p>Industry, National</p>	<p>Bird Receival Is a bit muddled. I would think this would refer to pre-hang, but, I may be misunderstanding. There is a couple of references to removing dead and unfit birds & hanging (point 6 in knowledge evidence)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not much on environmental. (mainly refer to the bird's environment) for control of feather, manure, odour, noise etc. - Animal Welfare - at this point should there be mention of the euthanasia process? If not full training on how to, at least a reference to how it is performed and what is required before a trained operator can perform via both methods. May be not yet required at this point (unless they are also referring to hanging which will require more criteria and evidence. I'm not sure there is actually the hanging process covered by current units) - knowledge evidence does state some points for animal welfare, but, there is no reference in performance criteria? <p>Application, second paragraph: Whom would these individuals be? (This conversation resulted in considering splitting this module)</p> <p>Element 1: PC 1.1 suggested rewording 'Confirm live birds are available for production requirements' to 'Confirm live</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<p>bird numbers are available to meet production requirements' Queried who would be responsible for this PC1.2 queried when cleaning and maintenance would be confirmed.</p> <p>Element 2. 2.1 - commented also need to be able to inspect the birds to make sure they are comfortable whilst being held in the lairage, and there are no trapped appendages in crates and 2.1 damaged modules to be removed from use and tagged out, 2.5 assume that these are defined in the Unit and 2.6 OK - what about euthanasia (not at this step though)</p> <p>knowledge evidence: bullet point 1 covering basic principles of bird handling identify if birds are not comfortable in lairage/ holding area ; bullet point 2 Yes - would be more the Live Bird supervisor; bullet point 8 added euthanasia to this point ; bullet point 9, added (impacts on process interruptions and required corrective actions)</p> <p>'Assessment conditions: 1. under resources, the point 'birds to use in the process' added 'and those that are not fit for purpose?' 2. under specifications on first bullet point, 'as per TMW comments, may need to consider including more environmental impacts in the unit; odour, noise, etc 3. added '• Taking appropriate and timely corrective action/s ' as a last point"</p>	<p>PC1.1 rewording adopted, and the supervisor might do this task but the operator would still need to confirm the numbers so this PC is still valid. PC 1.2 reworded for clarity from 'Identify and confirm cleaning and maintenance requirements' to 'Identify and confirm premises are suitably prepared'.</p> <p>While these are valid comments these are addressed in the PCs in broad generic terms and it would be up to the RTO to ensure the specifics were covered in the training materials. For PC 2.6 'ensure bird comfort' was added after inspect bird condition, 2.7 2.7 Complete workplace records in required format - moved to Element 3 as PC 3.3, two new PCs added '2.7 Manage escaped birds according to workplace requirements' and 2.8 Maintain condition of workplace area to workplace standards.</p> <p>For bullet point 1 this is covered in the information that is already there; bullet point 2 the operator only has to know what the acceptable time is, not necessarily do anything about it, they would raise the issue with a supervisor, point 8: adopted and euthanasia added; 9: adopted as an additional bullet point.</p> <p>1. This is implied 2. Doesn't belong in ACs and is addressed in the knowledge evidence. 3. Does not belong in ACs and stated clearly throughout the rest of the unit.</p>
<p>RTO, Qld</p>	<p>Noted the unit still referred to hanging and shackling in PE and KE, suggested deleting these reference as does not apply to this unit</p> <p>Adopted, they had been included in the unit in error.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AMPP210 Prepare birds for stunning	
Industry, National	<p>Application: 1. Next to poultry they have queried 'this would include turkeys, ducks?' 2. Commented in second paragraph of application 'there are the hangers in electric stunning pre stun; in CAS post stun'</p> <p>PC 1.3 1.3 Fit and adjust machine components and related attachments according to production requirements - commented "not sure if this would be done by an operator - more likely supervisor and /or maintenance, but include anyway</p> <p>Element2 1: PC 2.2 - commented 'cannot be done for CAS until post stunning' 2. PC 2.3 Prepare birds for stunning according to workplace procedures - commented 'hanging only prep that is done for electric stunning/ with CAS there is no preparation required by staff' 3. PC 2.4 Handle and manage birds humanely to reduce stress - commented ' as per our conversation, this must occur for pre and post stun handling procedures due to ethics'</p> <p>PC 3.3. Replaced 'Remove' with 'Manage'</p> <p>Performance evidence: point 1 - checked and set up equipment to operational requirements - commented 'may not be all this equipment - some may have to be checked and set up by maintenance' Point 3: identified out of specification birds and taken required action, commented ' (and reporting of greater than expected numbers)</p> <p>Knowledge evidence: added euthanasia to end of bullet point 1, and replaced 'further' with subsequent' in bullet point 3</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AMPX317 Monitor product flow in an automated process		
