

# Conservation and Land Management Project



## Summary of Feedback, Responses and Actions

10/3/2020

Draft qualifications, units of competency and skill sets for the Conservation and Land Management project were made available on the [Skills Impact website](#) for stakeholder review and feedback from 7 November 2019 – 2 February 2020. Please visit the website to view a full list of the documents that were submitted for consultation during this 'Drafts Available' phase.

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

	ACT	NSW	NT	Qld	SA	Tas	Vic	WA	Natio nal
<b>Industry (employer / employee)</b>									
<b>Industry Associations</b>									
<b>Unions*</b>									
<b>Registered Training Organisation (RTO)</b>									
<b>Government department (Gov)</b>									

Feedback received during the 'Drafts Available' phase for the qualifications, units of competency and skill sets that have been developed as part of this project has been predominantly positive, with mainly minor changes or updates required to reflect current industry practices and terminology.

Below is a complete summary of the feedback received for the draft qualifications, units of competency and skill sets developed and reviewed for the Conservation and Land Management project, and how this feedback has 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 (SMEWG). Where feedback contradicts other feedback, the matter was given to the SMEWG to help resolve.

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 AHC10116 Certificate I in Conservation and Land Management</b>	<b>3</b>
Feedback and comments .....	3
<b>Summary of feedback on draft qualification AHC21016 Certificate II in Conservation and Land Management</b>	<b>4</b>
Feedback and comments .....	4
<b>Summary of feedback on draft qualification AHC31416 Certificate III in Conservation and Land Management</b>	<b>9</b>
Feedback and comments .....	9
<b>Summary of feedback on draft qualification AHC40916 Certificate IV in Conservation and Land Management</b>	<b>36</b>
Feedback and comments .....	36
<b>Summary of feedback on draft qualification AHC41716 Certificate IV in Pest Management. 39</b>	
Feedback and comments .....	39
<b>Summary of feedback on draft qualification AHC51116 Diploma of Conservation and Land Management</b>	<b>40</b>
General comments .....	40
Proposed qualifications for deletion .....	48
<b>Summary of feedback on draft Skill Sets</b> .....	<b>50</b>
AHCSSXXX Basic Ecological Restoration Skill Set .....	50
AHCSSXXX Seed processing skill set .....	50
<b>Summary of feedback on draft Units of Competency</b> .....	<b>51</b>
New units of competency .....	51
Revised units of competency .....	122
Proposed units of competency for deletion .....	184

# Summary of feedback on draft qualification AHC10116 Certificate I in Conservation and Land Management

## Feedback and comments

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Gov WA	I am unclear as the occupational/vocational outcome of this qualification. It is NOT entry level as the Cert II is entry level. At best it is some kind of introductory course. Why is it a VET qualification at all?	SMEWG has advised to retain this qualification.  The Description has been edited to clarify the requirement and to reflect more accurately Australian Qualifications Standards Level 1 purpose, which is to allow for an introduction into the industry through foundation level skill training.
Gov WA	At this level all the core and elective Units (bar the NSY101 and NAR102) should be Core.	Feedback adopted. Changed core units to include <i>AHCNAR101 Support natural area conservation</i> . <i>AHCNSY101</i> and <i>AHCNAR102</i> have been left in the elective bank as requested.
Industry (Employer) Qld	This statement (Description) should specify from Level I or II of any currently endorsed ..... as it's not appropriate to include for example a Level IV unit as part of a Certificate I qual.	Feedback adopted.
Industry (Employer) Qld	This electives list should contain more detail as a way to provide better guidance on what units give a solid industry grounding e.g. Plant trees & shrubs, recognise plants, recognise fauna, treat weeds, observe environmental work practices also first aid units.	Feedback received and discussed with training package development experts. Elective units can only be listed in the qualification format. Further details for each unit can be sought by reading the application statement within each specific unit of competency which is available on training.gov.au once endorsed by the Australian Industry Skills Committee.
RTO Vic	Agree that this qual is too open. AHCNAR101 could be a core. The wording needs to indicate that the other units are to be in the context of CLM. Conservation Volunteers Australia may still use this qual.	Feedback adopted. Changed core units to include <i>AHCNAR101 Support natural area conservation</i> .
Gov WA	Disagree strongly with 563 and 809 (on the merits of the Cert I). The cert I does not have a vocational outcome and should not exist. Schools, green army etc should be training to the Cert II Units which are (hopefully) relevant to industry! If Cert I Units are recognised in the Cert II then they should have been Cert II Units.	SMEWG asked to consider this piece of feedback. The SMEWG advised to retain the qualification and believed that the existing Certificate I units are at an appropriate level. The Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) provide for Level 1 vocational qualifications focused on industry outcomes and to provide opportunity for individuals to progress into work or further studies. These outcomes are an introduction into the industry through foundation level skill training.

## Summary of feedback on draft qualification *AHC21016 Certificate II in Conservation and Land Management*

### Feedback and comments

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Is this much of an occupational outcome? My (WA) sense is that it is not. Maybe it is an Eastern States thing?</p> <p>Perhaps 'soil conservation' or 'soil and water conservation' would be more useful/informative here. And actually there don't seem to be any Units on conservation earthworks anyway.</p>	<p>The SMEWG were asked to consider this piece of feedback and to provide guidance. SMEWG After consideration they agreed that the occupational outcome, that being an introduction into the industry through foundation level skill training, of the qualification was appropriate, and all members including WA members were in consensus.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Disagree with 790 (on the use of having AHCNAR2XX Record work activities with basic technology in the unit). This is not a task, but a component of a task. Surely use of basic technology should be embedded across the Units in foundation skills. Or add as performance evidence. (and why is it a NAR?)</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to consider this piece of feedback. SMEWG suggest industry values this unit as it details a previously uncaptured job task of a level 2 worker in the industry. This job task (the recording work tasks using basic technology) is an increasingly important task, and industry is currently disappointed with course graduates inability to use these pieces of technology. The unit will remain in the elective bank of units for the validation period and it's embedding across other units through foundation skills or Performance Evidence will be raised in validation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 744 and 563 (on unit AHCPGD201). This is a horticulture Unit for amenity parks. Not broad enough for CLM. Most CLM planting is of seedlings, not trees and shrubs.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Moved AHCPGD201 Plant trees and shrubs from Group A Electives into group B.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Not sure this really fits here (AHCWRK208). CLM is not really about production (unless you wanted to change/read production as performance).</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to review this piece of feedback. They informed Skills Impact that AHCWRK208 is a communication unit for customers and is applicable to many environments. The Application statement and Elements support this by describing the skills and knowledge required to provide information on products and services in a range of settings.</p> <p>Elements: Identify information requirements and Provide information and the associated PCs are all relevant to Conservation and Land Management.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>I know this is an entry level qualification where workers will be under close direction. but surely they need to have a basic understanding of what CLM; ecology; soil formation; and the carbon and water cycles are. Is this knowledge included in any of the Units - it certainly should be the core.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>All units were reviewed to increase the strength in knowledge of ecology, and ecological principles. This information can be found in all new and reviewed units Knowledge Evidence and Assessment Requirements. The SMEWG did not feel a core unit in ecology was practical at this level due to the fact that ecological principles are embedded across all units.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>At this level all the core and elective Units (bar the NSY101 and NAR102) should be Core.</p>	<p>SMEWG advice was sought to assist in resolving this piece of feedback. The SMEWG group considered and advised that it is not appropriate to include these units since this would increase the number of units in the qualification as a whole, which they felt would dilute the quality of the qualification overall. The SMEWG have instructed Skills Impact that the list of elective units already possesses all the required units needed for the qualification. To bring in many more, especially just to satisfy a larger core, would allow RTO's to teach less applicable or even irrelevant materials through the qualification. SMEWG advised that the current spread of core and elective units balances what graduates need to know and do, and allows for enough flexibility to take into account</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
		environmental differences of location. Therefore the requirement of the Group A electives is to focus on CLM outcomes.
• Gov WA	The ability to recognise and identify plants is core to all and any CLM qualification.	Ability to recognise and identify plants is taught as part of <i>AHCPMG202 Treat plant pests, diseases and disorders</i> .
• Gov WA	Suggestion for new Unit: Assist with Trail Construction. Includes walking, bike and horse trails; sustainable trails principles; die-back awareness; visitor risk management; and key elements of flow and design.	Feedback adopted. Added Trail construction into the electives.
• Gov WA	I don't mind the A and B groups (although not sure why they are there at all) but the other headings (e.g. Fauna) are superfluous and confusing.	Feedback adopted. Cluster all electives into one general group.
• Industry Assoc Nat	Carry out NAR probably should be a Cert III unit because Cert III is the industry entry level course and it needs to be a core for that.	The unit appropriately describes the level of skills and knowledge required in this area at both Certificate II and III level and this was confirmed by the SMEWG when reflecting the feedback received on this matter.
• Industry Assoc Nat	Plant Trees and Shrubs should be changed to something like Plant Native Vegetation	This unit falls out the scope of the project and we are unable to change it. It is however relevant, and an RTO can contextualise the content to meet both the individuals and industry's needs.  This feedback has been captured and will be considered when the unit is next under review.
• Industry (Employer) NT	All this group A and group B stuff over-complicates and is difficult to find RTOs to deliver what we want. Other qualifications don't have these rules. Should simplify.	The SMEWG advised that the creation of Groups A and B is a significant improvement of the old qualification as it helps give the qualification a stronger CLM focus. Previously the qualification could be delivered with very few actual CLM related units taught within it. The new structure ensures that students have the appropriate grounding in CLM and are ready for the workforce when they graduate.
• Industry (Employer) Qld	Agree with 744 (on title of AHCNAR201)- trees and shrubs is not broad enough, needs to extend to include all native vegetation (climbers, grasses, sedges, etc.)	This unit falls out the scope of the project and we are unable to change it. It is however relevant, and an RTO can contextualise the content to meet both the individuals and industry's needs.  This feedback has been captured and will be considered when the unit is next under review.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld</li> </ul>	<p>This (list of core units) should be widened to include Cert I units. There are several current/recent programs (Green Army, Skilling Queenslanders for Work, VET in schools) which are producing substantial numbers of graduates with Certificates I in Conservation and land management. When they apply to upgrade to a Certificate II, there is very little credit they can gain towards it from their Cert I. By allowing level I units to be included as C group electives it will facilitate a training pathway.</p>	<p>A training pathway is facilitated by an individual undertaking the Certificate I and then progressing onto the Certificate II.</p> <p>Skills Impact has been informed that the training pathway would be through the completion of the Certificate I. Embedding qualification in other qualifications is no longer supported by the government.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld</li> </ul>	<p>Is there a reason why HLTAID001 Provide cardiopulmonary resuscitation has been omitted here (from list of first aid units)? It is also part of a First aid certificate so unlikely that students will complete HLTAID002 and HLTAID003 and not HLTAID001. Also this unit is just as relevant to working in the CLM industry.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Added HLTAID001 to the Electives list.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld</li> </ul>	<p>agree with 790 (that record work actives is a very important new unit)</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with need to broaden topic (AHCPGD201)</p>	<p>This unit falls out the scope of the project and we are unable to change it. It is however relevant, and an RTO can contextualise the content to meet both the individuals and industry's needs.</p> <p>This feedback has been captured and will be considered when the unit is next under review.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>A very relevant unit to add (new record work activities unit) as recording work activities with basic digital technology is definitely part of day to day operations</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>A cunning RTO can basically delivery a Cert II Hort and CLM without changing the unit context. A significant portion of CLM workers enter as parks and gardens staff who don't understand the ecology in CLM. Groups like Business, Infrastructure, Landscaping. While Yes in the CLM we do some of these tasks they differ from horticulturalists the fences that I use are predator exclusion and both the units together don't teach good fencing for CLM. Maintain properties should be removed as more often than not these need to be done by licenced trades not us bushy's</p>	<p>Feedback has been adopted through the Elective A and Elective B unit banks.</p> <p>RTO's are required to confer with industry through their respective validation process and must meet local industry expectations.</p> <p>ASQA as the regulator monitors RTO behaviour and addresses non-compliance.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 563 (about embedding Cert I units in the core) currently there is no pathway for any of the certificate. you are constantly making student do more and more with very little if any recognition towards what has been done.</p>	<p>The purpose of the core is to ensure that the individual has the essential level of skills and knowledge for the job outcome at this level as required by employers. Therefore, they are building on the skills and knowledge obtained by completing the Certificate I. If prior to commencing this qualification they have evidence that they can use to RPL to gain credits towards some or all units, then an RTO has articulation pathways and RPL tools at their disposal to transition individuals into this higher qualification.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 41. Basic principles of ecology fundamental to understanding area you are responsible for managing. Seasonality, succession and interaction of fauna and fungi essential to function and dynamics of system</p>	<p>Thank you for the feedback and this has been included in the Knowledge Evidence component where appropriate.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>what about FUNGI a key part of the living biosphere? Should be at least an introduction to fungi and role they play</p>	<p>This feedback was considered by the SMEWG who have not recommended adding separate units. but to included reference to this in the Knowledge Evidence component where it was felt more appropriate.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>No water units?</p>	<p>Feedback has been adopted Added LPW units to electives.</p>