Industry body, QLD	<p>Application: Suggested replace 'the smooth flow and quality of product in an automated food processing process- primarily targeted for individuals in a leading hand or supervisory role' with 'ensure continuity and quality for automated food production' and add the term 'leading hand' to make it 'leading hand/supervisors in the next paragraph.</p> <p>1. Confusing unit not providing clarity regarding whether the at AQF level to monitor and report or maintain production hands as an operator or supervisory role to manage through-put. Sound a lot like quality control and not production skills</p> <p>2. Should look at some MEM and MSS units as a guide.</p> <p>3. In the Performance Criteria, the active words are not able to be quantified or observed eg ensure, check, confirm, monitor"</p>	<p>The application was reworded as suggested.</p> <p>The application does state that the unit is for leading hands and supervisors, which does imply that they would monitor the process. The active words are appropriate for supervisors/leading hands. One of the major processors and a member of the SMEWG were satisfied with the terms used in the performance criteria.</p>
Industry, National	<p>Performance evidence: 1. Queried third bullet point• made adjustments where necessary to meet the requirements of parts of the production sequence for which they do not have direct responsibility - DO NOT?? Is this a typo?; 2. bullet point 4•provided advice and support to staff in training - 'and those on the line?</p> <p>Knowledge evidence - last bullet point • options for making adjustments to ensure consistent product flow - suggested adding 'and meeting product specifications</p>	<p>1. This is about if there are other parts of the production line backing up they can take measures to address this; reworded this point to make it clearer to read : •made adjustments where necessary to meet the requirements of subsequent parts of the processing sequence; 2. Adopted.</p> <p>Adopted.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	Assessment conditions: for the statement 'A minimum of three different forms of assessment must be used' they queried 'Usually what?'	Types of assessment used are typically quiz for underpinning knowledge, workplace demonstration, third party report and advice on this can be included in the CVIG.
AMPX318 Monitor product to be sent to rendering		
Industry body, QLD	<p>Performance evidence: Suggested replacing 'requirements' with 'to the required standard in dot point one; suggested replacing 'been proactive in taking preventative action where required' with 'Demonstrate at least 3 occasions where action may have prevented production stoppages'</p> <p>Recommendation: Rewrite elements and performance criteria to provide greater clarity. In particular application and Element one, where there were question marks beside these. PC 1.1 - Replace the first word with 'Name' or 'Select', 1.2 Replace 'Identify' with 'List'. this is an on the job performance</p> <p>Performance evidence: Suggest replacing 'effectively monitored' with 'Processed and undertaken corrective action in' and removal of the word 'due' in point one. Point 2 - replace 'met the renderer's requirements' with 'meet 100% of renderers specifications all of the time' Point 3 suggested add 'and document' after implemented in last point.</p>	<p>The suggestion was adopted, however instead of the word 'stoppages' the word issues was used as stoppages was considered to be too narrow a term.</p> <p>The SMEWG consider that the term 'select' would not be applicable for this unit as the individual would not get to choose the specifications. List is not appropriate either as they need to be able to identify where there is a problem, not memorise a rote list of sources and causes.</p> <p>The suggestion for point one of the performance evidence was adopted and the point reworded.</p> <p>For the second point – this is not possible, as percentages of compliance would be part of the customer contract and different in each case. Point three is a good suggestion and has been adopted, 'and documented' was added to this unit.</p>