## Summary of feedback on draft qualification *AHC31416 Certificate III in Conservation and Land Management*

### Feedback and comments

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Tas</li> <li>Industry (Employee) Tas</li> <li>RTO Tas</li> <li>Gov Tas</li> <li>Industry (Employee) Tas</li> </ul>	<p>Cert III of CLM too restrictive in terms of units that can be selected</p> <p>Streaming of skills is a good idea. Skill sets work well for RTO's too</p> <p>CHM303 unit has been replaced with CHM307. Make sure it's replaced</p> <p>Pest stream should include CHM303, CHM304, MOM315, PMG411 should go into the stream, PMG311 should come out of the stream</p> <p>Overall new cert III a very exciting development.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. New streaming of qualification removes restrictiveness.</p> <p>Feedback adopted. New qualification has specialisations or streams of study with it.</p> <p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Feedback adopted. A pest management stream of electives has been created and the recommended units included and PMG311 has been removed as suggested.</p> <p>Thank you for the positive feedback.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>I was wondering, thinking about the future, would it be a good idea to include a core unit that looks at Aboriginal perspectives on land, Country and culture? The thing is, anyone working in this field in the future will need to engage with local Aboriginal communities at some level, so a course like this could really benefit from an understanding of Indigenous perspectives on Country. I mention this now, because most Uni's are now ensuring units of study include these perspectives right through the curriculum, and it could be the perfect time to look at the big picture</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>A new core unit <i>AHCNAR3XX Conduct an ecological and cultural site inspection prior to operational works</i> that exposes individuals to CLM and cultural and ecological knowledge and skills has been developed to meet this requirement. .</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry SA</li> <li>Industry (Employee) SA</li> <li>Industry SA</li> </ul>	<p>Cert I's and Cert II's are useless. Focus more on Cert III+</p> <p>Practical skills always need to be covered. I'm surprised we're even going over some of this stuff</p> <p>Chemical units need to be in the Group E Pest Controller Stream for the new Cert III in CLM</p> <p>All agreed with the new Cert III format</p>	<p>Feedback Noted.</p> <p>SME advice that the Certificate I and II are supported and help attract employees into the industry through Schools programs and entry level programs and are excellent pathways for new entrants into the sector.</p> <p>Recommendation from Pest SME suggests that these CHM units are too generic and while they might be required they should not be listed in the specialisation listing.</p> <p>New Certificate III format well supported.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> <li>RTO NSW</li> <li>Industry Assoc Qld</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld</li> <li>Industry Assoc NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> </ul>	<p>All agree with the Cert III specialisations</p> <p>Should Marine become a stream of study? Yes, and it sounds like you're individually singling out people to make this not happen, and elevating others who don't.</p>	<p>Feedback Noted. New Certificate III format well supported.</p> <p>Feedback adopted following consultation with the SMEWG and key industry marine experts. After consideration of currently available units in this sector, the stream contains the following units of competency and will be available for feedback at validation</p> <p><i>AHCLPW305 Perform diving for scientific purposes</i></p> <p><i>AHCLPW306 Undertake sampling and testing of water</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR2XX Conduct intertidal marine monitoring</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR2XX Identify and collect marine life</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR3XX Conduct a subtidal marine monitoring operation from a vessel or platform</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR3XX Coordinate marine conservation activities on small vessels</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR3XX Monitor ocean conditions and marine environmental quality</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR3XX Operate mobile underwater vehicles</i></p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
		<p><i>AHCPGD306 Implement a maintenance program for an aquatic environment</i></p> <p><i>MARC037 Operate inboard and outboard motors</i></p> <p><i>MARF027 Apply basic survival skills in the event of vessel abandonment</i></p> <p><i>MARI003 Comply with regulations to ensure safe operation of a vessel up to 12 metres</i></p> <p><i>MARN008 Apply seamanship skills aboard a vessel up to 12 metres</i></p> <p><i>PUAOIL303 Apply health, safety and risk controls when working on oiled shorelines</i></p> <p><i>PUAOIL202 Use basic equipment operations for oil spill response</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industry (Employee) WA RTO WA RTO WA Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>• Industry (Employee) WA Gov WA Industry NT Gov/RTO WA Industry (Employer) WA</li> </ul>	<p>Can we just take units from the Pest Management Cert IV and put them somewhere else?</p> <p>Heritage compliance should be a unit, and it should be in the Cert III</p> <p>Awareness of indigenous culture and practice needs to be in here sometimes, otherwise the white privilege comes through</p> <p>I want make comments about which are vital Indigenous units should be core in the Cert III.</p> <p>Bring in cultural tourism stream into the qualification Should cultural tourism be a specialisation? You can do cultural tourism and ranger/ reveg work at the same time. They shouldn't be separate All stakeholders supported the new structure of the Cert III</p>	<p>SMEWG advise sought, as well as Pest Management specialists. Skills Impact has been advised that the Pest Management Certificate IV should be retained at this time, as there is still a need and job outcome for this qualification.</p> <p>Feedback adopted. New ecology unit for cultural site inspections has been added to the qualifications core list of units.</p> <p>There is a specific Training Package for cultural tourism. On the recommendation of stakeholders and SME's the units in cultural tourism can be imported into the qualification. This piece of feedback will be raised in validation for further discussion.</p> <p>Cultural awareness units are available through the AHCILM units included in the qualification.</p> <p>A core unit that exposes individuals to CLM and cultural and ecological knowledge and skills has been developed. Unit AHCNAR3XX Conduct an ecological and cultural site inspection prior to operational works.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<p>and is appropriate and the correct way to move forward</p> <p>Marine stream- may be important, can't discount</p>	<p>Thank you for the feedback and comments from others have also supported the new structure of Specialisations within the Certificate III.</p> <p>A marine stream has been developed and covers the following areas:</p> <p><i>AHCLPW305 Perform diving for scientific purposes</i></p> <p><i>AHCLPW306 Undertake sampling and testing of water</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR2XX Conduct intertidal marine monitoring</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR2XX Identify and collect marine life</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR3XX Conduct a subtidal marine monitoring operation from a vessel or platform</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR3XX Coordinate marine conservation activities on small vessels</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR3XX Monitor ocean conditions and marine environmental quality</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR3XX Operate mobile underwater vehicles</i></p> <p><i>AHCPGD306 Implement a maintenance program for an aquatic environment</i></p> <p><i>MARC037 Operate inboard and outboard motors</i></p> <p><i>MARF027 Apply basic survival skills in the event of vessel abandonment</i></p> <p><i>MARI003 Comply with regulations to ensure safe operation of a vessel up to 12 metres</i></p> <p><i>MARK007 Handle a vessel up to 12 metres</i></p> <p><i>MARN008 Apply seamanship skills aboard a vessel up to 12 metres</i></p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
		<p><i>PUAOIL303 Apply health, safety and risk controls when working on oiled shorelines</i></p> <p><i>PUAOIL202 Use basic equipment operations for oil spill response</i></p> <p><i>PUAOIL304 Use advanced equipment operations for oil spill response.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>Gov WA</li> <li>Industry (Employer) WA</li> <li>RTO WA</li> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>All- Approve of Cert III new structure of specialisations</p> <p>Can marine be a specialisation?</p> <p>All favour of an indigenous cultural awareness unit in the core</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and support for the new structure of Specialisations within the Certificate III.</p> <p>A marine stream (specialisation) has been developed and covers the following areas:</p> <p>.</p> <p>Cultural awareness units are available through the AHCILM units included in the qualification. A new core unit <i>AHCNAR3XX Conduct an ecological and cultural site inspection prior to operational works</i> that exposes individuals to CLM and cultural and ecological knowledge and skills has been developed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>Gov WA</li> <li>Industry (Employer) WA</li> <li>RTO WA</li> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>What about 'assess for ecological and cultural value? So it's more of a stop and look when you arrive at a site, an awareness thing?</p> <p>I want ecology and indigenous factors into 1 unit. WA is bigger on indigenous inclusion, and rest of Aus is keener on ecology</p> <p>Might want to axe the health and safety unit. They are being embedded into the units</p> <p>As a previous WHS trainer, I think it's worth getting rid of it and embedding safety into other units</p>	<p>.</p> <p>Feedback adopted. New unit <i>AHCECR3XX Conduct an ecological and cultural site inspection prior to operational works</i> has been created to address this skills gap and can be placed in the Certificate II on request. This new unit includes both indigenous factors and ecological factors.</p> <p>Feedback adopted. OHS/ WHS units have been removed and embedded into all other units of competency</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) WA</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with pest control stream</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RTO WA</li> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>Gov WA</li> <li>Industry (Employer) WA</li> <li>RTO WA</li> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Marine needs to be a specialisation.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>A marine stream (specialisation) has been developed and covers the following areas:</p> <p><i>AHCLPW305 Perform diving for scientific purposes</i></p> <p><i>AHCLPW306 Undertake sampling and testing of water</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR2XX Conduct intertidal marine monitoring</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR2XX Identify and collect marine life</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR3XX Conduct a subtidal marine monitoring operation from a vessel or platform</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR3XX Coordinate marine conservation activities on small vessels</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR3XX Monitor ocean conditions and marine environmental quality</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR3XX Operate mobile underwater vehicles</i></p> <p><i>AHCPGD306 Implement a maintenance program for an aquatic environment</i></p> <p><i>MARC037 Operate inboard and outboard motors</i></p> <p><i>MARF027 Apply basic survival skills in the event of vessel abandonment</i></p> <p><i>MARI003 Comply with regulations to ensure safe operation of a vessel up to 12 metres</i></p> <p><i>MARK007 Handle a vessel up to 12 metres</i></p> <p><i>MARN008 Apply seamanship skills aboard a vessel up to 12 metres</i></p> <p><i>PUAOIL303 Apply health, safety and risk controls when working on oiled shorelines</i></p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
		<p><i>PUAOIL202 Use basic equipment operations for oil spill response</i></p> <p><i>PUAOIL304 Use advanced equipment operations for oil spill response.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	<p>We want flamethrower and incendiary fire units in the qualification</p>	<p>Feedback has been adopted.</p> <p>Flamethrower and incendiary fire knowledge covered in <i>PUAFIR310 Operate specialist appliance.</i></p> <p>New FIR stream to contain the following units-</p> <p><i>AHCFIR3XX Conduct prescribed burning</i></p> <p><i>MARF028 Follow procedures to minimise and fight fires on board a vessel</i></p> <p><i>PUAEMR026 Treat operational risk</i></p> <p><i>PUAEMR027 Assess operational risk</i></p> <p><i>PUAFIR204* Respond to wildfire</i></p> <p><i>PUAFIR215 Prevent injury</i></p> <p><i>PUAFIR303* Suppress wildfire</i></p> <p><i>PUAFIR310 Operate specialist appliance</i></p> <p><i>PUAFIR312 Operate aerial ignition equipment in an aircraft</i></p> <p><i>PUAFIR406 Develop simple prescribed burn plans</i></p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic Industry (Employee) RTO Vic Industry (Employee) Vic</li> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic RTO Vic Industry (Employer) Qld</li> <li>Gov Vic</li> </ul>	All- agree with the streaming of the Cert III	Thank you for the feedback and comments from others have also supported the new structure of Specialisations (streaming) within the Certificate III.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	The unit AHCPM303 still contains an element of plant health and should focus on taxonomy skills as the next unit that contains taxonomy is at Level 5.	The SMEWG and pest management experts considered this feedback and have indicated that the reference to plant health in <i>AHCPM303 Identify plant specimens</i> refers to Indicative and identifiable health problems that assist with identification. For example: Scale infestations of some species of Acacia, lerp on some species of Corymbia or Eucalyptus etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	If you are going to control weeds or pest include apply chemical chemicals (AHCCHM307) as this should be done for WHS purposes and to meet licensing requirements for some states. While herbicide may not be used for some EM projects, they can be used on others	Feedback adopted. AHCCHM307 included in the Group E electives units bank of the qualification.  Broadly, the issue of AHCCHM units in this qualification has been addressed by including them in the general electives.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	Some of these elective represent historical compromises that are still written towards agriculture or horticulture and do not contain contemporary industry practices.	Feedback adopted.  In consultation with the SMEWG and this stakeholder, these units and electives have been identified and tailored to suit the modern industry's requirements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	If Marine is allowed as a specialization, then it would be logical to include a mine / contaminated site specialization. With the amount of mining activity occurring the skills would not be presented in restoring these sites as only a few units will meet their area of future demand. These units are already created through the MSL/MSS / RII Training packages	A marine specialisation has been developed and covers the following areas: <i>AHCLPW305 Perform diving for scientific purposes</i>  <i>AHCLPW306 Undertake sampling and testing of water</i>  <i>AHCMAR2XX Conduct intertidal marine monitoring</i>  <i>AHCMAR2XX Identify and collect marine life</i>  <i>AHCMAR3XX Conduct a subtidal marine monitoring operation from a vessel or platform</i>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<p><i>AHCMAR3XX Coordinate marine conservation activities on small vessels</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR3XX Monitor ocean conditions and marine environmental quality</i></p> <p><i>AHCMAR3XX Operate mobile underwater vehicles</i></p> <p><i>AHCPGD306 Implement a maintenance program for an aquatic environment</i></p> <p><i>MARC037 Operate inboard and outboard motors</i></p> <p><i>MARF027 Apply basic survival skills in the event of vessel abandonment</i></p> <p><i>MARI003 Comply with regulations to ensure safe operation of a vessel up to 12 metres</i></p> <p><i>MARK007 Handle a vessel up to 12 metres</i></p> <p><i>MARN008 Apply seamanship skills aboard a vessel up to 12 metres</i></p> <p><i>PUAOIL303 Apply health, safety and risk controls when working on oiled shorelines</i></p> <p><i>PUAOIL202 Use basic equipment operations for oil spill response</i></p> <p><i>PUAOIL304 Use advanced equipment operations for oil spill response</i></p> <p>As mines, quarries and contaminated sites are all terrestrial in nature they thereby fall into the general specialisations for restoration, rehabilitation and recovery of ecosystems.</p> <p>However, this piece of feedback has been captured and will be provided to the Industry Engagement Team so that this can be discussed with the IRC, which may result in the exploration of whether another project into this specific sector needs to take place.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	AHCWRK309 while it is still providing some service to CLM its true value has decreased. Presently with most of the AHC units is the inclusion of sustainability as PC or PE or KE and this can still continue, which can allow for industry relevance. This unit should be removed as a core and replaced with a more suitable general units.	Feedback adopted. <i>AHCWRK309 Apply environmentally sustainable work practices</i> has been removed from Core and located in the general electives.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	Group F should change to Aquatic to cover fresh and marine systems. What can occur in a marine environment can equally occur in a freshwater environment.	The SMEGW has advised that this piece of feedback will be resolved in the Validation phase of the project during a special webinar for the topic.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	Agree with 744 Carry Out Natural Area Restoration is more suitable to certificate III but it should be made into more than one UoC currently the UoC contains a number of components which lead to employment in Ecological Restoration. When these are grouped into a large unit they have a diminished value.	Feedback adopted. <i>AHCNAR303 Carry Out Natural Area Restoration</i> has now been split into two new units: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>AHCECR3XX Implement assisted regeneration works</i></li> <li><i>AHCECR3XX Implement ecosystem reconstruction works.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	A better name (than NAR) may be Ecological Restoration. as area sound like a designated place.	Feedback adopted.  NAR has been changed to Ecological Restoration (ECR).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	I agree with 570 that the core list of units is underdone and should consist of WHS, a unit of cultural/ecological assessment, but unlike 570 while I see the need for the bio security unit I think it should be a choice of two from a plant id unit, fauna id unit and a bio-security unit.	The SMEWG asked to consider this piece of feedback.  They have advised that this piece of feedback will be used when they make their final recommendations for the core list of units during the validation phase of the project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	Agree with the 570 (on name change of NAR) but prefer ecological restoration	Feedback adopted, however final name change to be considered and confirmed during the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will help to inform their decision-making process.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>The core units are general and don't allow for a person to change between sectors within the industry too easily. If I worked in Ecological Restoration and decided to change into Parks and Wildlife some of the underlying skills that would be expected will be absent. AHPCM303 should be a core unit, a soils, the new fauna unit and a new unit which should be written for invertebrates (insects, moths, bees, etc.).</p>	<p>The SMEWG were asked to consider this piece of feedback. They have advised that this piece of feedback will be used when they make their final recommendations for the core list of units during the validation phase of the project. The final decision will be made at the end of the validation period.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>Other units that would fit into this sphere (marine) would be the water testing unit (AHCLPW306). There are a number of units will some alteration from the Diploma which would be better suited to this area than in the Diploma.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added the unit <i>AHCLPW306 Undertake sampling and testing of water</i> into the Marine specialisation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>I cannot see the Fire controller stream which would be more of a PUA qualification as at that level you will be working at AQF 4 and 5. I would suggest looking at the AIIMS (Australian Incident Inter-agency Management System) doctrine. This will give you an idea of what is expected nationally at this level.</p>	<p>This is a specialisation within the Conservation and Land Management sector rather than a specific fire qualification. The specialisation caters for organisations and agencies where their role may include seasonal work in fire management (e.g. Dept of environment, National Parks, Parks Victoria) AIIMS has been utilised in the decision making for this stream.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>Like 763, 831, 827 and 570 that what we currently have is too generic and I would not be surprised they are exactly the same units from another training package. They are way too generic in the VETasphere.</p> <p>790 may point out a broadness is required the core need to be transportable from one industry to another.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The project team has searched the current available units on the national register and reviewed any potential imported units alongside the SMEWG members. They have identified the units which can be contextualised to meet the needs of this industry. Any current AHC unit that duplicates these units have been considered for deletion and the generic or cross sector unit can be imported into the qualification. Where this is not the case, the industry sector specific unit is retained or a new unit created to meet this skills gap.</p> <p>The Core units that have been selected are those that have been identified through the undertaking of a workforce functional analysis at the very start of this project. This is done to ensure that an individual has the core skills needed for the specific job opportunities this qualification opens up for them and the skills and knowledge that employers have stated their staff must have. Once this is completed the focus then turns to any core electives (specialisations) and any additional general elective units which are included in the qualification to provide a range of</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
		flexibility for individuals who just wish to undertake a generic CLM qualification.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>What rules are we going to have in place to stop providers from just reorganizing a Cert III in Horticulture to become a Cert III in CLM. While we would argue they are different qualification some RTO just want to completions no matter what.</p>	<p>The core unit <i>AHCNAR3XX Conduct an ecological and cultural site inspection prior to operational works</i>, begins the focus on the CLM sector. The requirement to select a specialisation ensures a CLM focus.</p> <p>The elective units when selected may apply to multiple sectors but still have relevance in the qualification.</p> <p>The statement 'Elective units must ensure the integrity of the qualification Australian Qualification Framework (AQF) alignment and contribute to a valid, industry-supported vocational outcome.' is an auditable requirement and can be challenged during ASQA audits if not supported by Industry.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	<p>Strongly support addition of a Marine specialization here. Unit suggestions could include:</p> <p>MARC037 MARF027 MARF028 MARI003 MARK007 MARN008 PUAOIL303 PUAOIL202 PUAOIL304</p> <p>... and would recommend writing new UOC's for the identification and collection of marine life, marine monitoring techniques, monitoring recreational/cultural fishing, and maritime search and rescue operations.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Marine specialisation created that proposes to cover the following:</p> <p>AHCLPW305 Perform diving for scientific purposes</p> <p>AHCLPW306 Undertake sampling and testing of water</p> <p>AHCMAR2XX Conduct intertidal marine monitoring</p> <p>AHCMAR2XX Identify and collect marine life</p> <p>AHCMAR3XX Conduct a subtidal marine monitoring operation from a vessel or platform</p> <p>AHCMAR3XX Coordinate marine conservation activities on small vessels</p> <p>AHCMAR3XX Monitor ocean conditions and marine environmental quality</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
		<p>AHCMAR3XX Operate mobile underwater vehicles</p> <p>AHCPGD306 Implement a maintenance program for an aquatic environment</p> <p>MARC037 Operate inboard and outboard motors</p> <p>MARF027 Apply basic survival skills in the event of vessel abandonment</p> <p>MARI003 Comply with regulations to ensure safe operation of a vessel up to 12 metres</p> <p>MARK007 Handle a vessel up to 12 metres</p> <p>MARN008 Apply seamanship skills aboard a vessel up to 12 metres</p> <p>PUAOIL303 Apply health, safety and risk controls when working on oiled shorelines</p> <p>PUAOIL202 Use basic equipment operations for oil spill response</p> <p>PUAOIL304 Use advanced equipment operations for oil spill response</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	<p>Should be 6 electives from group F.</p> <p>A good start to this category could be made using existing units from MAR (Maritime) and PUA (Public Safety) training packages (see comment below). But would also recommend writing of new UOC's to address the requirements here.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted</p> <p>Packaging rules changed to: at least 6 electives from Group F must be selected for the award of the Certificate III in Conservation and land management (Marine)</p> <p>See comment above for the proposed structure of elective units for the marine specialisation which will be available for feedback during the validation phase of the project.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Natural Area Conservation may benefit from a new title that better reflects the specialization. I suggest Ecological restoration and rehabilitation, or Ecosystem restoration and rehabilitation.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback and this will assist the SMEWG when they review the qualification in the validation phase of the project.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW	Aquatic environments is a better fit than marine as it encompasses a greater range of aquatic habitats not just marine habitats	Thank you for your feedback and this will assist the SMEWG when they review the qualification in the validation phase of the project.
• Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW	Is the Cert 111 Indigenous Land Management still proposed to be retained? It has not been part of the discussions or the review	Certificate III in Indigenous Land Management is not in scope for this project.
• Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW	In order to better reflect the outcomes and include aquatic environments the qualification title should be reviewed. I suggest Conservation and Ecosystem Management	Thank you for your feedback and this will assist the SMEWG when they review the qualification in the validation phase of the project.
• Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW	Possible new title Ecological restoration and rehabilitation/ Ecosystem restoration and rehabilitation	Thank you for your feedback and this will assist the SMEWG when they review the qualification in the validation phase of the project.
• Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW	Should this be Aquatic instead of Marine, so it captures all aquatic environments. Marine implies coastal application whereas aquatic encompasses estuarine, freshwater etc.....	Thank you for your feedback and this will assist the SMEWG when they review the qualification in the validation phase of the project.
• Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW	"I think two new units needs to be incorporated into the current NAR (future ecological restoration stream) that captures the skills and knowledge to ensure that restoration practice's two main operational competencies: 'Assist Natural regeneration' and 'Reconstruct an ecosystem' are well represented in the Training Package. 1. • 'Implement Assisted regeneration strategies and works' (elective unit) and • 'Reconstruct an ecosystem'(elective unit) "	Feedback adopted. New NAR/ECR units have been developed that directly address this piece of feedback- <i>AHCECR3XX Implement assisted regeneration works</i> <i>AHCECR3XX Implement ecosystem reconstruction works</i>
• Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW	What about the new proposed soils and geology unit? Should that be in the NAR specialisation? Also the chemical units should be included here	SMEWG advised that chemical units should remain in the Pest Management stream. <i>AHCSAW3/2XX Recognise Landforms and Soil</i> has been added to the stream.
• Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW	Agree with what 772 and 773 have said. Not sure we need new units to cover off on all the skills 734 (new proposed marine units) has mentioned as some of them can be contextualised within other units. For example, marine monitoring techniques, monitoring recreational/cultural fishing could possibly be part of Monitor biodiversity, Identification of marine life could go into the new fauna identification unit. Strongly agree that the title should reflect inclusion of both marine and freshwater.	The SMEWG is reviewing the title of the sector in the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be used to inform their decision making.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	fully support the inclusion of the new Field Identification of fauna unit	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	AHCWRK309 needs to be reviewed or replaced. I would suggest that environmentally sustainable work practices should be impeded into every unit so sustainability is a core consideration for every activity a person undertakes. This also allows training packages to keep pace with community expectations into the future. It also provides an opportunity to implement a new core unit around Bio security. Bio security is a very important workplace consideration that is relevant to all sectors of the CLM industry and can be contextualised to the diverse range of sectors.	The unit AHCWRK309 is not under review in this project. Your comment has been noted for when this sector comes up for review. The unit has been removed from the Core and placed in the general electives to allow for a Biosecurity unit to be included in the core.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	The new soils and geology units perhaps fits in to the general electives	Feedback adopted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	I believe that Carry out NAR should: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. be renamed Carry out ecological restoration works</li> <li>2. should be a level 3 unit. At the moment it is trying to cover off on too many things. it should be refined to focus on point 3 below</li> <li>3. Should focus on the skill development of on the tools activities, actually doing the works.</li> <li>4. Many of the other elements and performance criteria that currently exist in this unit will be covered in either proposed new units or existing units.</li> <li>5. This unit could be helpful to make sure students develop the skills required to work on the ground implementing a range of ecological restoration tasks i.e. cut and paint, crown, scrape and paint, spot weeding, target weeding, follow up etc....which tools to use for specific tasks, how to use the tools/equipment properly, how to move around a site without damaging regenerating plants etc....</li> </ol>	Feedback adopted Units as requested have been developed and included in the NAR Specialisations now called Ecological Restoration (ECR). This title from NAR to ECR will be decided during the Validation phase of the project.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>I would like to see 4 core units:  The current ones,  AHCWHS301 Contribute to work health and safety processes (Core)  AHCxxx Bio security unit (Core)  + two new units that would provide essential foundation skills for anyone working in CLM regardless of the specialisation stream.  Two new units could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertake a site assessment to identify natural and cultural characteristics and</li> <li>• Identify appropriate ecological restoration goals and approaches</li> </ul>	<p>Feedback mostly adopted. Core list of units have been expanded but will need to be discussed by the SMEWG during the validation phase of the project.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Title should reflect marine and fresh water environments perhaps Aquatic Ecosystems?</p>	<p>The SMEWG is reviewing the title of the sector in the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be used to inform their decision making.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>MSS025013 Assist with assessing and monitoring wetlands could be a unit that could be adapted to be included as an elective in the aquatic specialization. It will need to be adapted to at least a cert 4 level as it stands at the moment it is a diploma level.</p>	<p>Feedback to be considered by SMEWG in validation phase of the project.  MSS025013 - Assist with assessing and monitoring wetlands has been written for Qualifications from AQF level 4 through to Graduate Certificate. It may not be appropriate to include this unit at level 3.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>AHCLPW could also be included in the aquatic specialisation</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  AHCLPW306 Undertake sampling and testing of water has been added to the Marine specialisation</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Agree Natural area restoration is no longer working in the industry as it is perceived as only for protected areas rather than wherever ecosystems exist. Prefer Ecological Restoration or Ecological Restoration and Rehabilitation.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Final name change decision will be made during the validation phase of the project with the assistance of the SMEWG.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Carry out Natural Area Restoration (currently a Cert II unit) needs to be entirely reconsidered as much of its content is Cert III and it contains all the unique underpinning knowledge and skills relating to ecological restoration. However, it is disproportionately large for a single unit and so we need to reconsider where all that content should go.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.   AHCNAR303 Carry Out Natural Area Restoration has now been split into two new units:  AHCECR3XX Implement assisted regeneration works  AHCECR3XX Implement ecosystem reconstruction works.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>I was thinking something similar but we need to think carefully whether including 'rehabilitation' would be appropriate. The National Standards use 'Ecological Restoration' to include all repair levels as long as they include native biota. Only if not substantial native biota would 'rehabilitation' be used and that is not this case in this specialisation. The overall qual of CLM might include rehab, but not the specialisation.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted throughout project components.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Agree (regarding renaming Marine, Aquatic). Also the terms used in the unit titles and their content need to be amended to ensure this inclusivity of aquatic ecosystems to the extent possible (particularly the restoration ones).</p>	<p>The SMEWG is reviewing the title of the sector in the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be used to inform their decision making.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	<p>I agree with 570 on the title change, I would also add restoration. Ecological restoration is a rapidly emerging industry that will need qualified professionals. I would suggest the title: Ecosystem conservation, restoration and management. Moreover, if the units are structured in accordance with the requirement of the Society for Ecological Restoration (SER), the student can apply for the internationally recognised Certified Ecological Restoration Practitioner (CERP/CERPIT) <a href="https://www.ser.org/general/custom.asp?page=Certification">https://www.ser.org/general/custom.asp?page=Certification</a> This changes should also be integrated in the certificate IV and the diploma</p>	<p>The SMEWG is reviewing the title of the sector in the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be used to inform their decision making.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	<p>The principles and standards for ecological restoration should be included in the core units <a href="http://www.seraustralasia.com/standards/National%20Restoration%20Standards%202nd%20Edition.pdf">http://www.seraustralasia.com/standards/National%20Restoration%20Standards%202nd%20Edition.pdf</a></p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Units of competency have reference to the Legislation and industry standards. These will be listed in the Implementation Guide that RTO's use to develop their delivery and assessment.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	<p>Native seed collection. This unit seed should be expanded to include, native seed collection, production and quality testing.</p> <p>Another unit could be native seed processing and technology. New technologies for native seeds, such as seed priming and coating have recently been developed and could be an important skill set.</p>	<p>Training for these listed areas has been identified in other existing units of competency. Seed collecting is a task specified in this unit. To include production and testing in the same unit would not be possible as production is a specialist area under AHC production units including soil preparation, maintenance etc.</p> <p>Recommend developing a specific skillset to address the seed processing need. e.g.</p> <p>AHCNAR305 - Collect native seed  FWPFGM3202 - Extract seed  AHCSDT302 - Identify seeds  AHCSDT306 - Perform a seed germination test.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Great to have Indigenous Land Management as a specialisation. Very relevant to many jobs and would be very well received in our industry to have this included, particularly relevant for northern Australia.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 570 on change of title (away from NAR). A Certificate of Conservation could also an option for a title, that way it can encompass marine and freshwater ecosystems, which obviously don't fit well under the title of 'land management'.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Units as requested have been developed and included in the NAR Specialisations now called Ecological Restoration (ECR).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Strongly support the idea to include specialisations in the certificate. This allows the qualification to be not only be tailored to the needs of the students but also to have a qualification title that reflects their training and area of expertise to their field/job.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 734 to include additional units to marine specialisation. Worth noting that the diving qual would not be relevant to those working in Northern Australia (due to crocodile risk), so need to allow for enough electives to specialise in Marine without including the diving UOC.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Diving has been included in response to feedback, it is not a mandatory unit.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 734. Ecological qualifications with a marine focus are notably lacking currently. There are many marine rangers and conservation staff working in the marine field but they often come out of their training with a "land management" qualification. With an increasing number of marine parks and Indigenous Protected Areas (in marine/sea country) being created around the country, there is a demand for more marine rangers and appropriately qualified staff. Also agree with suggestions for new units of competency focussing on baseline data collection in marine environments, rec/cultural fishing, vessel ops (e.g. Elements of Shipboard Safety). Extra possible units to include here are the proposed AHCFAU3XX and AHCLPW3XX as these could have marine focus.</p> <p>If there is a demand to include freshwater environments as well, specialisation could be entitled "Marine and Freshwater" (rather than just aquatic). This is consistent with how many universities label their specialisations to include all aquatic ecosystems. Important to have the word "marine" in there as some jobs require specific marine (both ecological and operational) experience/qualifications. E.g. marine rangers often work solely (or at least primarily) on vessels in marine parks conducting sea country management. They need a qualification that includes aspects of marine ecology AND marine operations (e.g. vessel safety, maintenance etc. as while they may not necessarily require a coxswain but rather general safety/deckhand skills included in ESS).</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Marine specialisation has been included in the Specialisations. Final name change decision will be made during the validation phase of the project with the assistance of the SMEWG.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Strongly agree with adding a marine component into the CLM qual. We train a lot of indigenous salt water rangers that a CLM qualification does not really reflect what they are after. If we could offer CLM (marine) I think this would be of benefit.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Marine specialisation has been included in the Specialisations. Please see above for complete list of units in the new marine specialisation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Also strongly support the idea of specialisations, it gives the qualification more flexibility and specific training to the people/groups undertaking it.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Support for the specialisations has been noted.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>I like the idea of adding an extra core unit there, possible two based around ecology and indigenous land management, or these two could be an amalgamated unit. I would also favour if we dropped AHCWHS301 from the core group, as I believe every unit in the package has its own health and safety aspect to it.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. New core unit <i>AHCNAR3XX Conduct an ecological and cultural site inspection prior to operational works</i> added.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>I think we are headed in the right direction with this some other ideas may include</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Basic oceanography</li> <li>2.Marine fauna</li> <li>3.The scientific process</li> <li>4.Scientific data collection &amp; storage</li> <li>5.Indigenous engagement</li> <li>6.Indigenous awareness component – recognising that these are of course best delivered by TO groups/organisations themselves</li> <li>7.Vessel handling</li> <li>8.Marine &amp; vessel safety</li> <li>9.Marine pollution</li> <li>10.Navigation</li> </ol>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Additional units have been developed and some included to cover these suggestions, either in the Specialisation or within the scope of the electives on offer.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>I think Group F should be kept as Coastal/Marine as we already have units relating in the existing CLM package that can relate to freshwater/Aquatic. This specialisation of units is specifically targeted at students whose work is based around working around a marine/terrestrial environment.</p>	<p>Final name change decision will be made during the validation phase of the project with the assistance of the SMEWG.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>some other thoughts for units relating to marine</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Conduct baseline studies of marine and coastal ecosystems</li> <li>•Develop and implement a project to monitor the condition of marine and coastal ecosystems</li> <li>•Develop and implement a project to monitor the pressure on marine and coastal ecosystems</li> <li>•Collect and manage data</li> <li>•Develop and implement a maintenance program for operational equipment (could be vessels, trailers, tools etc.)</li> <li>•Maintain structures (moorings, signage, boat ramps etc.)</li> </ul>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Additional units have been developed and some included to cover these suggestions, either in the Specialisation or within the scope of the electives on offer.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some units / training around approaching the public, engaging with and talking to visitors</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) WA</li> </ul>	Agree with 570 (on marine being a specialisation	Feedback adopted. Please see above for complete list of units in the new marine specialisation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) WA</li> </ul>	Including marine in the qualification description is perfect	Support for marine inclusion on qualification description noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) WA</li> </ul>	Strongly agree with 772 and 779 (on proposed marine units, he's for them)	Feedback adopted. Please see above for complete list of units in the new marine specialisation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) WA</li> </ul>	Strongly agree with 772 (on Marine remaining the title name)	Feedback adopted. This will be discussed further in the upcoming terminology webinar. Please contact Skills Impact for further details
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	I agree with 570. The title needs to be reviewed so that it covers a broader outcome (which covers marine). (doesn't like the 'Land' in 'Conservation and Land Management'	Feedback adopted. This will be discussed further in the upcoming terminology webinar. Please contact Skills Impact for further details
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	Strongly agree with 779, 772 and 734. Marine specialisation is fantastic. However need to ensure that the electives are not just those from the shipboard safety skill set. Would suggest adding some extra relevant UOCs.	Feedback adopted. Please see above for complete list of units in the new marine specialisation. 7 new units of competency developed in this CLM specific Marine sector.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	Agree with 772. Great to have an indigenous land management specialisation.	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	Strongly agree with 734 and 772. There are a lot of indigenous rangers whose country is saltwater and marine rangers working in the marine field who come out of their training with a "land management" qualification. Marine (or aquatic) related work is relevant to so many groups/agencies across Australia so needs to be more	Feedback adopted. Please see above for complete list of units in the new marine specialisation.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	UOCs in this specialisation. Such as those 734 has suggested.	
• Gov WA	Agree and think the idea of specialisations is great. Across the country there are a lot of different groups/agencies etc. using this qualification and all with different goals so would be ideal to be able to narrow the field of study to what is most relevant for each group/agency.	Feedback adopted.
• Gov WA	Strongly disagree with 635 (on core units being made more specific). Core units must remain broad so that they are relevant for everyone undertaking this qualification no matter what specialisation or industry.	Feedback noted. SMEWG does not believe that the increase of the core from 1 to 3 units represents a significant increase in core units and that all additions are critical for graduates to know.
• Gov WA	Great to see technology being implemented into a UOC	Feedback adopted.
• Gov WA	Not sure about inclusion of the diving unit as in northern Australia due to crocs and stingers it can be difficult to perform diving operations. Additionally with some agencies there are a LOT of hoops to jump through to be able to have staff perform diving operations.	Diving is an elective and available if workplace requires it. It is not a core unit.
• RTO Tas,	AHCWRK309 is written for a higher level and should be removed	Feedback adopted.  The unit has been replaced in the Core and relocated as a general elective.
• RTO Vic	This should be from not form (does not specify place in document. Possibly page 1 or 2)	Feedback adopted.  Error corrected in Packaging rules 'form' to 'from'
• RTO Vic	Is this replacing Recognise Fauna (referring to new FAU unit)? This is where I taught Fauna identification skills. I do agree this should be at a higher level than a 2.	Feedback adopted.  The unit replaces Recognise fauna and is set at AQF level 3.
• RTO Vic	We should have a soils unit as a core. Without soils knowledge they can't do the other units well as everything is based on soil and geology.	Feedback sent to SMEWG for further feedback. SMEWG did not feel a soils unit should be in the core of the qualification, as some natural environments do not contain soil.
• Gov WA	Agree with 570 we need to fit this to all aquatic environments (name of marine sector documents)	Final name change decision will be made during the validation phase of the project with the assistance of the SMEWG.
• Gov WA	I Agree with 779 WSH is covered in all of the units we offer to some degree (and should be removed from qualification)	Feedback adopted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• Gov WA	fully agree with both 779,772 (that specialised study streams are a good thing) students to be able to specialise in a field would be great	Feedback adopted.
• Gov WA	fully agree with 790,772,779and 570  all very good points (in favour of a marine stream)	Feedback adopted. Final name change decision will be made during the validation phase of the project with the assistance of the SMEWG.
• RTO NSW	Why has the Cert III In ILM not been considered with other courses when discussing integrating, it is obviously being covered here?	This piece of feedback is out of the scope of the project. The writers of the Skills Forecast have been informed of this issue so that it can be remedied in a future project.
• RTO NSW	Yes, remove this unit (AHCWRK309). Like to think everything we are doing is about environmental sustainability	Feedback adopted. The unit AHCWRK309 has been removed from the core and relocated as a general elective.
• Industry (Employer) NT	way too complicated with all these groups. Other quals don't have this. It makes it really hard to find an RTO who will deliver the units we want as rangers in remote NT.	SMEWG asked to consider this piece of feedback. They have advised Skills Impact that due to support for the new streaming coming from every other industry stakeholder, and the benefits it will offer the industry, the new model for the Certificate III should remain.
• Industry (Employer) SA	I don't think the number of units should increase, I think 16 is more than enough. Agree that perhaps WHS can be amalgamated into all other units - as it generally already is. I like the idea for a core unit to be around natural and cultural management of some kind.	SMEWG asked to consider this piece of feedback. They have advised Skills Impact that as the new units in the qualification represent skills gaps that need to be addressed, the number of units (16) needs to increase in order to address these skill deficiencies.
• Industry (Employer) SA	Agree with 218 comment (that an ING stream is a good thing). I too work with Aboriginal conservation trainees/rangers and while not in a remote area it is already difficult to get RTOs who can deliver training. Need to ensure that the balance is reasonable otherwise Aboriginal trainees will miss out on accredited training.	Feedback adopted.
• Industry (Employee) Nat	Suggest including AHCPMG304 Use firearms to humanely destroy animals in this group. A unit in animal recognition should be mandatory for Vertebrate pest controllers.	Feedback adopted.
• Industry (Employee) Nat	Suggest inviting Intraining Systems (RTO 2929) and <a href="http://firemanagementtraining.com.au/">http://firemanagementtraining.com.au/</a> to comment on any fire related changes as this is a specialised niche area. (they didn't comment after we attempted to contact them)	Feedback adopted.
• Industry (Employee) Nat	Agree with proposed name change (away from NAR), preferred name out of those suggested is 570's Natural Area Conservation	Feedback adopted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• Industry (Employee) Nat	Agree with creating specialisations. Suggest for the current Cert III's that haven't had any enrolments and/or no RTO's are listed to deliver them that they not be included in the new specialisations.	Feedback adopted.  Units listed in the old qualifications have been listed in the new specialisations.
• Industry (Employee) Nat	biosecurity should be a core unit: conservation practitioners can do more damage than good if they spread weeds/pests/diseases between sites through lack of awareness or proper biosecurity protocols	SMEWG asked to consider this piece of feedback. They have advised Skills Impact that this will be resolved in the validation phase of the project as further consideration is required.
• Industry (Employee) Nat	This unit (Apply environmentally sustainable work practices) is akin to 'preaching to the choir' and is better suited as an elective.	Feedback has been adopted. The unit AHCWRK309 has been replaced in the Core and relocated as a general elective.
• Industry (Employee) Nat	the units AHCWRK311 are duplicated in the electives section	Feedback adopted. Removed duplication in electives.
• Industry (Employee) Vic	a core unit should include cultural and indigenous awareness training	Feedback adopted. The new unit added to the Core includes a basic understanding of culture and ecology.
• Industry (Employee) Vic	include geology/soils (in Group D)	Feedback has been adopted. Added new unit AHCSAW2/3XX Recognise Landforms and Soil to group D.
• Industry (Employee) Vic	field id of fauna good inclusion	Feedback noted.
• Industry (Employee) Vic	agree with 772 to maintain marine but to also include aquatic.	Final name change decision will be made during the validation phase of the project with the assistance of the SMEWG.
• Industry (Employee) Vic	great innovation (new LPW units)	Feedback noted.
• Gov NSW	Group B seems a bit heavy on restoring from processed propagules. I'd suggest combining 'Collect native seed' and 'Extract seed' into the one unit.	Feedback adopted.
• Gov NSW	I feel that some basic ecological theory is required at the Cert 3 level in the Group B specialisation. This would support skills that I'd expect someone qualified at this level with this specialisation to be competent in, such as: * describe vegetation communities * identify key habitat components * identify drastically altered abiotic conditions * (broadly) assess site resilience * (broadly) identify seral stages	Feedback adopted. The revised units of competency have had significant changes added to the Knowledge Evidence components to ensure ecological principles and other theoretical concepts are built into each of the relevant units.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov NSW</li> </ul>	<p>I agree with 563 (about additions to PMG stream). Additionally, 'Prepare and apply chemicals and 'Transport and store chemicals' should be provided and required in this specialisation.</p> <p>I feel 'Identify plant specimens' is also an essential skill in this field.</p>	<p>SMEWG and pest management experts asked to review this piece of feedback. Advice from the pest management sector suggests that the chemical units, while necessary, should not be listed in the specialisation. It was felt that these units will be selected by more than one sector.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) WA</li> </ul>	<p>Strongly support Marine Stream in CLM. Many New Marine and Coastal Conservation reverses created and more to come so future industry need.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	<p>Agree in part with 842. Combine collect native seed with extract native seed. However, this is an important component, and should be a core unit not an elective.</p>	<p>The units referred to in you comment are from two different Training Packages and cannot be combined. To address this feedback, however, we have developed a skill set for processing native seed.</p> <p>The core and elective units for the qualification will be confirmed by the SMEWG.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	<p>Could combine collect and preserve biological samples with identify plant specimens. I realise that biological samples may be more than just plants, but surely you could have collect, identify and preserve biological samples.</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to consider this piece of feedback. They have informed Skills Impact the differences in 'collect' and 'preserve' warrant two separate units.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 842 about ecological theory, they need to describe ecological communities, identify threats, identify methods to address threats</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>The revised units of competency have had significant changes added to the Knowledge Evidence components to ensure ecological principles and other theoretical concepts are built into each of the relevant units.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	<p>monitor biodiversity should be an elective in natural area restoration too</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added <i>AHCLPW3XX Monitor biodiversity</i> to ECR (NAR) specialisation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	<p>rename Ecological Restoration'</p> <p>Core units should be Maintain natural areas Implement restoration works</p>	<p>Feedback has been adopted</p> <p>NAR Specialisations and units are now called Ecological Restoration (ECR). This will be discussed again in the Validation phase of the project.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Great suggestion by 570 (on name change away from existing qualification name)</p>	<p>Final name change decision will be made during the validation phase of the project with the assistance of the SMEWG.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>I know this is an operator level qualification where workers will be under some direction. but surely they need to have an understanding of what CLM; ecology; soil formation; and the carbon, water and nutrient cycles are. I can't see where this knowledge is included in any of the Units - and certainly not in the core, where it should be.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. The revised units of competency have had significant changes added to the Knowledge Evidence components to ensure ecological principles and other theoretical concepts are built into each of the relevant units.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Given there are Cert III quals in Rural Pest Management, why is this stream needed?</p>	<p>Feedback and discussion with SME's have identified an employment outcome in conservation and land management where employees/rangers have some pest management activities as part of their land management roles and do not require a full pest management qualification</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Given there have been zero enrolments nationally in past 4 years in the current Cert III CE, why have this stream/specialisation?</p>	<p>Skills Impact has been advised that RTO's were reluctant to place this qualification on scope and as such was not available to employers. Feedback from SME's suggest that there is a need and this is a way that this job outcome can be achieved within a conservation qualification.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Suggestion for new Unit: Construct trails. Include trail (walking, bike and horse) development process, sustainable trails principles, trail design, die-back awareness, visitor risk management, elements of flow and design, anchors, gateways, corners, turns, switchbacks, trail armouring, stonework and technical trail features.</p>	<p><i>AHCLPW303 Construct access tracks</i> includes the type of access tracks/trails referred to in the feedback. Design of access tracks including risk management would be conducted at Level 5 or higher through civil construction and engineering units.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>AHCWRK309 to be removed and embedded into other units. Sustainability should be holistic and woven into units. Also agree with 819 that as it currently stands, it is written for higher levels</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Unit has been moved to elective list of units and WHS/OHS principles embedded in all reviewed training materials.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>agree with title change to conservation and ecosystem management</p>	<p>Final name change decision will be made during the validation phase of the project with the assistance of the SMEWG.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Good to see the Pest Controller in the Certificate III.</p> <p>Recommend adding the PMG312 Poison Baiting unit into the Specialisation.</p> <p>Don't see the need for the CHM units in the specialisation. These should be included in the general electives as they are not specialist for PMG units.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Moved the CHM units into the general electives.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Application: Change Marine to Aquatic</p>	<p>Final name change decision will be made during the validation phase of the project with the assistance of the SMEWG.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>NRM Elective NAR306-Digital media unit (new) could be useful</p> <p>LPW Electives - LPW3XX Monitor Biodiversity - Need to change title to avoid confusion with Cert IV level unit and to better describe</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Added <i>AHCNAR306 Conduct photography for fieldwork</i>.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Marine should be aquatic rather than marine which would allow for all watery environments. There are units that could be contextualised e.g. water sampling and testing, digital media unit, GPS unit, the new level III monitoring unit, identifying flora/fauna units, pest and disease units.</p>	<p>Final name change decision will be made during the validation phase of the project with the assistance of the SMEWG.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) NT, Gov NT,</li> <li>Gov NT</li> <li>Gov NT</li> </ul>	<p>Qualifications discussion- Cert III-</p> <p>There should be a Fire stream, or a Fire skill set.</p> <p>The specialisation of the Cert III should happen, and is better than the current set up</p> <p>Packaging rules- There should be a skill set that compliments every stream, in case people want to build their knowledge</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Fire specialisation has been included in the qualification.</p> <p>Supports the specialisation model for the qualification.</p> <p>Some skills sets have been developed to complement the new specialisations.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Carry out NAR probably should be a Cert III unit because Cert III is the industry entry level course and it needs to be a core for that.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Carry out natural area restoration has been reviewed and additional units developed to cater for level 3 requirements.</p>