Industry, National	Application: 1. queried 'what position does this apply to?'; 2. After paragraph one commented " Better if this happens during process - almost impossible to do post' 3. After paragraph 3 commented: How? A lot goes into bins automatically? Only way to check is going through bins on the floor which would only capture a small % of the material. Needs to happen at source. Measures need to	1.This could be any position. 2. Noted, and that is the intent on the unit however it could be anywhere in the process 3. The how is up to the workplace and the RTO, it's not for the unit to specify this. Also, note, this monitoring could (and should) be at any stage of the process, not just when the product is being sent to rendering.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<p>be put in place to restrict / prevent access and these points would be monitored</p> <p>Element 1: PC 1.2 Identify potential sources and causes of contamination from foreign matter - suggested adding 'and preventative actions implemented for the prevention of foreign objects'. Also suggested adding a new PC 1.XX include product temps, storage, handling, treating it as 'food', not 'waste' as can be the misconception - requires strong emphasis on this and making adjustments or reporting issues that could cause temperatures to go out of spec (where chilling is applied). 1.4 Identify monitoring schedule - queried 'and follow?'" additional comment on temps: Monitor for Rendering It is largely about foreign matter as this is an industry focus at the moment. No reference to temps, timeframes etc. The age of the material is also an important element of product quality as well as temperatures. 'Old' offal is most undesirable as it affects the food safety and the quality aspects."</p> <p>Element 2: 2.1 Conduct visual checks to identify the presence of foreign matter - commented 'Only superficial as above monitor items and processes designed to prevent entry of foreign matter, inspections are that only'. 2.2 Where applicable, use available technologies to detect foreign matter - comments 'How would this occur? Metal detectors and some other colour sorting technology is starting to be employed to detect and remove.' 2.3 Reduce presence of foreign matter to acceptable levels - comments 'Yes, that is the aim - should be aiming for zero (but not practical to achieve this, so retain the word 'Reduce') (beef and lamb guys have a lot of issues with tags, and wool as FO)."</p>	<p>1.2 - adopted and reworded to '1.2 Identify potential sources and causes of contamination from foreign matter and workplace control measures' 1.xx - adopted, but in Element 2. New PC added '2.4 Monitor product temperature, storage, handling and hygiene requirements and make adjustments or report according to workplace requirements' 1.4 no - this is not part of preparing for monitoring.</p> <p>2.1 Comment noted; 2.2 Noted, and this is for the RTO to determine and would vary depending on the workplace 2.3 agreed - removed the words 'to acceptable levels' from the PC to provide greater clarity.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<p>PC 3.5 replaced the word management with relevant as it (covers the internal customer, if appropriate (renderer)).</p> <p>Performance evidence: suggested replacing 'requirements with 'specifications' in bullet point 2. Bullet 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • taken action to remove foreign matter on at least three occasions - comments'(may not be practical as can be hard to identify)" <p>Knowledge evidence - Bullet 1. •purpose of rendering - suggested adding 'and its importance to commercial and sustainability considerations'; 2. last bullet - • environmental requirements relevant to the storage of product (can include the temperatures and age of the material) for rendering and the disposal of foreign matter. suggested adding word in brackets</p>	<p>Adopted.</p> <p>Bullet 2 - adopted. Bullet 3 - deleted this statement and reworded bullet 1 to • Processed and undertaken corrective action in a minimum of three shipments of product to be sent to rendering".</p> <p>Both suggestions adopted • commercial uses of rendered product added as second bullet point, and last point reworded to • environmental requirements, including temperature and age of the material, relevant to the storage of product for rendering and the disposal of foreign matter.</p>

Proposed units of competency for deletion

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AMPP207 Operate the bird receival and hanging process		
Industry, National	This unit was proposed for deletion as it was anticipated that the new units <i>Operate the live bird receival process</i> and <i>Prepare birds for stunning</i> would replace the need for it. However during consultation undertaken during this phase it was made clear by industry that different sites use different methods of stunning birds. For premises that still use electrical stunning <i>AMPP207 Operate the bird receival and hanging process</i> was still required as live birds were received and then hung on shackles for stunning to occur,	The unit will now be retained within the Training Package.