## Summary of feedback on draft qualification *AHC40916 Certificate IV in Conservation and Land Management*

### Feedback and comments

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>AHCNAR402 is very 'vegetation' oriented. This should be; Plan the implementation of ecological restoration works'</p> <p>Similarly 'Manage seed collection' should be 'Manage propagule collection' so that it includes all flora and fauna</p>	<p>SMEWG feedback sought to address this piece of feedback. SMEWG advised that <i>NAR402</i> will remain as a revegetation unit with others imported for the non-vegetation requirement. <i>FWPFGM3201 Manage seed collection</i> is not under review within this project. This feedback has been recorded for when the unit is next under review.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Agrees with above comment</p>	<p>SMEWG feedback sought to address this piece of feedback. SMEWG advised that <i>NAR402</i> will remain as a revegetation unit with others imported for the non-vegetation requirement. <i>FWPFGM3201 Manage seed collection</i> is not under review within this project. This feedback has been recorded for when the unit is next under review.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>Certificate III and the Diploma is much better qualification than the Certificate IV. The Units are not anything would add to the value of employing someone it would be better to focus on the Cert III and Diploma</p>	<p>SMEWG have advised to retain this qualification. Changes have been made to the qualifications application to further delineate the differences between the two qualifications.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>The units have some issue they do not deal with contaminated sites and there is no science involved for testing or understanding the analysis process. These units will not make some job ready for working in acid sulphate soils. We have to retrain our Cert IV CLM employees in soils as they know nothing in terms of soil biology, chemistry or mineralogy.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Added <i>MSS024020 Recognise common geological landforms and samples</i> which includes soils in the content.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>CLM is not horticulture and the two are distinctly different. Units with PCM and PGD do not contribute to employment outcomes unless you're in a nursery and not in the field.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. PCM and PGD units to exist only as electives and to appear within specialisations only where appropriate.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>your application statement, entry requirements and electives do not agree with each other. With no entry requirements for a Cert IV CLM and with units that are focused on planning/developing a Cert IV in CLM is not a job ready qualification. The Cert IV need to have some para professional science built in as in units that are on identifying, testing or undertaking. With the Cert IV graduates we have now we spend the first six months retraining them in identifying, testing and undertaking skills.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Application statements altered accordingly. SMEWG have advised to retain this qualification with a change to its structure.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NT</li> </ul>	<p>Superseded by PUA FIR210</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Unit updated in the qualification.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Entry requirements should be a Certificate II or III in Conservation and Land Management OR equivalent of 6 months full time work experience in Conservation and Land Management Industry. Justification: the Cert IV does not include some important base skills and knowledge (ecological, safety and operational, etc.) - prior to supervising a work crew the practitioner must develop this knowledge and skills relevant to the CLM industry.</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to consider this piece of feedback. SMEWG advised that entry requirements are not supported or appropriate for this qualification, as it restricts the ability of people to study the qualifications and places a block on entry into the industry.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Adding collection of propagules from fauna - adds complications as there are wider considerations when working with animals e.g. animal ethics approval, infection control, and in some cases, use of anaesthetics.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Adding collection of propagules removed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Nat</li> </ul>	<p>also supervising work teams/units (add to first paragraph of Qualification Description)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Description has been modified.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed Cert III does this also, so how is this different? Skills Impact has a better Qualification Description standard wording used in past projects Agree with 563 x 2 in this section.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Description has been modified. Use of other Skills Impact terminology replicated in Certificate IV.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>As per the Cert III, do we really want/mean conservation earthworks?</p>	<p>SMEWG has advised Skills Impact that they want to retain conservation earthworks as it will be a growth sector, and retaining training is vital.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>I understand 635 (this section) concerns - what are the job outcomes or are we simply creating a qual because the AQF provides for it. (Qualification Description)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Job outcomes have been re-written within the qualification for further clarity than what had existed previously.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>While I know what post-trade means, this doesn't really explain the skills and knowledge in this qualification. Is it an attempt to encourage prior completion of the Cert III or equivalent? If so, spell out the requirements explicitly. If not still need to explain what job (whether paid or unpaid) outcome of this qualification is. PS: CLM is not a trade anyway.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Description has been modified,</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>What does this mean?? (Second paragraph of the Qualification Description)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Qualification description has been amended for clarity.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>1 core Unit - seriously? Does this reflect that we are unclear about what the job outcome actually is?</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to address this piece of feedback. They would be happy to consider more core units if these units were explicitly brought forward from a stakeholder.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Sorry, but this qual needs serious reworking. Looks like a grab bag of a range of diverse and often unrelated units. Start with the intended job outcome and work from there.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Qualification re-worded to reflect specific job outcomes.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Cert IV is a good level but there needs to be more understanding of ecology, plants and animals and their management. The arrangement of the units currently allows students to gain the qual without an understanding of ecosystems and their management. The qual allows you to then get a job with possibly only having business and chemical etc. units.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Units of competency are job statements with each containing the relevant underpinning Knowledge and Skills required to be assessed. This is listed in each unit of competency in the Assessment Requirements. Units that contain underpinning knowledge relevant to Ecology, ecosystems etc. include: <i>AHCNAR401 Supervise natural area restoration works</i> <i>AHCNAR402 Plan the implementation of revegetation works</i> <i>AHCLPW401 Process applications for changes in land use</i> <i>AHCLPW402 Implement land and sea management practices</i> <i>AHCLPW403 Inspect and monitor cultural places</i> <i>AHCLPW404 Produce maps for land management purposes</i> <i>AHCLPW405 Supervise the monitoring of biodiversity among others.</i></p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	Should be renamed Conservation and ecosystem management	Final name change decision will be made during the validation phase of the project with the assistance of the SMEWG.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	Needs to be core units that include ecology, plants, animals. It should not be possible to gain a cert IV in CLM without having studied these three	Feedback adopted. SMEWG have advised to retain this qualification with a change to its structure to reflect needs for CLM units in the qualification. Ecology embedded in all new and reviewed units of competency.

## Summary of feedback on draft qualification *AHC41716 Certificate IV in Pest Management*

### Feedback and comments

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	Disappointed in the potential removal but accepts that the qualification is not being supported. Good to see the Pest Controller in the Certificate III.	SMEWG advised to retain the qualification due to possible future needs.

## Summary of feedback on draft qualification *AHC51116 Diploma of Conservation and Land Management*

### General comments

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Tas</li> </ul>	RTO Tas- Dip of CLM too restrictive in terms of units that can be selected	Feedback adopted. SMEWG have advised to retain this qualification with a change to its structure to reflect needs for CLM units in the qualification New structure requires: 4 Units must be selected from Group A but the rest including 2 from any training package will provide a CLM focussed qualification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	Speciality should be 'Ecological restoration' and so the unit AHCNAR503 should be changed to 'Design an ecological restoration project'	All sub-headings have been removed. There are no 'specialisations' in this qualification. Codes in the units of competency indicate specific unit sectors.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	These units are good for land care but you need to include some form of geology/geomorphology and there is no inclusion of contaminated sites.	Feedback adopted. <i>MSS025014 Perform sampling and testing of contaminated sites</i> has prerequisite - <i>MSS024020</i> .
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	Most of these units are too concerned with business and management you need to build in more para professional science as the technicians in the field will do a Dip in CLM and then need to a Dip in Lab Ops to meet our EB requirements	Feedback adopted. SMEWG have advised to retain this qualification with a change to its structure to reflect needs for CLM units in the qualification New structure requires: 4 Units must be selected from Group A but the rest including 2 from any training package will provide a CLM focussed qualification.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	I can understand the thinking of Diploma being about Management and Strategy. The reality for us is that we are looking for a person with a deeper knowledge on the technical side than being able to formulate plans or strategies. A more technical diploma would allow would reflect the role of the technical officer which are employed. Presently we spend most of time developing a Dip CLM technical knowledge as business management and budgets are not part of their job.	Feedback adopted. SMEWG have advised to retain this qualification with a change to its structure to reflect needs for CLM units in the qualification and to create deeper knowledge on the technical aspects of CLM. New structure requires: 4 Units must be selected from Group A but the rest including 2 from any training package will provide a CLM focussed qualification.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>I am not in the tourism business but in the restoration business would much prefer to see some more science based units than business type units</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. SMEWG have advised to retain this qualification with a change to its structure to reflect needs for CALM units in the qualification New structure requires: 4 Units must be selected from Group A but the rest including 2 from any training package will provide a CALM focussed qualification.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Entry requirements should be a Certificate III or IV in Conservation and Land Management OR equivalent of 12 months full time work experience in Conservation and Land Management Industry. Justification: the Diploma does not include some important base skills and knowledge (ecological, safety and operational, etc.) - prior to being responsible for broad operations and/or work unit, the practitioner must develop this knowledge and skills relevant to the CLM industry.</p>	<p>SMEWG advised that entry requirements are not supported or appropriate for this qualification.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Understand where 635 is coming from however I would caution that this is a very broad industry, e.g. in my experience there are several roles in the industry where budgeting is an important component. Suggest adding technical skills as suggested without taking any units away that are already in the qual.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted through new qualification structure. No units have been lost and the streaming allows for a more technically capable graduate.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	<p>Collecting from 20 different species is unrealistic for an individual, unless the nominal hours increase for this unit.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Collecting requirement lowered to 10.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov NSW</li> </ul>	<p>I agree with 563 (regarding entry requirements)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. SMEWG advice that entry requirements are not supported or appropriate for this qualification.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov NSW</li> </ul>	<p>I believe strategy, planning, and project management skills in addition to technical skills are frequently required of staff qualified at the diploma level in this industry.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Units within the diploma contain these skills.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov NSW</li> </ul>	<p>I agree with 809 (in regards to comment 'These units are good for land care but you need to include some form of geology/geomorphology and there is no inclusion of contaminated sites.')</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Added <i>MSS025014 Perform sampling and testing of contaminated sites</i> and its prerequisite: <i>MSS024020 Recognise common geological landforms and samples</i>.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>We definitely need a geology/geomorphology unit! This informs everything else (plant distribution etc.). At the moment we do AHCSAW502 to try and get some geology in the course, but a straight geology unit focussed on soils would be excellent</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Added <i>MSS025014 Perform sampling and testing of contaminated sites</i> and its prerequisite: <i>MSS024020 Recognise common geological landforms and sample</i>.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Restoration can include restoration of wetland areas, as well as terrestrial areas. Look at the work of Nature Glenelg Trust and others</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>It would be excellent to have a unit that is an introduction to Indigenous land management. These all seem to be tailored to people who are working in Indigenous organisations. There is a great need to build relationships with organisations, and for students working in other areas to understand the history and current issues. We try to incorporate this in all our units, but students repeatedly ask for an Indigenous unit. It would need to be developed/implemented in collaboration with local Traditional Owners.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. The following three units are in the Elective A unit bank</p> <p><i>AHCILM401 Protect places of cultural significance</i></p> <p><i>AHCILM402 Report on place of potential cultural significance</i></p> <p><i>AHCILM403 Contribute to the proposal for a negotiated outcome for a given area of Country</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Fire is very important. Agencies all have extensive fire training, so a TAFE unit is not going to really cut it. This needs more thought, particularly after our current fire season. There is a lot of misinformation out there.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Feedback has been received that the AHC unit <i>AHCFIR502 Plan prescribed burning for fuel, ecological and cultural resource management</i> is sufficient for the Diploma. As it is a planning unit it will meet the requirements for the qualification.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>A unit on setting up effective monitoring of coastal erosion would seem to be a precursor to coastal rehabilitation. Need to include greater understanding of coastal processes.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Added two units that may suit this purpose:  <i>AHCSOL503 Manage erosion and sediment control</i> and  <i>NWPHYS002 Interpret and analyse science principles for hydrographic surveying.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>AHCWRK503 is a great introductory unit and very adaptable to different contexts. We teach it first to set the expectations for future units, and the context used sets the scene for understanding the industry</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Many mature age students are changing industries. They may have extensive experience in other industries (e.g. as trades people) with great skills in self-management, project management etc. But they are not able to get a job in CLM without a qualification, and are not able to go back and do a lower Certificate because they need to work to support self/family. They are usually excellent students, highly motivated, and often gain employment in CLM before finishing their course. We would lose them if they had to meet 563's entry requirements</p>	<p>SME advice has been sought regarding Entry Requirements and this issue will be resolved in the Validation phase of the project.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>This is a great, adaptable course. I advise potential students to check the units different institutions offer as each course has a different flavour depending on the units and who is teaching. This is good. We need diversity. There are units which include minor planning and budgeting as part of a larger project. I think this is enough. If they are not working in the industry, a lot of this is make-believe ... they can't actually practice management skills. I've worked in industry 30 years, mostly in government. Diploma students are unlikely to be planning or running major budgets unless self-employed. See also comments above about mature-age students coming in with these skills already. All our students are different, we encourage them to develop their own interests so they aren't competing for the same jobs :)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted, a wide variety of units within the qualification allow for study in different sectors so that students can pursue their own professional interest within the sector. Planning units left in as electives, no core units, as some students may wish to study this as part of their qualification.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Planning prescribed burning is very specialised. DELWP, PV, CFA are all involved. Not sure how this could be taught without exceptionally strong relationships, and all the agencies provide their own in-house training anyway. As per comments below.</p>	<p>SMEWG and fire experts asked to review this piece of feedback. Skills Impact has been informed that the AHC unit <i>AHCFIR502 Plan prescribed burning for fuel, ecological and cultural resource management</i> is sufficient for the Diploma. As it is a planning unit it will meet the requirements for the qualification. This will be discussed at the upcoming FIR webinar.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>AHCNRM508 - can this actually be done? It would need to be scenario based and with strong collaboration with enforcement officers to be meaningful.</p>	<p>Training and assessment is managed by individual RTOs. The units generally support simulated scenarios as part of the assessment model. However, this is up to each RTO to decide. It may also be assessed on-the-job at this level.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>AHCLPW601 is not a Diploma level activity. In reality it would be done by someone with many years of experience and probably uni quals.</p>	<p>Your suggestion to remove AHCLPW601 from the qualification was considered by the SMEWG. Their feedback was that it is worth retaining as an elective unit.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>I think some kind of limit on how many business units can make up the Diploma ... need to make sure the Diploma includes enough on-ground knowledge.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. SMEWG have advised to retain this qualification with a change to its structure to reflect needs for CLM units in the qualification New structure requires: 4 Units must be selected from Group A but the rest including 2 from any training package will provide a CLM focussed qualification Management units tend to be in the B group of electives, and this would cater for manager based employment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>While appearing diametrically opposed, both 563 and 881 are correct. Many people running CLM operations have quite diverse non-CLM backgrounds. There is also a need for them to acquire specific CLM knowledge and (to a lesser extent) skills. The answer is an appropriately worded statement about entry requirements that allows the RTO flexibility to judge whether the potential student has the knowledge, skills and capability to successfully complete the competencies specified in the Diploma and that the RTO can satisfy any gaps. One could look at Cert IV Vet Nursing for an example.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. SMEWG now feel that the wording around entry requirements is appropriate, while actual entry requirements in the Diploma will not be introduced.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>This sentence (Qualification Description sentence 1) seems to be saying the person must be both technically advanced and a manager. While some people may be, some will be largely technical and some will be largely supervisory. So it needs to read more and/or. Does the Diploma warrant 2 streams?</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Description was amended as suggested. SMEWG feedback is that the diploma does warrant two streams as they provide the ability to gain technical skills in a particular area while not compromising on allowing the qualification to teach a broad range of skills.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p><b>Packaging Rules</b>  Comments for the Diploma from myself (with my former teacher hat ) and teacher colleague in CLM at Melbourne Polytechnic. We both have a very long involvement in delivering this qualification and working in collaboration with industry on many projects.</p> <p>Most of the students are pre-vocational. When building the program, units are selected to meet local industry needs and the objective to cover a broad range of underpinning skills and knowledge which we consider important for a well-rounded graduate embarking on a career in CLM. We used to build in a Cert IV (and some other RTOs still do this or add a Cert III into the program) but funding issues do not allow us to deliver this currently. We always have felt that the course is one or two units short of the mark. The solution would be to increase the total number of units from 10 to 12.</p> <p>Suggested diploma structure:  12 units  At least 4 from Group A  At least 4 more As or Bs  Up to 4 more AQF IV or above etc. in the context of CLM</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  SMEWG have advised to retain this qualification with a change to its structure to reflect needs for CLM units in the qualification. SMEWG approved of changes to structure, however suggested the below as an alternative to what is suggested in this piece of feedback.</p> <p>New structure requires:  4 Units must be selected from Group A but the rest including 2 from any training package will provide a CLM focussed qualification</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Electives: Missing Diploma units that require application of knowledge to CLM in geology and associated soil (non SAW units), groundwater (hydrogeology) – could be related to the interpretation of landscape processes or application of knowledge of land systems.</p> <p>A diploma unit that deals with CLM issues e.g. biodiversity, climate change/risks to natural communities. E.g. Assessing threats to biodiversity</p> <p>More choice in plant related units – recommend the VU unit VU22734 Apply the science of botany to plant identification. Would also like a related to plant physiology - CLM version of VU22735 Apply knowledge of plant physiology to horticultural practices.</p>	<p>The VU units are not specifically written as job outcomes. Competencies are standards written to reflect jobs and the underpinning knowledge is identified in each specific unit of competency. RTO's are charged with the process of delivering training that incorporates the underpinning knowledge so there should be no need to use or develop knowledge based 'competencies'.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>RTO NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> <li>Industry Assoc Qld</li> <li>Industry Assoc NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Marine units should be in the qualification</p> <p>If we can't have mandatory hours, then there should be an increase and diversity in what can be studied to make the qualification more appropriate for industry</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Complete list of new marine sector units can be seen above in the Certificate III in CLM section of the report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Tas</li> <li>Industry (Employee) Tas</li> <li>RTO Tas</li> <li>Gov Tas</li> <li>Industry (Employee) Tas</li> </ul>	<p>Dip of CLM too restrictive in terms of units that can be selected</p>	<p>SMEWG have advised to retain this qualification with a change to its structure to reflect needs for CALM units in the qualification.</p> <p>New structure requires: 4 Units must be selected from Group A but the rest including 2 from any training package will provide a CALM focussed qualification.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>RTO's should interview and assess the applicants capability before acceptance into these qualifications, and recommend lower qualifications where there is likely to be difficulties in completion.</p> <p>To place Entry Requirements against the qualification will reduce the number of students able to do the course. Many use the Diploma as an entry pathway into Degree courses where they have been unsuccessful in gaining direct entry from School due to lower TER scores.</p>	<p>RTO's already need to access the capabilities of all new students on commencement of a qualification. No entry requirements are included in the Diploma of CLM.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO/Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>When questioned on the value of 'AHC FIR502 Plan prescribed burning for fuel, ecological and cultural resource management', respondent was happy with the unit. Industry had been engaged in its development and meets the required outcomes for prescribed burn planning.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	<p>Due to funding issues it is not cost effective to deliver the Diploma to individuals and include all of the underpinning knowledge to those who don't have prior knowledge or experience. At our RTO we specify that the applicants have the Certificate 4 before commencing the Diploma.</p> <p>Industry also have an expectation that the graduates must have a solid understanding of the skills and principles when they graduate.</p>	<p>SMEWG advice that entry requirements are not supported or appropriate for this qualification as it restricts potential new-comers to the industry.</p>

### Proposed qualifications for deletion

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<p><b>AHC31616 Certificate III in Lands, Parks and Wildlife</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workshops and SME meetings</li> </ul>	<p>Overall support for the deletion/merging of this qualification into the Certificate III Conservation and Land/Ecosystem Management</p>	<p>Workshops and SME supported the deletion of this qualification in preference for a broader specialisation Qualification at Level 3.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>AHC31716 Certificate III in Natural Area Restoration</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workshops and SME meetings</li> </ul>	Overall support for the deletion/merging of this qualification into the Certificate III Conservation and Land/Ecosystem Management	Workshops and SME supported the deletion of this qualification in preference for a broader specialisation Qualification at Level 3.
<b>AHC32316 Certificate III in Conservation Earthworks</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workshops and SME meetings</li> </ul>	Overall support for the deletion/merging of this qualification into the Certificate III Conservation and Land/Ecosystem Management	Workshops and SME supported the deletion of this qualification in preference for a broader specialisation Qualification at Level 3.

## Summary of feedback on draft Skill Sets

### AHCSSXXX Basic Ecological Restoration Skill Set

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Tas,</li> <li>RTO Tas</li> </ul>	An aboriginal fire skill set might be appropriate	Cultural burn units already existed in the Indigenous Land Management (AHCILM) Units and a skill set was not necessary. This feedback has been passed on and will be raised during and upcoming Indigenous Land Management project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Tas</li> </ul>	Ecological Areas Skill Set and Recognise Native Flora should be new skill sets Stakeholder sent details: AHCNAR201A Carry out natural area restoration works AHCPCM201A Recognise Plants AHCFAU201A Recognise Fauna	Feedback adopted. New skill set created with all recommended units.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW,</li> <li>Industry (Employee) NSW</li> </ul>	There should be a unit or skill set on site evaluation or something similar	Recommended units already exist and a new one for Core of Certificate III has been developed which addresses this feedback.

### AHCSSXXX Seed processing skill set

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW,</li> <li>Industry (Employee) NSW</li> </ul>	Seed processing skill set	Feedback adopted. SME feedback supported development with support for the following units: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>AHCNAR305 Collect native seed</i></li> <li><i>FWPFGM3202 Extract seed</i></li> <li><i>AHCSDT302 Identify seeds</i></li> <li><i>AHCSDT306 Perform a seed germination test.</i></li> </ul>

## Summary of feedback on draft Units of Competency

### New units of competency

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution	
<b>AHCFAU3XX Identify fauna in the field</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> <li>RTO NSW</li> <li>Industry Assoc Qld</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld</li> <li>Industry Assoc NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> </ul>	<p>We approve of the new units, including the AABR's new ecology units</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld, RTO, Qld</li> </ul>	<p>To general the statement (for AC). Presently across the training and assessing (TA) industry for CLM we have people who have life experience allowing them to meet this requirement. The problem is we need to have a TA with the ability to have specific knowledge and skills in this area. the RII training package provides a good example tightening up the requirements for who delivers of qualifications and units.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Delivery issues are managed by individual RTO's. Qualifications of the Trainer/Assessor are covered by the Assessment Conditions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld, RTO, Qld</li> </ul>	<p>Identification techniques and resources and observing, identifying and reporting are the same.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Reduced PC's in Element 1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld, RTO, Qld</li> </ul>	<p>In the WHS line sub point with animal transfer infections/disease</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Added biosecurity into PC1.5.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld, RTO, Qld</li> </ul>	<p>PC 1.4 and !.5 is revilement and unnecessary. 1.4 is just a rewording of 1.1. PC 1.5 is great if I am approaching a bull in paddock. It is also unbelievable as trap lines do create an environmental impact and these can lost three to four days.</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to review this piece of feedback. They have informed Skills Impact that this unit is about observation not setting surveys or setting traps. These skills are covered under separate units.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld, RTO, Qld</li> </ul>	<p>PC 2.4 and 2.5 should be combined and it is unlikely in the field we can get to species level for invertebrates and with vertebrate fauna yes identification to species will occur. Reference material should stay but the reference collection should be deleted through the unit of competency.</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to review this piece of feedback. They have informed Skills Impact that a reference collection could be images, photographs, documents etc. There is no requirement for a 'dead' animal reference collection.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld, RTO, Qld</li> </ul>	<p>Remove target fauna and have fauna. in the assessment conditions.</p> <p>A global statement needs to be placed in here so that we do not have RTO's contributing or pushing species to extinction through creating "dead fauna collection" the easiest way to change that is rewording dot point one to "skills must be demonstrated and documented where (delete target) fauna inhabit (delete the rest). The word target might work for pest control for environmental management it might be what else is caught is just as telling about the environment.</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to review this piece of feedback. They have informed Skills Impact that a reference collection could be images, photographs, documents etc. There is no requirement for a 'dead' animal reference collection.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld, RTO, Qld</li> </ul>	<p>PC 3.1 is not appropriate as it encourages the collection and killing of fauna.</p> <p>3.3. Is not related to job role, to perform or meet the requirement in an RTO cannot be achieved there are very few notifiable pest animals. This needs to be removed as it relates to pest management not biodiversity</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to review this piece of feedback. They have informed Skills Impact that a reference collection could be images, photographs, documents etc. There is no requirement for a 'dead' animal reference collection.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld, RTO, Qld</li> </ul>	<p>X = 10 not X = 20 as it is more achievable and the reality can be 0 captures over three days. (PE Second sentence)</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to review this piece of feedback. They have informed Skills Impact that these are observations not captures.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld, RTO, Qld</li> </ul>	<p>KE should be written with less detail as it will mean the unit become difficult to teach. An example being the reference material change to use taxonomy tool. as reference collections are not normally used and fauna keys were written in the 1950 - 1980's some of which have changed particularly the invertebrate classification.</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to review this piece of feedback. They have informed Skills Impact that a reference collection could be images, photographs, documents etc. There is no requirement for a 'dead' animal reference collection.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld, RTO, Qld</li> </ul>	<p>What do you mean by a reference collection. While 635 might define it as an emotional way. They are right as RTO do have to collect evidence. I think that when we are flippant with language usage then confusion and misinterpretation of the requirements can be created. It is best to define what a target species is or a reference collection than allow RTO to assume or we will end up with the unnecessary collection of fauna. (KE and AC I think)</p>	<p>A reference collection could be images, photographs, documents etc. There is no requirement for a 'dead' animal reference collection.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld, RTO, Qld</li> </ul>	<p>Target fauna make it sound like a pest management unit. (AC)</p>	<p>Target fauna is the fauna that is either observed or the fauna that the observer is looking for. Target = an objective or result towards which efforts are directed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld, RTO, Qld</li> </ul>	<p>PC 1.3 Looks like from comments made by 757 and 635 can be both correct and a change of wording to "Determine location for equipment" would be better and more realistic to the job.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. PC 1.3 has been changed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld, RTO, Qld</li> </ul>	<p>Without defining what you mean by reference collection 635 is correct. In South Australia you are still expected to provide a voucher specimen of the fauna captured but in saying that it can be tissue these day for DNA bar coding. Permits in SA QLD NSW do not cover work for capturing and handling fauna on private lands which brings in to question the animal ethics which 757 brought up as private land is exempt from meeting or needing AEC approval or having the committee in the first place.</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to review this piece of feedback. They have informed Skills Impact that this unit is for observations and identification from those observations not formal survey and trapping skills.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld, RTO, Qld</li> </ul>	<p>PC 1.3 would not be performed by a person at this level this will be undertaken by their supervisor.</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to review this piece of feedback. They have informed Skills Impact that this is a level 3 Unit and the observation could take place wherever the observer is.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld, RTO, Qld</li> </ul>	<p>Disagree with 757 while modern fauna keys have been developed these just the old keys using a modern platform. They are still the old keys it like the saying a pig in lipstick is still a pig. The entire four dot points are not needed and the main point being "referenced material used" should be a PE not KE.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. This will be addressed during the validation phase of the project as the SMEWG was unable to reach a consensus.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA, RTO, WA</li> </ul>	<p>should be "recording" not "reporting" (KE Dot Point 3)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Changed KE 3.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA, RTO, WA</li> </ul>	<p>his unit looks very similar to the Level II unit AHCFAU201 Recognise Fauna. Both units need to be looked at together so that there is differentiation between what is expected at each level and they articulate together logically.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Both units were analysed side by side and made sure to be properly aligned with their AQF levels.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA, RTO, WA</li> </ul>	<p>Perhaps might be an opportunity here to focus more on the ecology of an area? Perhaps make the unit "Identify fauna relationships with the location". Home range, breeding/nesting/shelter, food and water resources, movements-nomadic/migratory behaviours, etc. I don't support removal of the existing unit.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. The existing Level 2 Unit will remain. This is an extension to it. The level 3 unit introduced the use of higher level skills in identification not just recognition.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 635 comments re tightening up who can deliver this unit</p>	<p>Delivery issues are managed by individual RTO's. Qualifications of the Trainer/Assessor are covered by the Assessment Conditions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>P.C. 1.3. Whilst the study area and sample sites will be determined by the supervisor, once on site the field worker would be expected to site the equipment to maximise observations.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Added additional PC for siting equipment.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>agree with 635'comments re PS. 1.4 &amp; 1.5 (RTO Qld's comments)</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to review this piece of feedback. They have informed Skills Impact that this unit is about observation not setting surveys or setting traps. These skills are covered under separate units of competency.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC 3.1 I don't believe it encourages collection and killing. The collection of reference specimens needs to be approved by the relevant animal ethics committee. There needs to be very good justification for collecting specimen to gain AEC approval. It was a permit requirement in south Australia that specimens were collected. Not sure if this is still the case.</p>	<p>Record fauna identification and sightings in reference collection according to workplace procedures, these are not collecting dead animals but recording the sighting, may be photographs, images or simply text.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>The unit 2 level should be made obsolete. As someone who employs staff to undertake fieldwork my expectation is that have the skill level of Level 3.</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to review this piece of feedback. They have informed Skills Impact that this unit is about identification of fauna by observation, and that both units should remain as they are appropriate for their AQF levels.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>(KE) I'm not sure that a set number is required i.e. X (20). I would be looking at the participant demonstrating the process they follow for a specified fauna group/s of relevance. This overcomes the concerns of trapping with no captures. Bird surveys are a very good group to use to teach animal id.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Fauna keys are a primary tool used by ecologists and there are many recent publications with keys e.g. field companion to the mammals of Australia. Many of the recent field guides have keys. Insect are more problematic and in many instances are only required to be identified to a family level.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 757 and 635. Particularly 757 comments about not requiring a number. Perhaps that should be re worded to say has identified a range of species from at least 3 different fauna groups (KE)</p>	<p>Feedback noted. This will be discussed further in the validation phase.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>I doubt RTO's would ever engage in creating dead fauna collections, let alone contributing to or pushing species extinctions.</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to review this piece of feedback. They have informed Skills Impact that a reference collection could be images, photographs, documents etc. There is no requirement for a 'dead' animal reference collection.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>There should be an element or at least a performance criteria as part of 1. Elements - around biosecurity requirements to ensure the spread of diseases is managed. This should also be included in the KE. This unit could apply to pest species as well.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Have included biosecurity in PC1.6.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>I believe that both the level 2 unit should remain and that the new fauna identification unit should be a level 3 unit. At level 2 recognise fauna would develop skills in identifying major fauna groups, i.e. birds, mammals, feral etc... basic identification. At level 3 they would develop skills to identify a range of fauna detection signs, tracks, scats, aerial, nests, habitat elements etc... They would be introduced to a range of fauna identification activities so they are able to implement / assist with survey tasks if required. Agree with 734 that KE needs to include fauna ecology elements. Should ensure that Conduct Biological Surveys (level 5 unit) scaffolds upon this unit to avoid possible duplication.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. The existing Level 2 Unit will remain. This is an extension to it. The level 3 unit introduced the use of higher-level skills in identification not just recognition. Added additional KE for location/ecology relationship Modified PC 1.3 to build relationship between ecology and fauna for selecting the location for observation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> </ul>	<p>(PE) 20 is high. Diversity of animals/ fauna key. Birds, reptiles, mammals etc.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 570 and 772. A need for this unit at both level II and III. (Don't delete level 2 unit)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Retaining the Level 2 unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 757. Depending on what your target species are, 20 may not be achievable. (KE)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	<p>In response to 570's comments, the Level II unit does identify animals to species level and does include distinguishing introduced/pest species and threatened/rare species with a requirement to report sightings to the supervisor. It also includes identification of scats, tracks and traces. The discernment between Level II and III for fauna recognition would come down to working under supervision of working autonomously and potentially supervising volunteers and trainees during the activity also using resources provided to them vs sourcing resources available in the workplace or purchasing if not available.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	<p>agree with 570's point here regarding biosecurity (point saying there should be an element for biosecurity)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Have included biosecurity under PC 1.6.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	<p>agree with 734 - if both units are to be kept at level II and III they must be carefully checked for duplication and that each unit matches its corresponding AQF level. I would not suggest deleting the Level II unit as it is important entry-level skill for Certs I and II CLM.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. The existing Level 2 Unit will remain. This is an extension to it. The level 3 unit introduced the use of higher level skills in identification not just recognition.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	<p>When delivering the Level II equivalent, we required 15 i.e. 5 species from each of the following groups: mammals, birds, reptiles/amphibians however we included scats, tracks and other traces in this so for example they might not sight a koala but they may correctly identify scat at the base of a koala food tree. This was absolutely feasible in 2 -3 field visits of a couple of hours. Likewise with birds, a student may correctly identify 3 species from the dawn chorus without actually getting a visual.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Have modified the PE to reflect similar to your suggestion: 20 fauna species in the field, which must include at least 5 from 3 of the following groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mammals</li> <li>• Birds</li> <li>• Reptiles/amphibians</li> <li>• Fish</li> <li>• Invertebrates</li> </ul>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>There is a need for this UOC at a level III. Where level II is more of an entry level to recognising fauna (and required in our field to provide a basic understanding to staff who will be working with more experienced staff to undertake fauna surveys), the level III provides those staff who are interested and capable to take the next step to be able to identify fauna at a higher level, which is currently lacking in our field. Definite need for both level II and III units.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. The existing Level 2 Unit will remain. This unit is an extension to it. The level 3 unit introduced the use of higher level skills in identification not just recognition.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Many fauna surveys are undertaken in accordance Standard Operating Procedures and in the case of animals, Animal Ethics approval. It is a regulated environment, permits are needed and so on. These projects often require expert supervision. Would not be selecting the fauna survey process at this level for many animal surveys.</p>	<p>The unit is about observation not setting surveys or setting traps. These skills are covered under separate units of competency.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Does this include invertebrates?</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Have included invertebrates as a possible group for those who wish to specialise.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC1.1: and select At this level, they would be following a plan which would outline the methodology - according to animal ethics and Standard Operating Procedures. They are unlikely to be selecting the procedure.</p>	<p>The unit is about observation not setting surveys or setting traps. These skills are covered under separate units of competency. Modified PC1.1 to clarify.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC1.2: and select - Already determined by SOPs</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Element 1 and its PC's have been changed from recommendations and feedback.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC1.3 following 'fauna' according to plan and SOPs</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Element 1 and its PC's have been changed from recommendations and feedback.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC1.5 Follow SOP.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Element 1 and its PC's have been changed from recommendations and feedback.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC2.2 add and Standard Operating Procedures</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Added SOP's in PC2.2.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC2.5 Some animals can only be identified to species with very close scrutiny. Some only by DNA. It may not be possible to handle animals (get close enough) in order to identify to species due to SOPs, Animal Ethics and Zoonoses, biting, stinging WHS/OHS issues. May need expert supervision. Invertebrates are hard to identify to genus level.</p>	<p>Industry have specified to genus and species level.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC3.3 In Victoria, it is a requirement that all fauna recorded is reportable - part of your fauna licence</p>	<p>Feedback noted. This will be added to the Implementation Guide.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PE at least X (20): This is a nonsense figure. Won't work with a range of fauna. Some may be rare or hard to identify. Sometimes you cannot record the target species on a field trip.</p>	<p>Recommendation received for similar unit to the following: 20 fauna species in the field, which must include at least 5 from 3 of the following groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mammals</li> <li>Birds</li> <li>Reptiles/amphibians</li> <li>Fish</li> <li>Invertebrates.</li> </ul> <p>There is no specification that identified animals need to be rare or hard to identify.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PE2: With this included this unit would not work with the constraints of working under the DELWP Fauna research permit. Interactions with fauna are strictly controlled and under guidance from an Animal Ethics Committee.</p>	<p>The unit is about observation not setting surveys or setting traps. These skills are covered under separate units of competency. No permits are required to observe for field identification.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	KE1.1 These would be determined by an expert or plan that had approved through an Animal Ethics Committee etc. as above. They should under guidance.	The unit is about observation not setting surveys or setting traps. These skills are covered under separate units of competency. No permits are required to observe for field identification. These KE 1.1 will highlight what is required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	KE1.4 Not applicable for aquatic and in some situations	Marine experts asked to review this piece of feedback. They have informed Skills Impact that tracks, scats and traces are still evident for marine mammals, some fish and molluscs etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	KE 8 Need to include the role of Animal Ethics and permits in fauna surveys.	The unit is about observation not setting surveys or setting traps. These skills are covered under separate units of competency. No permits are required to observe for field identification. These KE 1.1 will highlight what is required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	AC Resources include: Animal Ethics approval/Permits are not always required but are missing here	The unit is about observation not setting surveys or setting traps. These skills are covered under separate units of competency. No permits are required to observe for field identification. These KE 1.1 will highlight what is required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	the new faun unit and a new unit which should be written for invertebrates (insects, moths, bees, etc.).	Fauna should include invertebrates as this is a basic unit.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>fully support the inclusion of the new Field Identification of fauna unit</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	<p>There is a need for a unit at Certificate III that follows on from this one: AHC FIR301 Conduct prescribed burning</p> <p>Rangers do progress to the point where they conduct and lead the on-ground prescribed fire operation. This is not the Level IV Plan and Supervise level stuff, it is just leading an on-ground crew. At present there is nothing there.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted however the new FIR unit to be discussed further in the validation phase of the project.</p>
<p><b>AHCFIR3XX Conduct ecological burning</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Tas</li> <li>RTO Tas</li> </ul>	<p>AHCFIR3XX-IT- in PUA package there is a 'conduct simple' burns. There's probably a duplication. Level IV. RTO Tas- PUA units should be embedded in qualification, be it Diploma or whatever</p>	<p>There is no PUA unit at level 3 for conducting prescribed burns. There is a level 4 Unit with similar outcomes. <i>PUAFIR402 Conduct simple prescribed burns</i>. This matter will be resolved in the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be raised during the discussion.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) NT Gov NT</li> </ul>	There are close to no restrictions for NT fire and fire management, and we want to keep it that way. Don't mention Hazard Rating Systems, don't use the word 'wildfire', just use 'fire'	Feedback adopted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Nat</li> </ul>	This is a level IV responsibility - it is a specialised task (select few practitioners in the CLM industry lead burning operations) requiring broad knowledge (ecology, fire behaviour, reading the weather, WHS hazard and risk management, etc.) and can require solving unpredictable problems in changing contexts (e.g. changes in weather, fire behaviour, and people's capabilities). Ground crew participate in prescribed burning are operating at Level III under the direction of the operational lead (sometimes called Incident Control) who is operating at level IV. (In reference to the general unit and job tasks within it)	This piece of feedback will be resolved in the validation phase of the project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Nat</li> </ul>	swap the order - ID hazards etc. before delivering briefing (PC 1.10)	Feedback adopted. Order changed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Nat</li> </ul>	select and check PPE belongs under Element 1. - use PPE belongs under Element 2 (pc 2.2)	Element 1 has identify and implement controls. Element 2 is fit PPE.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Nat</li> </ul>	again, should be done prior to day of burn (PC 1.4)	Feedback noted and will be discussed in validation phase of the project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Nat</li> </ul>	this should be done prior to the day of a burn (PC 1.3)	Feedback noted and will be discussed in validation phase of the project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Nat</li> </ul>	Belongs under Element 1. (PC's 2.2b and 2.3) (WH Note-Numerical ordering issue in Element 2's PC's)	Feedback adopted. Changed PC1.4. Retained 2.1 and 2.2 as these are day of burn activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Nat</li> </ul>	check for unburnt ground and re-light if necessary, can't think of any other relevant tasks to 'conclude burn operations' generally go from burning straight to mop up (PC 2.6)	Feedback adopted. Deleted PC 2.6.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Nat</li> </ul>	change order - this is 3.1 then assess is 3.2 and report is 3.3 (PC's in Element 3)	Feedback adopted. Reordered PC's in Element 3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Nat</li> </ul>	at least two occasions required to demonstrate competence due to variability of site geography, habitat	Feedback adopted. adjusted PE to 2 occasions.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	type, weather conditions, fuel load, etc. Conducting one burn is insufficient. (PE Sentence 2)	
• Industry (Employer) Nat	in addition to this the practitioner would need to adjust the way they are carrying out the burn to suit the changing conditions (e.g. speeding up, slowing down, changing direction) or may even need to cease lighting up. (PE Dot Point 5)	Feedback adopted. Edited PE dot point 5.
• Industry (Employer) Nat	and environmentally sensitive sites and objects, e.g. tree hollows, nesting birds, threatened plant species (KE Dot Point 10)	Edited KE dot point 10.
• Industry (Employer) Nat	typo? do you mean conducting (AC Dot Point 1.1)	Feedback adopted. Corrected error.
• Industry (Employer) Nat	add mop up unit/equipment, weather monitoring devices, communication equipment (e.g. hand-held radios) (AC Dot Point 2)	Feedback adopted. Added extra resources to AC.
• Industry (Employer) Nat	add burn permit (this includes conditions that must be met before, during and after the burn) (AC Dot Point 3.2)	Feedback adopted. Added to AC.
• Industry (Employer) Nat	assessor must have experience conducting prescribed burns (AC Dot Point 4.2)	Feedback adopted. Added to Assessor requirements.
• Industry (Employer) Nat	Prior to this step (Element 1) there are preparations that the operational lead would carry out off-site/in the office e.g. mapping boundaries, checking weather forecast, checking staff availability and competence levels to decide sector leaders and match pairs based on experience, preparing burn site, ensuring availability of equipment.	This unit is not a supervisory level but is designed for implementing a prescribed burn set done by a higher authority.
• RTO Qld	Agree with 89 this unit should stay in the PUA TP. The units that are found in the CLM Level 3 are more than enough for a person to operate as part of a team. The key word is team as ecological/prescribe burning is done as a team activity. 563 is very correct on the requirements of a person and these are the people who make up the team.	This feedback will be discussed and resolved during the validation phase of the project.
• RTO Qld	563 is correct there are a number of activities that happen before and on the day (Element 1) and the most important is check the local weather at the site not on BOM. Control lines would be checked a day if not longer depending on the history of the site. Some of these task like asset protection planning is not necessary done by a	This unit is not a supervisory level but is designed for implementing a prescribed burn set done by a higher authority. The decision as to whether this should be an AHC unit or PUA unit will take place during the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be raised during the discussion.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	with a level 3 qualification. While the intentions of the unit are good, I would still prefer the unit from PUA qualification	
• RTO Qld	(PC) 1.9 should be at the end of the element 1 as all the activities before than would accumulate in the briefing to crews.	Feedback adopted. PC's in Element 1 have been realigned.
• RTO Qld	(PC) 2.9 needs to be moved to after 2.4 as communication will be happening throughout the burn as changes will happen.	Feedback adopted. Reordered PC's in Element 2.
• RTO Qld	in the PUA TP this is higher than a level 3 we should be consistent. This is why it is better to use the PUA as it is integrated into the fire services. (KE Dot Point 1)	Feedback adopted. Changed wording to ensure the process is understood as a supervisory role not at this level.
• RTO Qld	Considering the unit will be delivered in the workplace not by an RTO. As a government agency we are obliged to use the CFS for fire training. In doing so we have no choice but to use the PUA unit. I suspect that this may be the case for other govt ranger staff.	The decision as to whether this should be an AHC unit or PUA unit will take place during the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be raised during the discussion.
• RTO Qld	need to include fuel breaks (KE Dot Point 13)	Feedback adopted. Added dot point on fuel and fire breaks.
• RTO Qld	Include maps and GPS (AC Dot Point 2)	Feedback adopted. Added maps and map reading equipment.
• RTO Qld	and stakeholders. As neighbouring land users like to know and will watch you. (AC Dot Point 4)	Feedback adopted. Added stakeholders.
• RTO Qld	As part of the PE you need to include lookouts, escape routes, communications. The contingencies when things go bad	Feedback adopted. Added contingencies to PE.
• RTO Qld	need to be done at least three times in different environments as 563 indicates (PE Sentence 2)	Feedback adopted. Changed to 3.
• RTO Qld	734 comment about the PUA is incorrect in northern and central QLD we use the PUA as the foundation for the training. This maybe correct for WA. 635 and 89 did not indicate that a PUA prescribed burn existed. in SA Vic, NSW and QLD they use suppress wildfire for intermediately before going into the PUA suppress wildfire. In northern QLD we have adopted this structure in keeping with AIIMS which is the industry standard for	The decision as to whether this should be an AHC unit or PUA unit will take place during the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be raised during the discussion.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	fire management (Discussion around where unit should fall)	
• Industry (Employer) Qld	There should be knowledge of traditional fire-stick burn practices, appropriate time of year, fauna and water quality management (within Element 1)	There are separate units in the AHC training package for indigenous fire practices.
• RTO WA	<p>Disagree with 89 and 563 (about where this unit should exist, AHC or PUA). There are no level III units in the PUA package that focus on prescribed burns. They do not exist. There are only units that relate to wildfire. Working with prescribed fire already is, and will increasingly become a very important part of the work of indigenous rangers who work in the tropical savannah. Virtually all the work they do is with prescribed fire, not wildfire. There is currently a gap that we have identified for individuals to be trained in leading an on-ground team in prescribed operations. Students can be trained to "Assist with prescribed burning" at level II, but there is nothing about leading a crew on a prescribed burn, before students get to level IV where they do the PUA Conduct simple prescribed burns - which contains all the planning and regulatory side of things, which workers at level III do not do.</p> <p>These workers are definitely at level III not level IV. Presently there are between 50 and 80 of them that work in the Kimberley alone. They are not a select few. They do not replace the need for an operational lead working at level IV, but it is an important job function in fire teams of Indigenous rangers. This is perhaps an important difference between the Conservation industry in the savannah lands of northern Australia and the Public Safety industry in southern Australia.</p> <p>The unit name is not that important. if the proposed name needs to change so that it removes confusion with the level IV unit, then so be it.</p>	Thank you for the detailed feedback. The decision as to whether this should be an AHC unit or PUA unit will take place during the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be raised during the discussion and the Industry Representative Committee will be informed at their next meeting.
• RTO WA	There are many critical level IV functions in prescribed fire operations that should remain at level IV in level IV units. This unit is not intended to replace this. It is intended to add to and strengthen what is there in terms	Feedback noted. This unit is not a supervisory level but is designed for implementing a prescribed burn set done by a higher authority.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<p>of a pathway for progression for people that work primarily with prescribed fire operations.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	<p>This suggestion is not about lowering leadership standards. On the contrary, it is about increasing leadership standards. There is simply no PUA unit of competence that can be used to train level III workers to start taking on a leading role within their team on in a prescribed burning context, before they get to the stage of planning and leading the whole prescription exercise at level IV.</p> <p>This is not about somehow replacing or circumventing the very real requirement for experienced leaders at level IV that are responsible for leading the whole exercise at all. This suggestion actually came from level IV workers in ranger teams in the Kimberley that felt developing rangers did not have a next step to go to at level III after the initial "Assist with prescribed burning" unit.</p> <p>The Cert IV guys actually need some Cert III level guys to step up and start assisting in some aspects of leadership on the ground, if they are to successfully achieve landscape scale burning. These are very large areas that must be effectively managed, throughout the year to achieve carbon abatement targets, maintain biodiversity and prevent late season wildfires.</p> <p>For most of these workers wildfire response and suppression units are not suitable options at level III... this is not the activity that they are engaged in.</p> <p>It is important to recognise that "Conservation" and "Public Safety" are different industry areas. That is why there are different industry bodies for each and different training packages.</p> <p>Some of the concepts from PUA do adequately meet the requirements of CLM, but certainly not all. Both sides of this debate must recognise this. Fire emergency response and wildfire mitigation, are topics that are well catered for in the PUA package - as you would expect from a training package designed for the public safety</p>	<p>Thank you for the detailed feedback. The decision as to whether this should be an AHC unit or PUA unit will take place during the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be raised during the discussion.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<p>sector.</p> <p>Managing biodiversity, landscape-scale fire management and carbon abatement activities are not. The reason is simple, these activities are more appropriately Conservation industry functions, not Public Safety industry functions.</p> <p>The point is, it is incorrect to work on the premise that there will never be a need for units of competence around fire outside the PUA sector and package. This is not the case. I support the use of PUA units wherever appropriate, and the writing of CLM units where required for the CLM industry.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 734 (RTO WA). This unit would provide essential skills to indigenous rangers required for landscape scale fire management in native title areas. Currently there exists a knowledge gap for rangers working in teams conducting prescribed fire. This unit would assist rangers working on fire projects across northern Australia and increasingly through the deserts. This unit bridges the gap between the rangers stepping up from simply following instructions to leading teams prior to stepping up to the planning process. This is an essential unit to continue the development of effective fire programs across a huge area.</p>	<p>Thank you for the detailed feedback. The decision as to whether this should be an AHC unit or PUA unit will take place during the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be raised during the discussion. There are separate units in the AHC training package for indigenous fire practices.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> </ul>	<p>I attended consultation session where primary concern around prescribed burning was the lack of consideration of conservation values. It is incongruous to suggest that lowering the leadership standards for ANY prescribed burn will improve outcomes. All feedback I receive in my role, is that prescribed burning is a team activity, led by an experienced fire management practitioner (sometime more than one) who extensively plan and conduct prescribed burns with a team of qualified "assistants" or "crew" that are competent with supportive fire management functions. Therefore I agree with 89, 563 and would further suggest that the 4 PUA units (AQF IV and AQF V) of develop plans and conduct prescribed burns at simple and complex levels are quite sufficient and necessary. It seems that 809 is suggesting more</p>	<p>The decision as to whether this should be an AHC unit or PUA unit will take place during the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be raised during the discussion.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	training/competency as the existing "Assist with prescribed burning" unit is inadequate. I would agree here and again suggest that more reference to the PUA package would find existing competencies, to develop all the skills necessary.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Agree with 563 - consider adding some examples as much burn preparation is done in some areas (particularly in fragmented systems) where cultural and natural assets require protection e.g. rake hoeing around habitat logs on ground, roots etc. (KE Dot Point 10)	The decision as to whether this should be an AHC unit or PUA unit will take place during the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be raised during the discussion.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	undoing? Should it be conducting? (AC 1.1)	Feedback adopted. AC 1.1 has been edited and corrected.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	equipment to include equipment used in fire preparation as it is often quite different to that used during fire operations (AC)	Feedback adopted. Modified AC for equipment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC1.3 Should permits be an item in the KE?	Feedback adopted. Modified order of PC in Element 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PE 1 Would the communication equipment be checked prior to the preparations or before the burn commences? Not in element 1.	Feedback adopted. Modified order of PC in Element 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PE 8 coordinate... Not in PCs	Feedback adopted. edited PE 8 and 9.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO/Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is the concern that it can result in two sets of standards for prescribed burning one under the PUA and another under AHC</li> <li>The addition of this unit has the risk of duplicating units that already exist in the PUA training package. PUA have just recently (in 2019) concluded a full training package review, including prescribed burning units, therefore another industry consultation and validation</li> </ul>	Thank you for the detailed feedback. The decision as to whether this should be an AHC unit or PUA unit will take place during the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be raised during the discussion.

**Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues**

**Consideration and Proposed Resolution**

process only serves to frustrate industry who have limited time to participate in the Training Package review and update process. I know this seems a bit askew but in reality is how many industry people see this.

Also as this new proposed unit was "Additional Unit" to the project and only included in latest project updates, I had missed its inclusion myself until recently being advised by a client at CFA in Victoria. I question that a unit can be included that was not part of the original project process based on feedback from only one or two stakeholder feedback. Surely inclusion of additional units would need to have the project go back a few steps to pick these new additions up on an equal footing to the project planned units, as per the case for change and project development plan.

- That there are legal ramifications for public safety in the delivery and the potential misunderstanding that a person completing this new unit of competency is deemed competent in prescribed burning practice for which there are serious skills lacking. In the event of a serious escape such as the (DSE/DELWP) 2015 Cobaw fire escape here in Victoria, legal representatives for the plaintiff (or even a coroner or Worksafe investigation) will examine the skills and knowledge attainment of the burn supervisor, who may have the new unit without any of the previously identified underpinning competencies. This could inadvertently place industry or enterprise employers at risk, there could also be insurance coverage ramifications around liability and culpability of the host employer having employees trained to a second and lower level of competency.
- The national unit PUAFIR412 Conduct simple prescribed burns (Release 2) could be imported as the replacement unit for the gap your northern states stakeholders have identified. It has a chain of prerequisites as follows:  
PUAFIR303B Suppress wildfire (Release 2) ---  
PUAFIR204B Respond to wildfire (Release 2) ----  
PUAFIR215 Prevent injury (Release 2).

It is worth noting that these prerequisite units are already embedded imported electives in the two current AQF 2 and 3 CLM qualifications;

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<p>AHC21016 Certificate II in Conservation and land management (as PUAFIR215 and PUAFIR204B); and AHC31416 Certificate III in Conservation and land management (as PUAFIR215, PUAFIR204B and PUAFIR303B)</p> <p>This means there should not be any qualification pathway issues around having to work around numbers of enrolled elective units if the pathway is clearly communicated to Cert 3 students as part of an RTOs ethical marketing requirements (Clause 4.1) under the Standards. Please note the above mentioned PUA units have been recently upgraded to new version numbers and release dates within the PUA Training Package, so these would also need to be considered in the review and upgrade of your CLM Certificates 2 and 3 in this review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the unit is required to support indigenous land management fire activity then the unit 'AHCILM307 Implement Aboriginal cultural burning practices' would seem a better option since it is focussed more on cultural burns.</li> <li>• There is a real risk to public safety by people not trained effectively in wildfire control when conducting a prescribed burn as there are real risk of any fire getting out of control resulting in a wildfire</li> <li>• Units of competency should focus on National standards and be nationally adopted and not restricted to the actions of states where fire management are done differently (ref- feedback that NT and Nth WA use fire quite differently to "Southern States").</li> <li>• I recommend that the unit should not be developed</li> <li>• If development is recommended that, because of the possible legal ramifications, the unit development be taken out of this project and be considered in light of the with the review of the PUA training package outcomes to ensure consistency.</li> </ul> <p>Project timelines have worked against an appropriate consultation for such an important area of skills training, especially with a Royal Commission into fires on the eastern seaboard this summer imminent.</p> <p>The developer also noted a low number of feedbacks on this unit development from within the industry in Victoria</p>	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	and NSW particularly. I did explain the nature of human resourcing of campaign fires that have been occurring since November 2019, was not conducive to good exposure to information and project updates by industry. Many of our trainers, assessors and training department staff who would normally be around these issues, have been out of the office for many weeks, so may like myself as stated earlier, not have seen or read this part of the project update.	
<b>AHCLPW2XX Operate a handheld GPS device</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> <li>RTO NSW</li> <li>Industry Assoc Qld</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld</li> <li>Industry Assoc NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> </ul>	We approve of the new units, including the AABR's new ecology units	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	AHCLPW2XX Operate a handheld GPS really important	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	Strongly support the inclusion of this UOC. Very important skills and knowledge to be covered in this unit, and fills a training gap that exists.	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	Strongly support the inclusion of this unit. Agree with 772.	Feedback noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	Great that it includes the operation of tablet based GPS systems as we are seeing these more and more in the field	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	Agree with 772 but the unit is missing a fundamental aspect being collecting data all well and good but knowing what type of data to collect and how to use it is the essential. My employees can collect volumes of data but it does not mean it will contribute to the project. How data is collected and analysed should come before Element 1 as knowing what you want and what you want to do with the data defines how you manage the collection process.	Feedback adopted. Added a PC to identify purpose for using the GPS and data collected.
<b>AHCLPW3xx Coordinate and report on data collection</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> <li>RTO NSW</li> <li>Industry Assoc Qld</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld</li> <li>Industry Assoc NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> </ul>	We approve of the new units, including the AABR's new ecology units	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	Could the LWP3XX Coordinate and report on data collection be related back to cultural heritage as well?	The unit relates to all data collected. If data is collected on cultural sites then it too will be recorded.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	Support the inclusion of this UOC. Extremely important for staff who work at level II to understand not only why data is collected but also how the data is used, analysed and reported on. This would make a good introduction level unit to address this.	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	Strongly agree with 772. Great unit to include for students to understand what happens to the data and why we collect it.	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC2.2 and PE 4 - Does not match Application info. At level III they may not be briefing a work team or have a work team to brief.	A level 3 person may control small work teams and as such may engage in briefing them on the data collection activity
<b>AHCLPW3XX Implement a biodiversity monitoring plan</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> <li>RTO NSW</li> <li>Industry Assoc Qld</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld</li> <li>Industry Assoc NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> </ul>	We approve of the new units, including the AABR's new ecology units	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	RAHCLPW3XX- This could be your ecology unit. Very useful unit. WA wants ecology related to ecological knowledge, like data collection and work being completed on the ground	Feedback noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Qld	Move PC 3.1 and 3.2 into Element 2. This will be more matching with job requirements and places the focus on skills related to the workplace as opposed to organizing and packing a vehicle. The remains of Element 3 can be deleted as planned events/incidents are cannot be replicated in a training environment.	Units of competency are job statements and all aspects of the job should be stated. Element 3 refers to conducting the biodiversity work.  RTOs can assess these as they see fit including the use of simulation etc. PC 3.3 can be assessed using a simulated condition.
• RTO Qld	Agree with 570 transport is not that important and the focus should be on field savvy personnel. They need to know and be able to do monitoring not pack a vehicle. (PC 2.2)	Units of competency are job statements and all aspects of the job should be stated.
• RTO Qld	570 and 635 make a good point and demonstrate the confusion Element 1 you are preparing and then in element 2 you are still preparing but now transporting. The critical aspect which 570 identified is installing would be better as an element as my new staff understand the traps but have no idea of how to place them or use them effectively and loss of traps is an ongoing issue. (Element 2)	Units of competency are job statements and all aspects of the job should be stated.  RTO's must decide how to train and assess units. Industry specifies the job outcomes.
• RTO Qld	Reality for process in order of tasks switch PC 1.4 and 2.1. PC 2.2 delete as this may not be achievable due to the training environment/policies. Transport as part of an assessment will mean that other important aspects of set up is missed.	Units of competency are job statements and all aspects of the job should be stated.  RTO's must decide how to train and assess units. Industry specifies the job outcomes.
• Gov WA	Yes - non lethal trapping techniques could be included as they are used to monitor biodiversity. Though perhaps have it in the Knowledge rather than Performance criteria as this would be covered in the Animal Trapping techniques UOC. Monitor Biodiversity could be taught to cover a broad range of environments but could also focus on a particular environment relevant to the student (e.g. monitoring marine biodiversity would not include trapping vertebrates). (Answer to question 1 asked by RB)	Feedback noted.
• RTO NSW	Agree with 772 (in response to the comment directly above this one)	Feedback noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Again the transport requirement is very impractical to implement in a training environment. A lot of effort would go into setting up a mock scenario and this would have limited learning outcomes. (PE Dot Point 4)</p>	<p>Units of competency are job statements and all aspects of the job should be stated. Element 3 refers to conducting the biodiversity work.</p> <p>RTOs can assess these as they see fit including the use of simulation etc. PC 3.3 can be assessed using a simulated condition.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Instead of transport equipment and team to a site, which is a really hard performance criteria to access against because short of loading students and equipment into a vehicle and driving somewhere which is not practical, this PC would be hard to assess.</p> <p>It could be replaced with Locate equipment within a monitoring site. This puts the emphasis on developing skills on where to locate survey equipment to optimise detection. (PC 2.2)</p>	<p>Units of competency are job statements and all aspects of the job should be stated. Element 3 refers to conducting the biodiversity work.</p> <p>RTOs can assess these as they see fit including the use of simulation etc. PC 3.3 can be assessed using a simulated condition.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>What is missing from the E &amp; PC's that are very important. Basic knowledge of where on a site to locate photo monitoring points, take photos and location details. How to replicate photos and communicate change over time. Every project requires this at some stage. Knowing what type of data to collect. Having knowledge of different techniques for monitoring biodiversity.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Added to KE as the Monitoring plan developed by higher authority will determine much of this. However, a general understanding would be required.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>participants must have knowledge of the principles of photo monitoring and condition classifications to track changes over time (KE Dot point 4.3)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Amended KE to include recommended.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	There should be at PC that relates to reference ecosystems so people understand benchmarks to be monitored against	<p>This would be specified in the Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>This unit is about carrying out the monitoring process based on the plan.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	A statement needs to be included that permits are required. (Prerequisite)	<p>This would be specified in the Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>This unit is about carrying out the monitoring process based on the plan.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	Assessment condition need to be better at describing the skills/knowledge of the Trainer/Assessor. The unit has an animal ethics requirements and dealing with animals that could or are likely to die. Having this complexity need to be reflective of the assessment conditions.	<p>Compliance with ASQA trainer/assessor requirements are specified in the Assessment Conditions.</p> <p>ASQA Trainer/assessor requirements are:</p> <p>Trainers and assessors must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>hold the required credentials (Standards 1.14 and 1.15, Schedule 1 of the Standards)</li> <li>hold vocational competencies at least to the level being delivered and assessed (Standard 1.13[a])</li> <li>have current industry skills directly relevant to the training and assessment being provided (Standard 1.13[b])</li> <li>have current knowledge and skills in vocational training and learning that informs their training and assessment (Standard 1.13[c])</li> <li>undertake relevant professional development (Standard 1.16).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	Support inclusion of this unit. Also like that it can be applicable to marine/coastal environments.	Feedback noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	also purpose of survey (PC 1.2)	Feedback adopted. Added PC for confirming purpose of monitoring.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	What's missing here is reviewing the success/otherwise of the survey, identifying failures and deciding how to address this for future surveys. (Element 4)	This would be specified in the Monitoring Plan. This unit is about carrying out the monitoring process based on the plan. The supervisor would conduct the analysis. See <i>AHCLPW405 Monitor biodiversity</i> Element 4.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	environmentally sensitive is a more appropriate term to use here (PC 3.2, word highlighted was 'sustainable')	Feedback adopted. Amended PC 3.2 with change.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	Cannot see the need to create this unit at level III if the Level IV unit can be included in a cert III as an elective. Suggest reviewing both units and deciding to keep one at the appropriate AQF level. Planning and carrying out biodiversity surveys is more aligned with a level IV i.e. it's a more specialised responsibility. Simply identifying flora/fauna is a Level III whereas planning and executing a biodiversity survey involves routine and non-routine activities and solving sometimes unpredictable problems e.g. equipment failure, dealing with sick/injured animals if caught in a trap.	This unit is about carrying out the monitoring process based on the monitoring plan.  The unit <i>AHCLPW405 Monitor biodiversity</i> is about setting up the monitoring plan.  Skills Impact have recommended that a change to title may be required to rectify this disparity. This will be discussed and decided upon in the validation phase of the project.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	<p>Response to above- "This unit is intended to support the training of workers involved in monitoring biodiversity that work alongside, and for, staff operating at level IV or higher.</p> <p>There are a large number of Indigenous rangers in the north assisting with setting up survey sites, running surveys, decommissioning sites, maintaining and storing equipment around biodiversity monitoring operations.</p> <p>They nearly always work alongside biodiversity workers with either Certificate IV or higher qualifications (in reality usually postgraduate qualifications). They operate at level III, and the training to support their operations must be at level III. The existing level IV unit is inappropriate as it contains planning, permissions and data analysis functions that these level III workers do not do.</p> <p>This function does not replace, and is not equivalent to the level IV and higher functions that are still a critical part of these operations. It is about delineating appropriate job duties and tasks at each level, and providing a coherent pathway for students to progress appropriately through different levels of study that are appropriate for their workplace."</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Not appropriate - some monitoring can take place over a smaller time frame than this depending on the situation. Also, one instance of monitoring may not be enough to determine competence e.g. a monitoring plan for aquatic invertebrates and a one that includes trapping small mammals require very different skills. (PE Second sentence)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Removed time scale for monitoring from the Performance Evidence. Over a period of time specified in the monitoring plan.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Response to comment above "in response to 563, I'm not sure it is "inappropriate" and really 3 months is a short time. Perhaps this unit could be done in conjunction with other 'doing units' and students can monitor their work?"</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Removed time scale for monitoring from the Performance Evidence. Over a period of time specified in the monitoring plan.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	also the work must be carried out in keeping with relevant legislation and permit conditions (PC 1.2)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added compliance with regulations into PC 2.3 where installation must comply.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	again environmentally sensitive is more appropriate, need to add legislation and permit conditions (PE Dot Point 7)	Feedback adopted. Amended PE 7.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	Monitoring of microorganisms is rare in comparison with monitoring of flora, vertebrates and invertebrates - should not be mandatory under required knowledge. (KE Dot Point 3)	An awareness of all forms of monitoring is important and is included in the KE. Workplaces may have a specific focus on any one where RTO's can spend expand the Knowledge specific to the workplace needs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	In response to RB1 - if the answer is yes, then Apply animal trapping techniques would need to be a pre-requisite.	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	agree with 635's comments regarding Trainer/Assessor requirements (this comment- "Assessment condition need to be better at describing the skills/knowledge of the Trainer/Assessor. The unit has an animal ethics requirements and dealing with animals that could or are likely to die. Having this complexity need to be reflective of the assessment conditions.")	<p>ASQA Trainer/assessor requirements are pretty straight forward in this respect. Trainers and assessors must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>hold the required credentials (Standards 1.14 and 1.15, Schedule 1 of the Standards)</li> <li>hold vocational competencies at least to the level being delivered and assessed (Standard 1.13[a])</li> <li>have current industry skills directly relevant to the training and assessment being provided (Standard 1.13[b])</li> <li>have current knowledge and skills in vocational training and learning that informs their training and assessment (Standard 1.13[c])</li> <li>undertake relevant professional development.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>There needs to be another point inserted to cover knowledge of the principles of photo-point monitoring and condition classification to track changes over time with respect to project goals (KE)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>KE has been amended with recommended additions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	<p>They should be able to correctly identify the biodiversity they are monitoring (Elements)</p>	<p>Identification is a separate unit of competency.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Could also add, storage techniques especially if carrying out basic photo monitoring i.e. how something is stored and named will very much help with lining photos up and communicating changes. (KE)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended KE with recommended additions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 570, that basic understanding of where on a site to install monitoring points is vital to understanding how to interpret and communicate changes. So consider add a point to element 2. (this statement- 'What is missing from the E &amp; PC's that are very important. Basic knowledge of where on a site to locate photo monitoring points, take photos and location details. How to replicate photos and communicate change over time. Every project requires this at some stage. Knowing what type of data to collect. Having knowledge of different techniques for monitoring biodiversity.')</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended KE with recommended additions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>And that individual was clear on the goals of the project and monitoring of that project. If you don't know what the goal of the project is how do you know what to monitor? Or if you are successful etc.. (PE)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended PE 1 with recommended addition.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>This title already taken for the Cert IV unit. Very confusing. Would be under supervision. Suggest 'Carry out biodiversity monitoring' or words to that effect.</p>	<p>Skills Impact have recommended a change to title for clarity. This will be considered and decided in the validation phase of the project.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Vic	Response to RB comment re-non-lethal traps? Very possible, under permit and Animal Ethics approval.	Feedback noted.
• RTO Vic	PC2.3 Supervisor may need to check setup prior to use	Feedback noted. Operating procedure should include this if it is required.
• RTO Vic	PE - edit There must be evidence that the individual has on at least one occasion carried out biodiversity monitoring for a specified site over a specified time of <del>no less than 3 months</del> and has:  Firstly one occasion - doesn't work with three months). Does not make sense. Monitoring activities are generally long term but 3 months does not work where monitoring work is undertaken once a year over many years. Also would not work if there were monitoring of some species at particular stages of life cycle. For example nesting birds may only be present for a period less than three months. Spawning coral - one night. Ephemeral plants. I could go on!	Feedback adopted. PE has been amended to reflect feedback received.
• RTO Vic	PE 6 split ethical and sustainability procedures: Needs to be separated. Be specific	Feedback adopted. Amended PC 3.2 to reflect feedback received.
• RTO Vic	KE 1 Too vague. Need to specify exactly what is needed in order to carry out the monitoring according to the plan. Perhaps specify basic knowledge of the ecological system they are working in	Feedback adopted. Amended KE dot point 1.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Vic	KE 3 Would you just need to relate this to the monitoring to be undertaking.	As a KE a general understanding of the types of organisms and how to monitor. Contextualisation for their specific workplace would focus on one or more.
• RTO Vic	KE4 all sub points: Would depend on what is being monitored. Some of these may not apply to the work being undertaken.	As a KE a general understanding of the equipment used to monitor would be important. Contextualisation for their specific workplace would focus on one or more of those mentioned.
• RTO Vic	KE 6 Once again this should be separated more specific	Feedback adopted. Amended KE as recommended.
• RTO Vic	AC 3.1 Need be specific about ethics. They should know what they can and can't do ethically and legally. State and Federal regulation, guidelines/Standard Operating Procedures.	Amended AC as recommended.
<b>AHCLPW3XX Operate remotely piloted system for conservation work</b>		
• Industry (Employer) SA	Agree with new units  Add seeding to new drone in CLM unit	Feedback adopted. Seeding added to new unit <i>AHCLPW3XX Operate unmanned aerial system for conservation work</i>
• Industry (Employee) SA	Agree with new units	Feedback noted.
• Industry SA	Agree with new units	Feedback noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> <li>RTO NSW</li> <li>Industry Assoc Qld</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld</li> <li>Industry Assoc NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> </ul>	We approve of the new units, including the AABR's new ecology units	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	Strongly support inclusion of this unit. Very useful in remote areas and to monitor ocean/coastal fauna.	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) NT</li> </ul>	1.3 Should that include implement controls according to CASA requirements?	Feedback adopted. Modified PC 3.1.
<b>AHCMAR3XX Conduct intertidal marine monitoring</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	I feel that rocky shores should also be included (PE)	Feedback adopted. Amended PE to include rocky shores.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC1.1 Assume that the work plan outlines methodology to be used? Methodology in in the KE but not in PCs.	Methodology underpins many of the Elements and PC's in the unit.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	Response to RB Comment: IF WHS is covered in 1.4 then it is identified only. Would need to follow WHS/workplace procedures in element 2.	Feedback adopted. Units identified as Level 3. Amended 1.4 to WHS risk assessment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	Response to RB comment 2.5 Perhaps it is to implement the procedures during the monitoring process. 1.6 refers to the preparation of equipment and materials.	Feedback adopted. Amended PC's in Element 2 to reflect use of biosecurity procedures.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC3.3 Is this the same as 3.1?	Feedback adopted. Deleted PC 3.3 and amended PE to reflect types of records to be recorded.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC3.5 Needs to be clarified. Workplace waste disposal procedures may not all be environmentally responsible	Feedback adopted. Amended PC's 3.4 and 3.5.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PE Some of the dot points are repeats of the PCs</p> <p>PE1 second list: 'monitoring and methodologies' Not specifically mentioned in PCs.</p> <p>PE 2 second list: Methodology, equipment and resources would be predetermined for monitoring. Selection would be very limited. Perhaps located is a better word?</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Amended Pc1.1 and PE 1 to better reflect unit outcomes.</p> <p>There may be options for equipment to be used selecting would be necessary PC1.2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>KE 6: Beyond what is in the PCs. Recording data only PC 2.4 and reporting in 3.1</p> <p>KE 8: Word sustainable not in PCs - 3.5.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Amended KE6 and KE 8.</p>
<b>AHCMAR2XX Identify and collect marine life</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>What does 'industry approved' mean? At level II would assume that the workplace would provide scientific identification resources for the collector to use.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Amended PE.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PE</p> <p>Suggest review PE points. Some dot points are repeats of the PCs.</p> <p>See comment 2.1 above</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Repeats of the PC is acceptable however have reviewed and amended PE.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	KE Comments: 3. Is this unit for sub tidal species only? First mention of subtidal. 7 Would there be other ethical considerations other than animal welfare? 9 Permits - to be consistent with PC 1.5 10 For what purpose? 12 Environmental mentioned in 3.3. Review for consistency 13 Would this dot point be one of the identification resources listed above? 15 Is this covered in dot point above?	Amended KE as recommended
<b>AHCMAR3XX Conduct a subtidal marine monitoring operation from a vessel or platform</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	I feel that rocky shores should also be included (PE)	A platform could be a rock shore no need to add to PE.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	Remote underwater cameras/drones? (PE, where you've put 'Others??')	Feedback adopted. Added remotely piloted systems.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC2.6 Should WHS be included or just the emergency procedures?	Feedback adopted. Added extra PC for WHS.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Response to RB Comment: Could be some kind of benthic sample collection device. E.g. net, dredge, corer perhaps.</p> <p>PE 8 Biosecurity not in PCs</p> <p>PE9 Seems to be a repeat of the first item of PE</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Have adopted non-invasive/lethal techniques for monitoring in this unit.</p> <p>Added biosecurity PC2.3 and included in PC 3.2 and 4.2.</p> <p>Deleted repetition.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>KE10 Biosecurity Not in PC's KW11 Should WHS be included more broadly?</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Added biosecurity PC2.3 and included in PC 3.2 and 4.2. Modified KE11.</p>
<b>AHCMAR3XX Coordinate marine conservation activities on small vessels</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC5.1 According to the plan?</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Added to PC 5.1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PE Review dot points for repeats of PCs</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Repeats of PC's is acceptable. They are different documents.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>KE 3 Clarify - vessel capability and performance requirements for marine conservation activities? 4 and 5 For marine conservation work? 7 add marine 9 specific to marine conservation work? Sustainability not in PC's</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Amended KE as recommended.</p>
<b>AHCMAR3XX Monitor ocean conditions and marine environmental quality</b>		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	Element 1: AQF alignment - does the planning align more with level V?	Feedback adopted. Element 1 is about operational planning. Amended PC1.1 to highlight that a Monitoring plan is used.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	KE's KE13 biosecurity - Not mentioned in the PCs. Suggest adding to elements 2 and 3. KE 14 What about WHS hazards and risks more broadly? KE 15 contaminants - Contaminants in PE and KE but not in PCs.	Feedback adopted. Amended PC's to include reference to biosecurity.  Added PC for Risk assessment added WHS to PE and KE.  The contaminants are contained within the water samples collected Element 3.
<b>AHCMAR3XX Operate mobile underwater vehicles</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC1.2 Is that a supervisor/manager task? - aligns above III	Individuals at AQF Level 3 can take limited responsibility for the output of others within established parameters.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC3.3 Report to supervisor/manager?	Feedback adopted. Amended PC's in Element 3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PE: Suggest reviewing PE items and removing those that repeat PCs PE 1 Not specified in PCs	Repetition with PC's is acceptable.  PE 1 reflects PC1.5. The dot points are information that should be used when preparing for deployment of Underwater vehicles.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	KE biosecurity measures - Not required in PCs	Feedback adopted. Amended PC's to reflect importance of compliance with biosecurity procedures.
<b>AHCECR2XX Capture digital media for fieldwork</b>		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> <li>RTO NSW</li> <li>Industry Assoc Qld</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld</li> <li>Industry Assoc NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> </ul>	<p>We approve of the new units, including the AABR's new ecology units</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Support the inclusion of this UOC. Using media (in the form of photos and videos) is becoming increasingly common and useful in our field of work. There is no current equivalent training that I am aware of that is available in our region, so the inclusion of this unit would be highly valued.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Strongly support the inclusion of this unit and agree with the reasons stated by 772 (Chloe Rings). Digital media is so useful in our field of work to report on projects, to sit alongside articles, to report trainee progress, to be additional evidence for trainee's performance etc.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	<p>also support the inclusion of this unit</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	suggested reword: transfer media from capture device to storage/editing device (PE 8)	Feedback adopted. Changed PE 8 to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>transferred media from capture device to storage/editing device.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	media - need consistent language - also what if the selected media used for assessment are audio and video? (PE 9, Word 'image' highlighted)	Feedback adopted. Used digital media.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	remote / infrared photography is becoming very common and should be mentioned (KE 2)	Specialist photography is covered in <i>AHCNAR306 Conduct photography for fieldwork</i> . This unit is for Level 2 and basic equipment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Nat</li> </ul>	this is a very exhaustive list for knowledge evidence which would make this unit difficult to teach at level II - please consider how it may be able to be reduced without losing the integrity of the unit	Reference to 'Basic' in the KE is an indicator to RTO's delivering this unit that they only need to address the fundamentals. The purpose of the unit is as an introduction to digital media.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Terminology good (application)	Feedback noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	add to element 3 (between 3.3 and 3.4) to select on site optimal position and time of day to record (i.e. so information captured suits purpose). Acknowledge that it could also be 'compose (3.4) but maybe needs to be more specific?	Element 1.1 and 1.2 identify purpose which should include time of day, Element 3.3 would include light settings on basic equipment for purpose and 3.4 covers the composition of the image.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Agree with 563 (regarding this comment 'suggested reword: transfer media from capture device to storage/editing device')	Feedback adopted. Changed PE 8 to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>transferred media from capture device to storage/editing device.</li> </ul>
<b>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	other substrates would include rocks or rope if we are working in aquatic environments.	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	The unit is a much better offering than its predecessor and is at an appropriate level.	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	This is a very good introductory unit and will sit well in the level 2 suite.	Feedback noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>I just have a minor suggestion with regards to the name: Instead of carry out basic ecological restoration works would we consider Perform basic ecological restoration works or undertake basic ecological restoration works. Perform or undertake I think are more in line with the language that is used in industry.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Have changed title to 'Perform'.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (employee), QLD</li> </ul>	<p>I agree the name could be improved/simplified. Suggest "Implement Ecological Restoration"</p>	<p>Implement is often used at level 3 as they implement plans or procedures. 'Perform' has been used in the unit title consistent with other feedback and in line with directed works at level 2</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>This unit should replace the existing Carry our NAR unit which should be deleted from the NAR suite</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Skills Impact have tagged <i>AHCNAR201</i> for deletion based on feedback from industry experts.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>I like "Implement Ecological Restoration"</p>	<p>Implement is often used at level 3 as they implement plans or procedures. 'Perform' has been used in the unit title consistent with other feedback and in line with directed works at level 2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>I am not commenting on this version as I have done so on a later one which was sent to Ron, other than to say the Performance Criteria needs to mention being able to carry out works with reference to a reference site or ecosystem.</p>	<p>At level 2 the individuals would be under direction and the project brief and supervisor would specify the work.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Is this term clear to the range of end users? Consider 'industry standards'</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Replaced 'enterprise' with 'industry'.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Again, so it is easier for a wider range of end users, I suggest writing 'seed and propagule banks' (In KE)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Included seed and propagule banks in KE.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>It is my understanding that this unit is proposed to replace Carry out Natural Areas Restoration? Could this please occur</p> <p>Also a great unit that is able to encompass the main concepts of ecological restoration</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>This unit will replace <i>AHCNAR201 Carry out Natural Areas Restoration</i>.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Application: This addition to the Application statement in AHCNAR201 with the reference to the 'project brief' in PC 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.1, .32, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 4.1 and 4.2 infers that the worker would be interpreting or following a restoration plan or 'minimal brief' not just carrying out the works as suggested in the title.</p> <p>The statement in the Application of AHCNAR201 includes "All work is undertaken to supervisor instructions, according to the restoration plan and enterprise work procedures." This statement infers that the supervisor is directing the work in accordance with the restoration plan. The new unit is less clear on where that responsibility sits and is less reflective that this type of work is usually carried out by a supervised team (as mentioned in the Application).</p> <p>Also am unclear about what constitutes a 'minimal brief'. Suggests that the individual may have to work with limited information. Would it be more typical that action plans/ work plans are prepared for the implementation of restoration plans and recovery plans for particular sites where the work is carried out?</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Modified the unit to reflect concerns raised by replacing reference to project brief with supervisor instructions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Proposed Unit Sector name change - Have no issue with the change.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted for now and will be discussed further during the validation phase of the project.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Element 1: Review Element 1 wording. Have to assume that the team are carrying out the works identified in the planning and initial survey work that preceded the plan/works plan. The worker would have to 'ground-truth' the site against the plan (the physical and biological features identified in the plan). Suggest rewording to 'Inspect site to confirm ecological restoration activities'.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Element 1 wording altered to align with reasoning behind feedback. It now reads 'Identify activities and inspect site for required works'.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>The use of the term 'project brief' is questionable in this context. A project brief defines the project requirements in the initial stage of a restoration (or recovery) plan prior to the planning process. Actions for the implementation of the plan, such as the activities described in this unit, come out of the planning and are often outlined in action/work plans. See units AHCNAR503 Design a natural area restoration project (PC 4.2), AHCNAR402 Plan the implementation of revegetation works (element 2) and AHCNAR303 Implement revegetation works (PC 1.5). All these units should work together in terms of language and processes.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Language across the sector has been reviewed and attempts made and uniformity in usage.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC2.1 WHS use Work Health and safety	Feedback adopted. Changed to work health and safety.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC2.1 Should WHS hazards and risks be identified during the site inspection and prepared for in 2 (as per 2.5)?	SMEWG advised that they will provide final feedback on this during the validation phase of the project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC3.1 Should this be in element 2?	Feedback adopted. Moved Performance Criteria 3.1 to 2.6.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC3.2 and 4.2 consistent language substrate (soil)	Feedback adopted. Changes soil to substrate in PC 4.2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC 3.3 Control may not be possible	Feedback adopted. Changed wording for PC 3.3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PE Project Brief - See comments above	Feedback adopted. Removed reference to Project Brief.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Vic	PE 2 Not in elements. Goals, approaches, methods would be determined in the planning phase and outlined in a plan/work plan (implementation phase).	Feedback adopted. Edited PE 2.
• RTO Vic	PE3.2 Not in PCs. Also the soil survey work and other biological surveys would have been undertaken in the preparation of a plan. Would require skill and knowledge beyond the Cert II level and this unit.	This refers to 'intact elements' that the individual needs to be aware of so as not to damage.
• RTO Vic	PE3.3 Other substrates: Perhaps refers to surfaces/materials that provide ecological niches/habitat for other organisms - e.g. rocks, logs and tree trunks	Feedback noted.
• RTO Vic	PE 4 Project brief: See comments for 1.1	Feedback adopted. Removed reference to project brief.
• RTO Vic	PE4 all sub points: All required, not just suggestions? Also is this the same as the regeneration treatments covered two dot points below? Assisted regeneration treatments are not mentioned in PCs. 3.1 mentions preparing for ecological restoration treatments, 3.2 only specifies substrate and hydrological treatments.	Yes all need to be assessed.  Other treatments have been included in dot points below.
• RTO Vic	PE 5 Is this repeated in third last dot point below?	Feedback adopted. Deleted repetition.
• RTO Vic	PE8: Not specific in PCs - only preparing for transport.	Feedback adopted. Added transport to site in PC2.6
• RTO Vic	PE9 and 13: Industry standards: First mention of industry standards. How would this be judged? Are there regulated standards?	Yes, there are National Standards for the practice of ecological restoration. These are published by SERA.
• RTO Vic	KE 1 as converted in enterprise standards. ??	Feedback adopted. Replaced this statement.

**AHCECR3XX Conduct an ecological and cultural site inspection prior to operational works**

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	RB the unit is part of the planning process. Plans in ecological restoration are done based on evidence and data collection which this units does in spades.(answer to RB question 1)	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	in ecological restoration we use inventories than operations plans (PE Dot Point 3)	Feedback adopted. Changed site plan to inventory.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	The unit is overall a very good and fit for purpose as a core unit.	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	(PC) 1.3 could include identifying not just the elements but also the ecological functions and processes. 1.5 could also refer to ecological functions and processes.	Feedback adopted. Added ecological functions and processes into PC1.3 and 1.5.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	(response to immediately above comment) Again my feeling is that where the word operations is used it could be substituted with works. It is also more in line with the language used in the industry.	Feedback adopted. Replaced operations with works throughout the unit.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	Would it be appropriate to add recommend bio security protection measures as PC 3.3. At the moment they are identifying threats but not required to think about how to mitigate them?	Feedback adopted. Modified PC's to reflect identifying and recommend actions to mitigate risk of threats.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	I agree (with RTO Qld) this should be a core unit	Feedback adopted. This unit is to be included as core unit.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>please remove the word 'operation' from title) as it is not required Rework to: Conduct an ecological and cultural site assessment prior to works</p>	Feedback adopted. Replaced operations with works throughout the unit.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>I agree with 809.(agrees with RTO Qld that this should be a core unit) I think this unit fills an important gap as a core unit.</p> <p>Just a comment, couldn't it be called Conduct an ecological and cultural site assessment prior to works (leave out the operational) this word is related to the construction sector rather than ecological sector as this gives it a broader scope and operational has a very rigid flavour.</p>	Feedback adopted. This unit is to be included as core unit.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>PC 2.6 is very open to interpretation. What is acceptable risk? What could be seen as acceptable risk to one person may not be to another. Could a better learning outcome be met if it was 2.6 Determine appropriate risk/threat mitigation measures?</p>	Feedback adopted. Modified PC's to reflect identifying and recommend actions to mitigate risk of threats.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>Can the word elements being changed to elements/processes and delete to that and operation (PC 1.3)</p>	Feedback adopted. Added ecological functions and processes into PC1.3 and 1.5.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>the word "Operational" could be dropped from the title and "inspection" can be replaced by "assessment"</p>	Feedback adopted. Title has been changed to reflect feedback responses.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>need to identify ecosystem function and processes as part (PC 1.5)</p>	Feedback adopted. Added ecological functions and processes into PC1.3 and 1.5.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC 1.3 could include identifying not just the elements but also the ecological functions and processes. 1.5 could also refer to ecological functions and processes.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Added ecological functions and processes into PC1.3 and 1.5.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Agree (with RTO Qld), this should become a core unit instead of AHCWRK.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. This unit is to be included as core unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Remove this word (operational from title)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Title has been changed to reflect feedback responses.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Remove this language. There should be no acceptable risk. Just determine risk/s (PC 2.6, word 'acceptable')</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Modified PC's to reflect identifying and recommend actions to mitigate risk of threats.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>yes agree with a number of people on (PC) 2.6. Consider changing to: determine risk to cultural and heritage assets and ways of ameliorating those risks. it is a bit like identifying safety risks / hazards and ways these can be avoided. Definitely take out "acceptable"</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Modified PC's to reflect identifying and recommend actions to mitigate risk of threats.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 570. Identify biosecurity threats and ways of mitigating those threats. (this comment -'Would it be appropriate to add recommend bio security protection measures as 3.3. At the moment they are identifying threats but not required to think about how to mitigate them?')</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Modified PC's to reflect identifying and recommend actions to mitigate risk of threats.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>As per previous page, consider removing 'acceptable' as the identification of a risk should be coupled with the identification and recording of ways to mitigate those risks (referring to this comment 'Remove this language. There should be no acceptable risk. Just determine risk/s (PC 2.6, word 'acceptable')')</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Modified PC's to reflect identifying and recommend actions to mitigate risk of threats.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Also agree with 545, 764, 809 and 570 that this should be a core unit. It is a great foundation for site assessment, learning to read a site and therefore better understand the ins and outs of how to restore a site down the track. With some tweaks could be used for marine focused course as well.	Feedback adopted. This unit is to be included as core unit.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC's 1.4 Threats generally or threats from the operational impacts? 1.5 Does the site operations plan have a tool to make this determination?	Feedback adopted. Modified PC's to reflect identifying and recommend actions to mitigate risk of threats.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PE PE 2.2 Response to RB Chemical characteristics - Suggest remove this. PE2.6 May not see signs of common animals on the day, let alone threatened species. Would be looking for habitat elements	Feedback adopted. Removed reference to chemical characteristics PE2.2  Have replicated presence or signs of for PE 2.6. Individuals must search for identifiable evidence even though they may not be present.
<b>AHCECR3XX Conduct site inspection for ecological restoration</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	Approve of the creation of this new unit.	Feedback noted.
<b>AHCECR3XX Implement assisted regeneration works</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	To answer both RB - Yes those involved in bush regen do organised the labour cost i.e. how many person hours does this job require as it part of scoping the job. When the job is originally scope the environment or climate may change or other neighbouring activities may have occurred that you were unfamiliar with had started.	Feedback noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	the community and neighbours (add to last subheading of Assessment Conditions)	Feedback adopted. Added stakeholders to the dot points for relationships in the Assessment Conditions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	Hydrological treatment read like gloppy goo. They are not explicit	This comment will be addressed in the validation phase of the project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	I think (PC) 3.5 could be incorporated into 1.1 Conduct site inspection to identify intact ecological features and potential threats to regenerating species	Feedback adopted. Incorporated PC 3.5 into 1.1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	We need something about recording activities undertaken i.e. daily site report	Feedback adopted. Included a new PC in Element 3 Update records for regeneration works according to workplace procedures.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	Not sure monitoring should be in here?? (PC 4) Monitoring is much longer term. Perhaps this should be, record responses of desirable and undesirable biota in follow up visits.	Feedback adopted. Changed Monitor to Record.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	I feel (PC) 2.5 and 2.6 are not level 3 performance criteria. Preparing a schedule of works requires an in depth knowledge, more appropriate at Cert 4 or diploma level. 2.6 could be deleted and 3.2 could cover it undertake assisted regeneration activities in accordance to the schedule of works.	Feedback adopted. A Level 3 person may coordinate labour and plan daily activities Skills Impact have reworded PC 2.5 and 2.6.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	agree with 570 - Need record and fill out daily record sheet noting daily activities, use of herbicide, personnel, site observations etc.	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Included a new PC in Element 3 Update records for regeneration works according to workplace procedures.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	prefer 'colonisation' with an 's'. Also important to be consistent throughout package e.g. see two lines above. (Application)	Feedback adopted. Corrected spelling error.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Great call 570 (about amalgamating PC's) - agree that potential threats could be placed together with 1.1 and 3.5 becomes fill out daily record sheet	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Incorporated PC 3.5 into 1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	level 3 students and practitioners regularly determine and organise labour and report on works delivered and response of site to works.	Feedback adopted. Have reworded PC 2.5 and 2.6.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	(Element) 3. should include reporting on works	Feedback adopted. Included a new PC in Element 3 Update records for regeneration works according to workplace procedures.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	(PC) 5.1 and abiotic site elements	Feedback adopted. Added abiotic site elements to PC 5.1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	(PC) 2.2 Add including potential threats to fauna and abiotic elements from control of exotic plant species.	Feedback adopted. Added threats to PC 2.2. Did not include fauna and abiotic elements.... as this would be included in environmental and would be fleshed out in the Knowledge Evidence so no need to include in the PC.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	(PC) 2.1 Include quality	Quality would be included in the procedures for environment PC2.1 Quality of works would be included in project brief PC3.2 .

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 859 re what level 3 does and need to record works. Level 3 lead small crews and need to monitor expenditure of hours against the scheduled budget.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Included a new PC in Element 3 Update records for regeneration works according to workplace procedures.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Application: The Application reads like a knowledge unit. Match unit title, Application and Elements.</p> <p>Also review header code.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Updated Application.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Response to RB comment PC 2.5: Planning the implementation is usually a level IV activity as is preparing a schedule of works (2.6). Implementing the planned schedule of works is a III. Question that you would be doing all the preparation work prior to a schedule of works being planned. As for the comments made for the AHCECR2XX unit, the units need to work together - generally managing and designing at the diploma, planning for implementation at the IV and implementing at the III. Review unit for consistency with related AHC units and AQF level.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>A Level 3 person may coordinate labour and plan daily activities.</p> <p>Skills Impact have reworded PC 2.5 and 2.6.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Response to RB PC3.5 A restoration/regeneration plan seems to be missing from this unit. The elements and PCs indicate that this unit is about the task of going to a site, working out what needs to be done, doing the work and following up work without reference to a related restoration plan or client. Have to record ecosystems and communities (not identify them), identify boundaries and other factors but not record them, identify environmental risks but not deal with them, prepare a schedule of works and then a 'project brief' appears in 3.2 (see comments about the use of this term in AHCECR2XX feedback).</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Amalgamated PC 3.5 into PC 1.1.</p> <p>At level 3 an individual should be able to interpret or at least comply with a project brief.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PE3 all locally... Remove 'all'. Who is to say what all the locally applicable treatments are? Could render the unit undeliverable.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Removed 'all' from PE statement.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Vic	PE4 and minimised threats: Not in PCs	Feedback adopted. PC 2.2 changed to include threats. PC 3.4 addresses threats.
• RTO Vic	KE 3: In 3.5? Not specified in PCs.	Climate change is inferred in the Knowledge Evidence.
• RTO Vic	KE6 In the local area or more broadly?	This refers to the principles more broadly as it is under Knowledge Evidence.
• RTO Vic	KE7 all sub points The level of knowledge underpinning some of these techniques is beyond level III. Review.	Feedback adopted.  Skills Impact have reviewed and modified header dot point and some sub points.  Knowledge of the techniques is appropriate at level 3.
<b>AHCECR3XX Implement ecosystem reconstruction works</b>		
• RTO Qld	This is much better unit than the previous unit that felt and read more like planting trees for a horticulture project.	Feedback noted.
• Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW	I think (PC) 3.6 should be in the planning stage, it should be 1.4 and 1.4 should become 1.5	Feedback adopted.  Moved PC3.6 to 1.4. and renumbered Element 1.
• Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW	Agree with 809 (that this a better unit than what existed previously)	Feedback noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Again I do not think this is a level 3 performance criteria. Preparing a schedule of works is higher level. It could be undertake activities in accordance with a schedule of works or recommend activities to inform a schedule of works. Participants will not have enough skills and knowledge to prepare a SOW and it will be very difficult to access.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Reworded PC's 2.5 and 2.6 to reflect Level 3 activities.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>There must also be evidence that the individual can identify varying levels of resilience</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Added to Knowledge Evidence.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>physiology of growth of desirable and non-desirable organisms (KE Dot Point 2)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Added to Knowledge Evidence.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>(PC) 2.2 is a very tricky skill. I do not believe a level 3 has the ability and knowledge to determine species selection. This is usually undertaken in the plan. Perhaps tighten to species placement within the plan</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changed PC 2.2 to identify from Project brief.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Strongly agree with two different ecological environments. (for PE, KE and AC)</p>	<p>This piece of feedback will be discussed during the validation phase of the project, as will the issue it refers to.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>This is a far more appropriate application for a Certificate III level worker. The Control Weeds and Pest units read very differently, and we now have two sets of expectations of what a Cert III graduate will be able to do.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	I think PC 1.2 is more suited to a Cert IV course, where they are developing the skills to operate and think at a landscape level.	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Modified 1.2 to identify potential in keeping with terminology used in Level 3.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	I agree with 545 regarding point , and like the suggestion. (regarding comment '2.2 is a very tricky skill. I do not believe a level 3 has the ability and knowledge to determine species selection. This is usually undertaken in the plan. Perhaps tighten to species placement within the plan')	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changed PC 2.2 to identify from Project brief.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	Exactly what is meant by biota in a CLM regeneration context?	Biota has been used to be inclusive of the Aquatic environment, which might include coral and vegetation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	suggest that it should be two of the following methods. transplanted stock is not often undertaken in our region, and infrequently works in our setting. Does sown propagules refer to direct seeding? If so, can we simplify the terminology? (For KE)	While it may not be implemented in all regions as an assessment, all individuals should be assessed in order for them to have transferable skills.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	Again I question the validity of connectivity at a Cert III level. (KE Dot Point 2.6)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Modified PE to reflect level 3 outcomes.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	Irrigation implies formal processes of getting water to a site . In our region this is not a process that is ever used, and would pose difficulty in teaching and assessment.	This is a practice performed on some sites and individuals should be aware of these methods and assessed for their understanding of the limitations you have identified.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>I disagree with the need for a name change. My argument is that it is making it too academic for Cert III. Revegetation works may be simple similar to a horticulture project or more complex as situations require. At Cert III it should be about the skill of the planting, the complexity should be under guidance of higher level supervisors or picked up over time in the career. This unit maybe should be an optional elective rather than replacing AHCNAR303</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Name changes for unit sectors will be resolved during the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be raised and considered by Skills Impact and the SMEWG.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>couldn't 2.5 simply say '-Prepare the soil' or if needed add 'appropriate to revegetation techniques being used'</p>	<p>As the unit could be used for aquatic environments the substrate may not be soil.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>I apologise for being cynical. These new evidence criteria - both performance and knowledge are getting very wordy, they seem to be complicating things for the sake of change. I am not sure about the rest of the country but here in North East Victoria, we are not seeing funding to CLM study or career paths. Making the requirements harder is counterproductive to getting people in to the industry. From a teaching perspective, the way we are being audited- good luck proving you have covered all these points unless you have more hours than we could justify. The old unit worked well to assist our local council implement their annual revegetation program in their environmental reserves</p>	<p>In the past there has been poor understanding of the Performance Evidence and the depth of Knowledge required for units of competency.</p> <p>The intent is to make it clear on what is required for assessment.</p> <p>Training Package development does not take into account delivery and funding issues. This needs to be addressed at the State level with individual funding bodies.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>in response to 895. Assessing a site from both what is happening on site and what is happening off site is essential to making decisions about how a site might be reconstructed and even what species might be used. The goals of a project including if the project is to link areas is essential at all levels including level III</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Modified 1.2 to identify potential in keeping with terminology used in Level 3.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>I used to work with cert III students (and they worked with each other) to determine the species list. It worked very well as they then learnt a whole lot about site analysis and conditions that might need planning for such as frost, exposure, flooding, predation etc. It also assists students thinking about goals, replicating nature / species placement etc. Ideally something about species selection in my opinion should remain</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Confirmation to retain reference to species selection in element 2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>would interpret a schedule of works work better? (In response to this comment 'Again I do not think this is a level 3 performance criteria. Preparing a schedule of works is higher level. It could be undertake activities in accordance with a schedule of works or recommend activities to inform a schedule of works. Participants will not have enough skills and knowledge to prepare a SOW and it will be very difficult to access.' about PC 2.7)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Reworded into 'Organise and coordinate site activities for work team for reconstruction works' as this is well within the capability of a Level 3 person.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>in response to 899 - not all sites have soil. If reconstructing an oyster bed, seagrass or another site, you may be dealing with other substrates. If confusing, should some examples be included?</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Addition of substrate examples to be discussed and agreed upon by the SMEWG before the final drafts.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 895 in relation to there are a number of ways to reconstruct a site including direct seeding. So, perhaps there needs to be performance evidence of one approach to reconstruction across two ecosystem types BUT knowledge evidence of another 1-2 techniques used across the country / industry.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Two different ecological environments have been retained.</p> <p>The depth of the KE does specify different ecosystems, ecological communities and restoration principles which must be assessed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Suggest adding, 'current' i.e. current industry standards as things are continually evolving. (in PC language)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Included 'current' when referencing industry standards.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>using two of the following methods and include other techniques in dot points such as direct seeding; use of materials (e.g. Coir logs) etc. (KE opening sentence)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Used the following dot points reflected in the current standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• replanting nursery stock</li> <li>• direct seeding or introduced propagules</li> <li>• translocation</li> </ul>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>in response to 895, please see earlier comments as I believe it is key to some of the decision making (even BASIC decisions) for reconstruction as it influences goals of the project, species selection and placement, maintenance etc.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Confirmation to retain reference to species selection in element 2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>In response to 895, this is a nationwide course so if you don't need water, lucky you! In many places, if you don't consider how to water or establish plants, then they may well die.</p> <p>I suggest the wording be focused more to the establishment of the reconstruction project including watering as this then allows other techniques to be applied / taught and better includes the establishment of other ecosystems (e.g. securing bags containing seagrass propagules to seabed; watering regimes for terrestrial systems (where required); protection of plants against predation etc. etc. (language all through the unit)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Reworded to elevate establishment in the dot point.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>in response to 899 - our industry has developed a lot since planting some trees, and students as well as teachers need to be aware of updated terminology as well as, how to reconstruct a site including where on a site and all the different ways a site can be reconstructed. Even if they are not making all the decisions at a level 3 (though many are), the fact is, a lot of students do not do higher levels such as level IV or V so getting a sense of what is happening industry wide and the different reconstruction techniques (e.g. planting, direct seeding, use of materials etc.) to assist reconstructing a site is a good thing!</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>I appreciate what 545 is saying about species selection - but the reality is that a cert III trade must know the basics or they will actually plant the wrong things. Too often there is no plan and few people do the Diploma, which covers this at a higher skill level. We could wordsmith this so it adds 'consistent with the reference ecosystem' at the end. Because the reference ecosystem (which is often a pre-set) will provide the simple guide to species selection.</p> <p>I can't seem to be able to comment on the other points in this page made by 545 which question the inclusion of documentation of threats and so on. The Cert III trade is more often than not required to competently carry out these simple tasks including noting if a reconstruction needs further care to avoid threats. They need to be taught at level suited to Cert III . There could be some word smithing solutions.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Modified PC 2.2 to identify species from the project brief.</p> <p>Formal plant identification is addressed in other units of competency.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>The problem with calling it 'revegetation' is that would exclude marine and aquatic work that cannot be called 'revegetation'. The term 'reconstruction' is used in the restoration workplace and is not an academic term.</p>	<p>Feedback noted and will help to inform Skills Impact and SMEWG's decision on the final name of the unit, to be set during the validation phase of the project.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Re-Code: Revegetation works are common undertaking in natural area restoration. Is this unit replaces AHCNAR303 and the question is whether it would work for revegetation.</p>	<p>Advice from the SMEWG is that this will replace the current unit for revegetation and will also address the aquatic environment.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Element 1: This unit is about implementing a work plan. Would developing a scope of works be part of the implementation? Seems to be missing reference to a restoration plan guiding these works which would direct the scope of works (element 1).</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Components of Element 1 have been reviewed. Changes to PC 1.2 and addition of PC 1.4.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC1.1 Project Brief: As per previous comments - needs clarification</p>	<p>The SMEWG were asked to consider this piece of feedback.  They have informed Skills Impact that the use of a project brief is quite appropriate at this level.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Element 2: Schedule of works prepared in 2.6, labour requirement/permits suggest a higher - would these be a supervisor/manager level task?  The structured work context would suggest a supervisor but there is no accountability to a supervisor, manager or client.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Components of Element 2 have been reviewed.  Changes to PC 2.2, 2.5 and addition 2.6 address accountability issue raised in feedback.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC2.4: All species or all individuals?</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Modified PC2.4 (3.4) and also corrected numbering error.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Element 4 Response to RB Comment: According to the Application, individuals undertake defined activities and work in a structured context. The unit is patchy in terms of the recording, documentation or reporting that would be required in a structured workplace.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Added PC 4.6 to maintain records and reports.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PE 2 and 3: The unit is about implementing the works which may not include these points (determined before the works plan)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Modified PE dot point 2 and 3.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Vic	PE 7: Suggest remove the words ' using all the following methods' and remove the three sub dot points. May not be possible or practical to use all three methods and these three points are covered in the Knowledge Evidence.	SME advice to demonstrate at least two of the methods.
• RTO Vic	PE 7.1 clarify	Feedback adopted.  Reworded PE dot points 7.1,7.2 and 7.3 using terminology from the industry standard glossary.
• RTO Vic	PE 7.2 sown propagules may not be available	Feedback adopted.  Reworded PE dot points 7.1,7.2 and 7.3 using terminology from the industry standard glossary.
• RTO Vic	PE 7.3 Question this. May not be possible or advisable in some circumstances.	Feedback adopted.  Reworded PE dot points 7.1,7.2 and 7.3 using terminology from the industry standard glossary.
• RTO Vic	KE3.4: For implementation? Not in elements or PCs	Feedback adopted.  This is underpinning knowledge and relates to components of many PC's but notably PC 1.3 and 2.3.
• RTO Vic	KE6 sub points 1,2,3 need clarification	Feedback adopted.  Clarified KE 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3.
• RTO Vic	KE6.5 does this fit in with hydrological requirements?	Feedback adopted.  Clarified KE 6.5.
• RTO Vic	KE7: Very broad knowledge area. Suggest restricting to pest and diseases related to the reconstruction site. What is really needed for the implementation of a reconstruction plan?	Feedback adopted.  Reworded KE 7 to read pests and diseases and the principle control strategies for their prevention and control on

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
		reconstruction sites including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• methods for minimizing the transfer of undesirable organisms (biosecurity)</li> <li>• methods for biological, cultural, mechanical and chemical pest control.</li> </ul>
<b>AHCSAW2XX Recognise landforms and soil types</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> <li>RTO NSW</li> <li>Industry Assoc Qld</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld</li> <li>Industry Assoc NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> </ul>	We approve of the new units, including the AABR's new ecology units	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>PE 1 should be re worded so that it is the candidate provides evidence of conducting</p> <p>1 Land form survey</p> <p>1 Soil survey</p> <p>An additional dot point should be added for the testing of soil, rocks and mineral for type of properties. Testing should be done in the field.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended PE to include land and soil surveys.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RTO Qld</li> </ul>	THE AQF for the unit should be a AQF3 not AQF 2 as this will allow the units to be used over three levels not two which is currently proposed	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>The unit meets the AQF standard as a level 2.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Qld	Need to provide information on who would assess the unit and the range of practices that would be suitable for the students to undertake. (AC)	Feedback adopted. Assessment Conditions has been updated.
• RTO Qld	Element 1 is not required, If they have done WHS training this would be mere repetition (1.3). The other two PC (1.1 and 1.2) do not contribute to the employ-ability or employment of a person.	Feedback adopted. Each unit is a standalone job profile. As such must reference all aspects of the task.
• RTO Qld	KE dot point 2 and 3 should include testing for rocks and mineral instead the way that it is written it is assumed knowledge	Feedback adopted. KE has been amended.
• RTO Qld	The student should be able to do simple field test to determine the rock / mineral type in the field which would be better fitting for Element 2 as 2.3 and the current 2.3 is changed to 2.4	Feedback adopted. Field tests have been included in the PC and KE.
• RTO Qld	the 5th dot point should be required as it covers large amount of material. As is should be * land form surveys * Soil surveys * Monitoring Techniques * Equipment (PE)	Feedback adopted. Amendments have been made to PE to reflect an AQF Level 2 unit of competency.
• RTO Qld	KE last two dot point not required.	Feedback adopted. The last two dot points in the KE have been removed.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>This unit should not be just about recognition of soils and land forms. It should have a strong emphasis on identifying soil degradation and modification and implementing soil protection/conservation and amelioration actions. Another reason why it should be a level 3 unit. (Application sentence 1)</p>	<p>The development of this unit was as a Level 2 unit to recognise Land forms and soil types.</p> <p>Further works on the site are specified in other level 3 units of competency.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 635 . PC1.2 and 1.3 are ambiguous. Not even sure what 1.1 is aiming at.            Suggestions below:            1.2 Identify sources of information (students can be introduced to where information can be obtained i.e.. Espade etc..)            1.2 Identify site and investigate/interpret existing references            (In reference to this comment by RTO Qld- 'Element 1 is not required, If they have done WHS training this would be mere repetition (1.3). The other two PC (1.1 and 1.2) do not contribute to the employ-ability or employment of a person.')</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Reviewed all PC's and have amended to reflect the projected outcomes of the unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>I agree with 635 this should be a Level 3 unit.</p>	<p>Intent of the unit was at Level 2 for Recognition skills only see Stakeholder response below.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>This statement would need to be modified to reflect the application at a level 3 (Application sentence 2)</p>	<p>Intent of the unit was at Level 2 for Recognition skills only see Stakeholder response below.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Some of the language in the PC will need to be changed if it goes to level 3.</p>	<p>Intent of the unit was at Level 2 for Recognition skills only see Stakeholder response below.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 635 and 570 that this unit would best suit level III</p>	<p>Intent of the unit was at Level 2 for Recognition skills only see Stakeholder response below.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	<p>Disagree with 635 and 570 on this (unit at level 3). Examination of soils and landforms in the context of a park or reserve is most often an activity that does require reference to a specialist either within or outside the organisation, and the ability to identify the correct source of expert advice is essential to this activity.</p> <p>There is also equipment and reference material involved in this activity, and the ability to identify and source this equipment correctly is essential (soil sampling equipment, soil/geological maps and reports, etc.)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	<p>At level II and III building skills and knowledge that is based on sound, accurate advice is essential.</p> <p>Equally, poor, ill-informed or inaccurate advice is counterproductive for both workplace and conservation outcomes, and the personal development of sound skills and knowledge in individual workers.</p> <p>Soil science and regional geology are specialist areas of expertise, and workers have to know where to find sound advice in these areas.</p> <p>Sometimes these experts may exist within the agency they work for, but also sometimes they are tucked away in government agencies like Departments of Agriculture/ Primary Industry, Geological Survey Organisations, educational institutions such as universities and sometimes private consultancies.</p> <p>Their expertise is invaluable, and often freely given if you know where to go to get it. Whether it is within the organisation they work for, or in another department or agency, level II and III workers should know where to go for accurate advice regarding soil and landform concepts and advice.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	<p>Disagree with 570 on the emphasis of this unit.</p> <p>Soil degradation, modification, protection and amelioration should all be covered in other units of competency - that is a different focus to what this unit is intended for.</p> <p>This unit is not intended to be primarily about interventions on disturbed land. There are very large regions to the north, and a great many conservation workers engaged in working on them, where the land is relatively undisturbed.</p> <p>Whether they work in mine site rehabilitation, agriculture or a World Heritage Area, or Class A reserve, all conservation workers should have a fundamental understanding of land-form and soil concepts, and how to find resources and expertise to build these skills.</p> <p>Interventions are a different topic that builds on this.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>When using the term identify, it implies an AQF level of 3. I agree similar to 734 that this is a specialized skill of geology. Undertaking sampling and testing, then providing a report is not a 2 or 3 qualification. A level 3 should recognise/ identify these criteria for works but not make reports.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Basic field testing should be included in this (Elements and PC's). Is this aimed as a landform unit or a soils unit? Although integrated information, they are two different specialist topics. Geology and landform is very expertise information but basic on ground information can be sought be visual identification (sometimes) and a lot can be gained from simple soil tests.</p>	<p>Intent of the unit was at Level 2 for Recognition skills only see Stakeholder response above.</p> <p>Included basic field tests to assist with soils, and landform recognition.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PE - Soil test undertaken PE 6 to have provide concise report to supervisor removed. This is required at AQF 4. Undertaking of results are recording as per work order is better suited to AQF 3	Feedback adopted. PE and KE have been amended with changes from feedback.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	agree with (RTO Qld)635 re KE 2 & 3 and remove KE 6 &7	Feedback adopted. PE and KE have been amended with changes from feedback.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	Unit Comment: This unit is above a Cert II level, especially with the inclusion of soil survey and monitoring techniques. Geological concepts should sit at the IV and would work better with Cert IV/Diploma units. Geology missing at the higher levels. Where would this would be used in industry at the Cert II level? Needed for a deeper understanding of landscape processes and land degradation to inform land management practices and plans.	Intent of the unit was at Level 2 for Recognition skills only see Stakeholder response above.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	Title Maybe add 'types' as the distribution of soil types are associated with the landforms.	Feedback adopted.  Changed title to include soil 'types'.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	KE 1,2&3 - This is more than level II  KE 5 Would need to be able to recognise soil types. This is above the Cert II.	Intent of the unit was at Level 2 for Recognition skills only..  Feedback adopted. The unit has been reviewed and amended to reflect this level.

## Revised units of competency

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>AHCLPW301 Supervise park visitor activities</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry/Tas</li> <li>Industry (Employee) Tas</li> </ul>	<p>Biggest barrier for RTO's is the performance criteria in LPW301. We don't lock doors, we don't shut down. They're open 24/7</p> <p>Remove words 'for security'. Just say 'in Parks/ areas'</p>	Feedback adopted. Word 'security' removed from unit.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> <li>RTO NSW</li> <li>Industry Assoc Qld</li> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld</li> <li>Industry Assoc NSW</li> <li>Industry (Employer) NSW</li> </ul>	Can we add PUA units alongside this one?	Feedback adopted. PUA units aligned with this unit in qualifications.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) WA</li> </ul>	Just talk about 2-way radios. Not what is in their currently Agree	Feedback adopted. Changed KE to two-way radios.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	Agrees above	Feedback adopted. Changed KE to two-way radios.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	should be at least two occasions (PE sentence 2)	Feedback adopted. Changed to two occasions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	remove "digital surveillance systems" unnecessary duplicate from first point (KE Dot Point 5.3)	Feedback adopted. deleted digital from surveillance systems.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	too much detail here - this is not a radio communications unit. These details should be assessed in a different UOC, they do not belong in the assessment for Supervising Park Visitor activities. (KE 5.4)	Feedback adopted. Deleted communications systems from the KE.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	remove "electronic" the majority of parks in Western Australia do not have electronic surveillance (KE 5.1)	deleted 'electronic' from KE 5.1. Feedback adopted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	remove "electronic" as above (KE 5.2)	deleted 'electronic' from KE 5.3. Feedback adopted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>AHCLPW303 Construct access tracks</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Feedback received</li> </ul>		No feedback received for this unit.
<b>AHCLPW304 Carry out inspection of designated area</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Response to developer comment on what is being inspected:</p> <p>That is not specified so that the application can be put into a range of contexts. The context is defined in element 1.</p> <p>It could be routine inspection of facilities in parks such as toilets, picnic areas, designated tracks and viewing points. My limited observation is that it is used for inspecting built facilities and assets in parks.</p>	Feedback noted.
<b>AHCLPW305 Perform diving for scientific purposes</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Tas</li> </ul>	Diving unit, should be 'support diver	Have completely remodelled this to reflect a job outcome and align more to the Australian Standards (AS).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	Great unit but shouldn't be compulsory for the marine specialisation of the CERT III CLM. In the north of Australia diving ops can't always be conducted. Also within certain agencies because of WHS issues and keeping tickets up to date it can be very difficult to conduct diving operations.	Feedback adopted. Unit is not compulsory.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Nat</li> </ul>	SISOSCB006 - Perform diver rescues with a minimum of 10 logged dives and with a minimum of 5 hrs of documented total dive time HLTAID007 - Provide advanced resuscitation (add to Prerequisite Units)	Feedback adopted. Have completely remodelled this to reflect a job outcome and align more to the AS.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Nat</li> </ul>	This unit is NOT equivalent to AHCLPW305 Perform diving for scientific purposes	Have completely remodelled this to reflect a job outcome and align more to the AS based on SME and industry feedback.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Nat</li> </ul>	<p>This unit of competency describes the skills and knowledge required to dive to support scientific research, monitoring and inspection roles associated with places or areas of significance or as a Restricted Occupational SCUBA diver.</p> <p>All work is undertaken to legislative, manufacturer, enterprise and code of practice requirements.</p> <p>This unit applies to individuals who work under broad direction and use discretion and judgement in the selection and use of available resources.</p> <p>This unit requires compliance with the current AS/NZS 2299.2 Australian/New Zealand Standard for Occupational diving operations, Part 2: Scientific diving – Clause A9.1 Competencies of Scientific SCUBA diver and current AS/NZS 2815.6 Australian/New Zealand Standard for Training and certification of occupational divers, Part 6: Restricted occupational SCUBA diver - Clauses 3.1 to 3.12</p> <p>Dive certificates and licensing apply for this unit and specific determination should be sought from the relevant State or Territory. (Application)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>This has been completely remodelled to reflect a job outcome and align more to the AS.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Training dive time should include minimum requirements of AS/NZS 2815.6:2013 Clauses 3.9.4 Training dives.</p> <p>Assessors must satisfy the Standards for Registered Training Organisations requirements for assessors, and be an individual who is currently certified and sanctioned by an industry authorised organisation to teach and assess Scientific or Restricted Occupational SCUBA diving skills. (AC)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>All unit requirements aligned with AS/NZS and Scientific or Restricted Occupational SCUBA diving skills.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Replace all with performance and knowledge evidence based on the elements and performance criteria of AS/NZS 2815.6:2013 Clauses 3.1 to 3.12 (PE)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted and made equivalent for VET sector.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Foundation Skills essential to being able to add, subtract, multiply whole numbers, decimals and common fractions; calculate percentages and transpose and solve simple formulas e.g. gas laws. Be able to understand written and verbal communications and be able to communicate easily with other people.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Foundation skills added as suggested.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Nat</li> </ul>	Replace all elements and performance criteria with AS/NZS 2815.6:2013 Clauses 3.1 to 3.12 3.1ROLE OF THE RESTRICTED OCCUPATIONAL SCUBA DIVER 3.2ANATOMY,PHYSIOLOGY AND DIVING PHYSICS 3.3HEALTH AND SAFETY IN DIVING OPERATIONS 3.4DIVING FIRST AID 3.5EFFECTIVE WORKING RELATIONSHIPS 3.6EMERGENCY PROCEDURES 3.7SCUBA EQUIPMENT 3.8PRE-DIVE PREPARATIONS 3.9UNDERWATER DEPLOYMENT 3.10POST-DIVE PROCEDURES 3.11DIVING WORK TASKS 3.12USING ENRICHED AIR NITROX (EAN); only where used, not required	Feedback adopted and made equivalent for VET sector.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov/RTO WA,</li> </ul>	Soft copy feedback from Gove/RTOWA	Feedback adopted.
<b>AHCLPW306 Undertake sampling and testing of water</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	Include chain of custody and tractability. These forms need to be filled out particularly for EPA work that we do. (PE Dot Point 7)	Feedback adopted.  Edited PC and PE for traceability.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	Insert Record tractability and chain of custody information in here (PC 3.4)	Feedback adopted.  Edited PC and PE for traceability.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	The list is rather ambitious. Temp is a nice to know but not really important in the scheme of things. Temp and time in storage is very important as it will affect the quality of the water on the way back to the lab. The bottom three tests occur only in Labs, the rest can be done in the field. (PE Dot Point 3 and all sub dot points)	Feedback adopted.  Removed Temp, pesticide, metals and hydrocarbons and plastic from PE dot point 3 sub points.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Qld	three is achievable and realistic. You are missing storm water drains. (PE Second sentence)	Feedback adopted. Added storm water drains and reduced to 3.
• RTO Qld	10 is over kill and by the time you reach the 10th you are in robot mode. It better to say five. (PE second sentence, in response to red text)	Feedback adopted. Reduced samples to 5.
• RTO Qld	This need to be combined as check and calibrate equipment (PC 2.3)	Feedback adopted. Changed to check and calibrate.
• RTO Qld	Not required if anything it should be element 1 (PC 2.4)	Feedback adopted. Removed PC2.4.
• RTO Qld	PC 2.6 what is the purpose as were is the testing equipment going	Feedback adopted. Removed PC 2.6.
• RTO Qld	Briefing occur by the supervisor not at this level it would be unusual for someone at this level to provide a briefing. (PC 2.7)	Feedback adopted. Slight modification to 1.1 to reflect instructions from supervisor.
• RTO Qld	Equipment is sent away for repair as much of the equipment in our lab is specialized and requires specific skills beyond this TP. (PC 4.2)	Feedback adopted. Deleted PC 4.2.
<b>AHCLPW401 Process applications for changes in land use</b>		
• No feedback received		No feedback received for this unit
<b>AHCLPW402 Implement land and sea management practices</b>		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	Agree with 731 - add the term 'cultural landscapes' (see comment below)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Change made to the Application.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic/NAT</li> </ul>	Include the term cultural landscapes after indigenous and non-indigenous,..... cultural landscapes.	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Change made to the Application.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	Application word missing after non-indigenous	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Change made to the Application.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Element 1</p> <p>This is a good unit. Difficulties in running these units (Melb Vic) as there are very few suitably qualified trainers in indigenous practices around our area. Also cultural information is very difficult to access for specific areas.</p>	Feedback noted.
<b>AHCLPW403 Inspect and monitor culturally significant places</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic/NAT</li> </ul>	Inspect and monitor culturally significant places (title change)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Title change made.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC1.1 conservation = Heritage or cultural heritage plan?	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended PC1.1.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Vic	Element 3: ?? Is this how it is actually done in industry. Reads like something a consultant would do which is at least level 5.	SMEWG confirmed this is how the task is performed by industry.
• RTO Vic	FS Reading - Complex charters - Is this Level IV?	Feedback adopted.  Removed reference to complex in FS Reading.
• RTO Vic	FS Writing dynamic: Why dynamic? It should be a concise site report according to a pre-determined format. Otherwise it is more a level 5 skill.	Feedback adopted.  Removed dynamic from FS Writing.
• RTO Vic	KE10 all sub points: If they are inspecting and monitoring there will likely be a pre-determined formatted enterprise document.	Diving experts have informed Skills Impact that this is not always the case. If no report format i.e. in the case of a consultant, then this needs to be addressed.
<b>AHCLPW404 Produce maps for land management purposes</b>		
• Industry (Employee) Tas	LPW404, Fix the wording around PE 'at least 1 map of any 3 of the following'	Feedback adopted. Amended PE as recommended.
• Industry (Employee) NT	Don't use the word 'customers', just 'stakeholders' or just 'end users' through the unit	Feedback adopted. Replaced customer with stakeholder.
<b>AHCLPW405 Supervise the monitoring of biodiversity</b>		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	suggest the aim or goals of monitoring are first defined and understood. Only then do we know which approach or technique is best suited. (Elements)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added PC 1.1 Determine aims and goals of monitoring program.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	in response to 570 (immediately below). Agree however monitoring may be more focused than that e.g. monitoring for a particular species so reference to the aim of the monitoring project may assist?	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	Reference ecosystems needs to be here. (PC 4.2)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added PC 1.1 Determine aims and goals of monitoring program, that may require a reference ecosystems.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	There needs to be a line inserted about principles and procedures for monitoring changes over time with respect to project goals (KE)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended KE to reflect recommendation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Strongly agree with 744 (above)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended KE to reflect recommendation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	Insert the word analyse as it will link it to the PC better. (PE Dot Point 6)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended PE.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	Replace the word test with pilot to be technically correct (PC 2.5)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended PC2.5 with Pilot.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	Reviewed in collaboration with RTO teacher feedback	Feedback noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Vic	Title: The new level III unit having an identical title to the old level 4 unit will cause much confusion at the coalface. See comments on level III unit feedback already sent for new unit.	Feedback adopted.  Title changed.
• RTO Vic	E1 Review wording. Doesn't really cover what is in the PCs.	Feedback adopted.  Element 1 title amended.
• RTO Vic	PC1.1 Element 1.1 suggests that there is an existing monitoring plan which would set out the techniques.	Feedback adopted.  Modified PC's in Element 1.
• RTO Vic	PC1.2 Where is the hazard/risk analysis/WHS?	Feedback adopted.  Added WHS into Element 1.
• RTO Vic	PC2.1 Please clarify. If the monitoring plan requires licences, permits, animal ethics approval etc. then this would be carried out in the planning process (part of the plan) and activities reported to relevant authorities (usually annually). Would need prior to trialling.	Feedback adopted.  Moved PC2.1 to Element 1.
• RTO Vic	PC2.5 Is this covered in 1.4?	Feedback adopted.  Removed testing from Element 1. Retained and expanded in Element 2.
• RTO Vic	PC2.6 Not just the equipment. The process of monitoring has impacts. These are generally dealt with through the planning,	Feedback adopted.  Retained in element 2 as it is being tested.  Added 'process' into the PC.
• RTO Vic	PC2.7 These procedures should already be part of the monitoring plan. Monitoring requires consistent data which usually means consistent techniques over time. Maybe identify rather than develop. Also does wording of element needs a review to cover the data aspect.	This is testing the data capture system in the field.
• RTO Vic	Element 3: What if the person has the responsibility at this level but does not have a team to supervise?	The unit outcomes must reflect possible employment scenarios. In a training situation this needs to be assessed.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Vic	PC3.3 Needs wording review.	Feedback adopted.  Amended PC3.3.
• RTO Vic	Element 4: Question the removal of analysis from the element. At the level IV there should be some analysis of the findings that are reported, not just "here is the data and the trends". Are the monitoring techniques appropriate? What do the results trends mean? Is the monitoring meeting the objectives of the plan? Any recommendations?	Feedback adopted.  Changed Element 4 to assessing and collating data.
• RTO Vic	PE re RB Comment: Not necessary. The unit is written as a process. Monitoring takes place over time and maybe only one survey is done per annum. Combined with the knowledge evidence should be sufficient.	Feedback noted.
• RTO Vic	PE1 The monitoring techniques and data collection should be in the monitoring plan. Element 1.1 refers to the plan.	Feedback adopted.  Amended PE 1.
• RTO Vic	PE 2 ..and tested	Feedback adopted.  Amended PE.
• RTO Vic	PE3 - 'developed' May not be required. Perhaps identified.	Feedback adopted.  Amended PE.
• RTO Vic	KE - Need knowledge of relevant legislation, regulations, licencing, permits, ethics etc.	Feedback adopted.  Amended Knowledge evidence according to recommendation.
• RTO Vic	KE 1 This is not referred to in the PCs. The focus of the unit is on supervising monitoring. Not planning or analysing. PC 2.6 mentions environmental impacts. Needs to relate to PCs.	Feedback adopted.  Amended Knowledge evidence according to recommendation.
• RTO Vic	KE 2 - This should be in here but it doesn't relate directly to any PCs. 4.1 has been changed. Need to review.	Feedback adopted.  Amended Knowledge evidence according to recommendation.
• RTO Vic	KE2.3 What about other chordate animal groups - birds, amphibians etc.?	Feedback adopted.  Amended Knowledge evidence according to recommendation.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Vic	KE 2.4 Invertebrates - not just insects	Feedback adopted.  Amended Knowledge evidence according to recommendation.
• RTO Vic	KE 3 <del>systems</del> change to 'techniques'	Feedback adopted.  Amended Knowledge evidence according to recommendation.
• RTO Vic	KE6 Data recording The word analyse has been removed from PC 2.7 and element 4.	Feedback adopted.  Amended Knowledge evidence according to recommendation.
<b>AHCLPW501 Develop a management plan for designated area</b>		
• RTO Vic	Management plan could be for area with high values, e.g. flora or fauna species which may not be rare, but need ongoing care and maintenance - hollow-dependant fauna, fire-dependant flora. The focus here is on things that are going badly. We need to maintain what is going well too! At least four of the issues is also too restrictive! One is enough. (PE)	Feedback adopted.  Amended PE.
• RTO Vic	Terrestrial or marine is too restrictive. Could be a wetland or riverine area. (PE Sentence 2)	Feedback adopted.  Amended PE.
• RTO Vic	Land capability is a bit of an old-school concept. To cover this we have to ask students to consider some kind of development of the site which is not always appropriate. (PE, 2ND set of Dot Points, Dot Point 2.5)	Feedback adopted.  Amended PE and removed reference to 'land'.
• RTO Vic	Costing management strategies is a bit of make-believe. It is not practical to cost the entire management plan (they do not have the knowledge and it is unreasonable to ask them to have it at this level). Instead we ask them to cost their own development of the plan (what does it cost them to research and prepare it), and also select three strategies to cost. (PE, KE)	As a unit of competency industry require that a costing is done. How an RTO's assesses this is not the purpose of the unit itself. How an RTO carries out the assessment is the responsibility of the RTO
• RTO Vic	Civil design concepts is not appropriate for many natural areas that do not need signage, reading or seats. Change to (which may include civil design concepts) or leave out altogether. (KE)	Feedback adopted.  It may not be for 'many' natural areas, but it is required by industry.
• RTO Vic	Impact means forceful physical contact. The correct word is 'effect'. I'm not sure what is meant by this phrase anyway? 'Requirements of native flora and fauna', 'Interactions of native flora and fauna' (KE Dot Point 3.1)	Feedback adopted.  Heading dot point specifies, 'biota and biological influence on ecology'.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Students need to know who the Traditional Owners are and understand Cultural Heritage Sensitivity mapping. Also European cultural heritage (e.g. Heritage trees and heritage sites) Also Municipal zoning, fire zoning etc. (KE Opening paragraph)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Amended these concepts into the KE.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Identification of stakeholders. 'Soliciting feedback' sounds weird. Levels of stakeholder engagement, engagement strategies is more useful. (KE Dot Point 10.2)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Amended these concepts into the KE.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Soil, plant and water testing processes and procedures is very involved, and this is not necessary or practical as part of this unit. As it reads they would have to demonstrate all these to pass the unit. Covered in other units. Delete. Considering the soil, plants and water quality is however important. (KE)</p>	<p>These are knowledge issues and as such need to be included. They are not required in the Performance Evidence.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>could add sea i.e. this could be applicable to land and sea. (Application)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Removed reference to land. This then includes all ecological environments.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Civil design concepts are not always required though I acknowledge they are sometimes required. So instead could 'civil concepts' be an example rather than a requirement? (PC 3.4)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Deleted design retaining civil concepts in PC 3.4.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Don't agree with 4.2 - neither the language or the need for summary reports as part of a larger plan. Please consider removing. (PC)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Removed PC4.2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Could 4.5 be re-worked? Not sure what land capability actually means? is there something more or better that could be outlined? (PC)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Changed PC 4.5 to 'Assess site performance for proposed use'.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Application: The management plan documents the management strategies. Never understood what how a defined emphasis is different to an emphasis Delete 'on flora or fauna covering the range of (unnecessary)</p> <p>This should be reworded. "Developing a management plan for a designated area is a task that ranges in size depending on the area involved. The wording should be for a singular plan. A management plan contains a range of strategies such as- strategies for natural value conservation (biodiversity), cultural values, landscape values, fire management, visitors, recreation etc. etc. "</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Application has been amended.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC 3.4 Why are these words deleted. Less clear now. PC3.5 as above</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Training package design does not recommend for 'including' in the PC's as the included list may not be finite and can be defined in the PE and/or KE where it can be explained.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC3.4 Civil design concepts are not always part of a client brief which is why the words, 'where relevant' are needed. Perhaps remove the reference to civil design concepts.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Modified 3.4 following additional feedback.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PE RB Comment: Not sure of having a list at all given the variety of types of issues. Can have cultural and heritage issues, changing climatic conditions, fire recovery, threatened species to manage, proximity to urban areas. The dot points are all interlinked. Perhaps say that the management plan contains at least four prioritised strategies. Don't need to list.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>PE has been amended to reflect feedback.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PE 2.2 or aquatic?</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>PE has been amended to reflect feedback.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PE 3 assessed land capability : This works for land but not aquatic areas. Would land capability always be relevant?</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>PE has been amended to reflect feedback.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PE New dot point for Legislation, regulations etc. that are relevant to the site, land use, planning etc.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Included a new PC in Element 1 and amended PE to include legislative and regulatory implications.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Vic	There is a lot of crossover and repetition in the dot points.	Feedback adopted.  Amended KE to remove duplication where found.
• RTO Vic	KE1 Re civil design Only if relevant to the plan. This aspect requires clarification. Suggest removing the civil design part all together and adding the development and prioritising of strategies to support the plan. Civil design is relevant if there are visitor/recreational facilities/tracks specified in the client brief and/or identified in the strategies. Usually outsourced to specialists.	Knowledge evidence is required by all who attempt this unit.  Application of the unit will be in the context of their employment. Understanding of all components is necessary to ensure transferability of skills.
• RTO Vic	KE 3.2 effect of pest flora In dot point below	Feedback adopted.  Amended KE to remove duplication where found.
• RTO Vic	KE3.3 Covered in assessments - dot point above	Feedback adopted.  Amended KE to remove duplication where found.
• RTO Vic	Habitat assessment requirements repeat	Feedback adopted.  Amended KE to remove duplication where found.
• RTO Vic	Add KE Dot point for Legislation etc.	Feedback adopted.  Amended KE to include legislation.
<b>AHCLPW503 Assess land use applications for legislative compliance</b>		
• No Feedback Received		No feedback received for this unit
<b>AHCLPW505 Implement natural and cultural resource management plans</b>		
• RTO Vic	I agree. This would be difficult to actually achieve. (Response to RB question 1)	Feedback adopted. Retained original title.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Vic	Re RB Comment for Implement: The task of implementing the whole plan (implementing plans) would be at management level. The manager would delegate aspects of the implementation.	Feedback adopted. Retained original title.
• RTO Vic	AC 1 Is this another way of specifying in the workplace?	Feedback adopted. Amended AC.
<b>AHCLPW601 Coordinate the preparation of a regional resource management plan</b>		
• No Feedback Received		No feedback received for this unit
<b>AHCECR101 Support ecological restoration</b>		
• Industry Assoc Nat employer	The Unit Sector should be changed to 'Ecological restoration'	SMEWG have advised that this sector will be called. Ecological Restoration (ECR). This will be confirmed in the validation phase of the project.
• Gov NSW	I agree with this comment (directly above)	SMEWG have advised that this sector will be called Ecological Restoration (ECR). This will be confirmed in the validation phase of the project.
• Gov NSW	I suggest the addition of basic manual weed control techniques, including * recognition of target species * cut-and-paint * scrape-and-paint * crowning * skirting * deseeding (KE Dot Point 2)	Feedback adopted.  Added KE for manual methods of weeding.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	842 - Agree that recognition of target species is a great one to add. Also manual weed removal techniques such as crowning and deseeding would be good - but perhaps the use of herbicide would not be so good at level 1 until they had done chemcert or equiv? (In response to comment above)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added KE for manual methods of weeding.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	I would add to knowledge evidence 'recognition of the purpose and value of conservation management projects'	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added 'recognition of the purpose and value of conservation management projects to KE.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	manual handling is not just unloading and loading it is how a body is used throughout the day, how one moves when using tools and equipment, how long repetitive tasks are performed. (PC 1.4)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Manual handling in PC 1.4 has been retained.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	I agree. also some knowledge of why removing this plant in this situation by this technique (With Sybylla Brown's 2nd comment)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Included purpose in the KE for weed control.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Qld</li> </ul>	I agree with 743 and 811 that the unit be called Ecological Restoration in line with industry terminology	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Title has been changed to Support ecological restoration.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Qld</li> </ul>	I agree with 842 & 743 that there should be some site assessment criteria and demonstrated knowledge of weed control techniques for initial site preparation for re-vegetation works.	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Weeds have been included in the Knowledge evidence.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Suggest changing to 'Support natural area restoration' (title change)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Title has been changed to Support ecological restoration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Agree with 811 (Manually handling comment)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Manual handling in PC 1.4 has been retained.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Suggest changing 'revegetation' to restoration as there are many ways to facilitate recovery of a site and this unit does is not simply about revegetation. Also modify in performance criteria area (Element 2)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Title has been changed to Support ecological restoration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	plants and / or materials as perhaps plants are not required to restore the site (Element 3)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Modified PC3.2 for more generic application.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Please change revegetation to restoration as this better encompasses a variety of approaches to ecological restoration including weed control at all scales and other assisted regeneration techniques (KE)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Revegetation has been changed to restoration.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Agree 100% Would also add Drill/fill, Frilling, Basal bark; Mow and catch; Whipper snip and rake/remove slash; fine art of Hand weeding [Logistics, etiquette and practicalities]</p> <p>Understanding of weed biology and critical importance of timing of weed control</p>	<p>This is a level 1 unit and is unlikely that these skills would be used.</p> <p>The Level 2 unit, <i>AHCNAR201 Carry out natural area restoration works</i> is where more advanced techniques would be used.</p> <p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Increased the KE to include additional hand weeding techniques that don't require chemicals or machinery at this level.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>I agree. 'Ecological restoration' is the terminology that is used around the world and has been used for over 20 years. (title change)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Title has been changed to Support ecological restoration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>The Performance Criteria seem so broad that I can't see what the trainee would learn that is specific to the industry</p>	<p>The Performance Evidence and Knowledge Evidence component provides the focus and direction for the industry.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Agree re name change to Ecological Restoration and replace through the document</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Title has been changed to Support ecological restoration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 859 re change to restoration. Could change to Conduct Biodiversity Restoration and Management</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Revegetation has been changed to restoration.</p>

**AHCECR102 Support native seed collection**

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov NSW</li> </ul>	I suggest rephrasing to "recognition of broad ecological systems for locating seed collection target species" (KE Dot Point 2.2)	Feedback adopted.  Rephrased Knowledge Evidence dot point 2.2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov NSW</li> </ul>	accuracy and completeness (KE 3.4)	Feedback adopted.  Modified Knowledge Evidence.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov NSW</li> </ul>	All risk mitigation measures, not just PPE (KE 7.1)	Feedback adopted.  Modified KE dot point 7.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	recognising mature seed that is ready for collection (KE 3.2)	Feedback adopted.  Modified KE dot point 3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	What does this mean? knowing where on the plant the seed is? Maybe should be 'correctly identifying seed on the plant' (KE 3.2)	Feedback adopted.  Modified KE dot point 3.2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	demonstrating methods to separate... (KE)	Feedback adopted.  KE 3.3 includes separation of seed from waste material.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	<p>What are common seed disorders? Do you mean, recognise predated seed, differentiate between filled and non-filled seed, differentiate between viable and non-viable seed (KE 3.3)</p>	<p>KE3.4 Dot point specified the following: recognising common seed disorders that affect the health and viability of seed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> </ul>	<p>this should start with a verb. documenting seed treatments? performing seed treatments? (KE 3.5)</p>	<p>KE states a knowledge of: seed treatments and storage requirements for seed species collected.</p>
<p><b>AHCECR202 Maintain wildlife habitat refuges</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>consider sticking with 'management plan' as this suggests that another plan altogether is developed or is required to be developed and one may not be readily available. i.e. all info. may be in mgt plan. (Element 1 or 2)</p>	<p>At level 2 it is more likely they will be under supervision so have changed all references to planes etc. to supervisor instructions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>as above i.e. not sure a maintenance plan will be developed but a management plan may be easier to get hold of. (Element 3)</p>	<p>At level 2 it is more likely they will be under supervision so have changed all references to planes etc. to supervisor instructions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Why is unit restricted only to predator control when there are other threats notably weed invasion? Is this issues picked up in other competencies?</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Changed wording to invasive species to be inclusive of predators and weeds.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	Weeds may play a critical role in providing wildlife habitat and corridor links e.g. Blackberry and Brown Bandicoots. Key action may be containing weed spread as part of reveg works to maintain and reconstruct habitat refuges	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changed wording to invasive species to be inclusive of predators and weeds.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	I agree with 890 regarding weeds and habitat.	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changed wording to invasive species to be inclusive of predators and weeds.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	Agree with 890. Why focus just on predators. Maybe the animal to be protected requires a certain fire regime, or ongoing recruitment of a species of plant, or a vegetation structure that a predator may help to protect from the grazers (native and/or introduced).	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changed wording to invasive species to be inclusive of predators and weeds.</p>
<b>AHCECR301 Maintain natural areas</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) NT</li> </ul>	I work in NT and most of bush is reasonable condition, remnant is not relevant. maintaining natural areas means managing fire weeds, feral, erosion. Often no need for revegetation.	<p>Units of competency must meet all State and Territory requirements.</p> <p>If revegetation is used to maintain some areas in Australia it should be retained. RTO's are at liberty to contextualise the training to suit local industry needs</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>To avoid users thinking this is only about maintaining reserves and protected areas the title should be changed to 'Maintain remnant vegetation areas'</p> <p>I take your point, 218. And in addition this should apply equally to aquatic. So it potentially should be 'Maintain native ecosystem areas' or sites - to ensure it is pinned down to particular sites.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changed Application statement to include native ecosystem areas.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>within (Application)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Change made to Application.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>In response to 218 . The requirement to maintain and manage natural areas is across the board and as our ecological systems degrade, more and more maintenance is required, even in the most "pristine" world heritage areas, weed, pest and fire mgt (to name a few) is required as part of the maintenance of these systems. NT has some big issues with weeds (e.g. exotic grasses) and pest mgt and this alone appears to be increasing the fire intensity of some areas further impacting the health of forested systems. While resilience is great, the need for management and maintenance is imperative to ensure a healthy site or ecosystem. This unit would therefore be very relevant in the NT though perhaps the name of the unit or its application needs more work?</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>consider re-wording PC 2.2 to: undertake ecological restoration site maintenance works according to plans.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changes made to PC2.2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>re-word first dot point to: accessed the site and minimised any damaging impacts (PE)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changes made to PE dot point 1.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	restoration / rehabilitation as likely to be either / or (KE 4)	Feedback adopted.  Modified KE 4.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	I assume this goes with overall dot point on WHS procedures?? if so, add dot point (KE Dot Point 10)	Feedback adopted.  Corrected formatting of dot point.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	Agree with comments 859 (on re-wording pieces in Element 2)	Feedback adopted.  Changes made to PC2.2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	Include "quality" with health and safety	Feedback adopted.  Quality aspect would/should be specified in the plans and instruction in units of competency.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	agree with 859	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	change to "environmental"	Feedback adopted.  Changes made to PC 2.1.
<b>AHCECR302 Collect and preserve biological samples</b>		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Not sure why the collection, identification of biological samples needs to be part of a monitoring program??</p> <p>Collecting samples might also be required for identification purposes to understand certain aspects of a site including its health. In addition, taking a sample of a plant and properly pressing it might be required to have it identified by a herbarium. I suggest the application for this unit might be to: collect, identify and preserve biological samples as part of a conservation project. (Application)</p>	<p>The unit may also be used outside of conservation, so it needs to be broader.</p> <p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>The Application has been modified to capture concerns raised.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>could also add to element 1 the need for students to understand basic legislation around the collection of samples e.g. protected areas and restrictions, threatened species and / or state / federal legislation governing threatened species etc.</p>	<p>Added extra PC to Element 1 for compliance with regulatory requirements</p>
<b>AHCECR303 Implement biological reintroduction works</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry SA</li> <li>Industry (Employee) SA</li> <li>Industry SA</li> </ul>	<p>Stick with 'ecological environments', instead of massive list of environments</p> <p>Agree that students need knowledge of different environments</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) WA</li> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	<p>Knowledge evidence is much expanded</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>In point PC 3.3 Replace 'plant materials' with 'biological stock' and deleted 'revegetation' and replace 'revegetation plan' with 'restoration plan'</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>PC 3.3 changes made.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>biological reintroduction (PE, Highlighted word is 'revegetation'. Must mean replace word with suggested)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Replaced revegetation with biological reintroduction.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	Replace soil type and geology' with 'substrate factors (e.g. soil and geology, reefs material, sea bed)' (KE 4.5)	Feedback adopted.  Replaced with substrate.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	A similar unit needs to be created that is called something like 'Implement assisted regeneration treatments'	Feedback adopted.  Unit has been created.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	In PC 3.4 Replace 'plant revegetation stock' with 'reintroduce biological stock' 'revegetation plan' with 'restoration plan'	Feedback adopted.  Changes made to PC 3.4.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	Add a dot point at the top of list under 'ecological principles' This should read: "locations on the revegetation site where natural regeneration can be facilitated and locations where it cannot' (KE)	Feedback adopted.  Change made to KE Dot point 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	This unit is relevant to marine (seagrass and kelp forests) and wetland vegetation but it is not fully applicable to reconstructing marine and aquatic communities that are for example, based on corals, shellfish or other faunal organisms. It is worth asking whether we need to make this more generic or create new units for restoring aquatic ecosystems. If the latter is chosen, this unit should include all revegetation methods not just planting. This includes transplanting, direct seeding and brush matting etc. (That does not make the Conduct Direct Seeding' unit redundant as that is a more specialised unit than this, which should be generic	This piece of feedback has been discussed with the SMEWG and a decision on it will be made during the validation phase of the project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	Add a dot point 'genetic principles for ecological restoration including genetic integrity and genetic diversity' (KE)	Feedback adopted.  Added dot point into KE.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	Add dot point to list: Existing boundaries of regeneration potential (KE 4)	Feedback adopted.  Dot point added into KE4.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>I suggest that that this unit be amended to 'Implement biological reintroductions' to ensure it is inclusive of marine and aquatic reintroductions. If not it should at least include direct seeding and all other direct reveg methods. This means the term 'revegetation' should be replaced throughout with 'biological reintroductions' when referring to the action and 'ecological restoration' when referring to the overall enterprise.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Replaced revegetation with biological reintroduction.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 743. The point that not made by 743 is the unit needs to be simplified as it is prescriptive and does not reflect the diversity of the industry now (comment immediately above this one)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Replaced revegetation with biological reintroduction.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>sub dot points like this might have a purpose but from an instruction design perspective and as an industry practitioners point they are confusing. I can see the need to add to a clear statement including making it prescriptive. Place the including in Assessment conditions as "defined as and may include" For instance if your located at Marla in SA do you think the Aboriginal Rangers will need to know about marine and water communities. This type of format for knowledge writing resembles a bad marriage between the KE and the Range Statement (KE 2)</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>SMEWG advised to retain existing format.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Yes add 743 dot point to top of list. If remnant soil and plants regeneration should be the first choice. (for this comment 'Add a dot point at the top of list under 'ecological principles' This should read: "locations on the revegetation site where natural regeneration can be facilitated and locations where it cannot')</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Dot point has been added.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with all 743 comments.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with all 743 and 811 comments. Definitely agree that unit needs to be created called something like 'Implement assisted regeneration treatments'</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>New unit <i>AHCECR3XX Implement assisted regeneration works</i> created.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>I think the first step is to identify what we already have. i.e. Identify existing habitat and identify existing indigenous vegetation. If above exists should 'implement assisted regen' be carried out? Second step. What are we trying to achieve? i.e. a food source for a rare bird or recreate a complex ecosystem. Do we have a plan? Do we have a reference ecosystem?</p>	<p>Feedback noted and has been used to inform the discussion on this topic.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov Vic</li> </ul>	<p>agree with 811. Where does assessing whether there is existing habitat and existing indigenous vegetation occur in training? sorry if this is an unnecessary question - I am new to full composition of training modules.</p>	<p>Assessment is covered in the Performance Evidence and the Knowledge Evidence.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov Vic</li> </ul>	<p>agree strongly with 743. (this comment- 'Add a dot point at the top of list under 'ecological principles' This should read: "locations on the revegetation site where natural regeneration can be facilitated and locations where it cannot')</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Change to KE has been made.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov Vic</li> </ul>	<p>agree with 743. (this point- Replace 'soil type and geology' with 'substrate factors (e.g. soil and geology, reefs material, sea bed)')</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Change has been made.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov Vic</li> </ul>	<p>does this unit cover the following planting approach:</p> <p>The reveg we plan and implement each year does not in my opinion result in/aspire for ecosystem reconstruction. Instead we only add indig top storey and middle storey and vine species to areas of extremely weedy ground storey. We keep the extremely weedy ground storey for the long term.</p> <p>Just control weedy grasses around the planted plants – i.e. within 1m of the centre. No indig grasses or herbs or lilies etc. planted. Lower middle storey species used e.g. Lomandra. Distance between plants is 2 to 3m.</p> <p>After about 2 years we mostly use a grass specific herbicide to create conditions where self-seed of the planted species may occur. Spray within 1 to 2 m of plant centre.</p> <p>We do choose these tree, middle and vine species based on what would have been there and the exiting substrate condition. So we are doing ecosystem reconstruction, but is it what this unit has in mind?</p> <p>In my opinion recreation of the ground strata is generally an unwise use of resources. The priority in my books is remnant management and fauna habitat creation. I see the planting that we do as described above as fauna habitat creation not ecosystem recreation.</p>	<p>This appears to be a strategic approach to a specific biological reintroduction project, in this instance plants.</p> <p>The Assessment conditions will allow for different approaches during training and assessment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Yes strongly agree with 743. (comment -A similar unit needs to be created that is called something like 'Implement assisted regeneration treatments')</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>A new unit has been developed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>replace 'natural' with 'ecological' (Application 1st sentence)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Application has been edited.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	Replace 'natural area' with 'ecological (Unit Sector)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Replaced natural with ecological.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	Add another PC (After PC 3.7) : Select and implement the retention or addition of habitat features appropriate to restoration plan (e.g. debris piles, logs, rocks, shell, artificial hollows).	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Addition of PC3.8 has been made.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>In response to 743 Revegetation can also be done (and is being done) in a marine context e.g. seagrass. I agree that there are also reintroductions being done in other marine systems (e.g. reef, oyster beds etc.) so I wonder if this can be absorbed into some of the new marine units as I think many across the country would be very confused if we changed it to biological reintroductions?</p> <p>There are many methods and approaches available including direct seeding as well as a wide range of assisted regeneration techniques so agree a range of techniques / approaches should be tabled to better ensure teachers and students explore the most suitable for their site.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Used biological reintroductions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Agree with 743 - change to ecological (comment about 1st sentence in Application)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Replaced natural with ecological.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	agree with 743 in relation to marine restoration comments	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>need to add to Element 1 identify goal/s of the revegetation project. This will assist all teachers / students understand why and how they are intervening which ultimately influences what and where works should be done. it will also take into account revegetation for a specific task (e.g. to provide certain food sources / habitat for a particular species or conducting revegetation to assist managing erosion etc.)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added new PC top Element 1.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>In response to 743 re: select and implement the retention or addition of habitat features (this comment- In point 3.4 Replace 'plant revegetation stock' with 'reintroduce biological stock' 'revegetation plan' with 'restoration plan'), First it would need to be identified that they were in fact required as some projects would not need these (e.g. if linking remnant veg). I suggest adding, Identify the need for habitat features to element 1 and if identified as required, then can be added to implementation as it is not a given.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. Added new PC to Element 1 for identifying need for habitat.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>expand first dot point to; a range of revegetation techniques (PE)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added to this statement. Developer has a concern that this is too open. This will be discussed in the validation phase of the project.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 743, this comment 'Replace 'soil type and geology' with 'substrate factors (e.g. soil and geology, reefs material, sea bed)') and suggest a slight modification / addition 'substrate factors (e.g. soil, soil condition, geology, reef material, seabed etc.)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Edited KE Dot point to include substrate factors.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>yes - absolutely. Add to set of dot points under 'defining the revegetation site boundaries' (response comment 'Add a dot point at the top of list under 'ecological principles' This should read: "locations on the revegetation site where natural regeneration can be facilitated and locations where it cannot")</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Change was made to KE.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with comments by 859 Need clearly defined measurable outcomes (this comment- 'need to add to Element 1</p> <p>identify goal/s of the revegetation project. This will assist all teachers / students understand why and how they are intervening which ultimately influences what and where works should be done. it will also take into account revegetation for a specific task (e.g. to provide certain food sources / habitat for a particular species or conducting revegetation to assist managing erosion etc.)')</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Change was made to Element 1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Insert staged site preparation to accommodate scale of weed invasion and timeline required to effectively prepare site prior to reveg works. (proposed new element)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added to KE as Element 3 is driven by the restoration plan so individuals must be aware why the plan specifies a staged approach if a staged approach is specified.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	Identify habitat also must consider possible functional role played by weeds also (Element 1)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Change was made to Element 1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	Where does collect appropriate provenance of seed and propagation fit? Need to pre-order plants 12 months advance notice (general question)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>1.3 select tools and materials and should address this as the planning of materials etc. would be at a higher level and presented in the restoration plan.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	agree with both comments 853 and 859	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>I think the first step is to identify what we already have. i.e. Identify existing habitat and identify existing indigenous vegetation. If above exists should 'implement assisted regen' be carried out?</p> <p>Second step. What are we trying to achieve? i.e. a food source for a rare bird or recreate a complex ecosystem. Do we have a plan? Do we have a reference ecosystem?</p> <p>(Element 1)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Addition of 1.1 Identify goals from restoration plan should address these issues.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	Monitor Reveg site is a bit broad - monitoring of plant survival and health should be specified at least.	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>PC3.1 now reads Monitor biological reintroduction site and identify factors detrimental to plant growth.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	The concept of quality needs to be included in all units. All CLM activities should take quality requirements and risk mitigation controls into consideration, not just health, safety and environment. Our clients usually provide specifications around the quality of work.	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Quality would be reflected in the Plans and procedures stated in Performance Criteria.</p> <p>Compliance with standards also support quality and these are reflected, where appropriate, in the PC's.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	Section 3 needs to include recording works and reporting as per management requirements (Element 3)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added PC 3.9 Maintain records and reporting according to workplace requirements.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 890. Revegetation material either needs to be collected and propagated or ordered according to provenance and site needs. Is this part of another Reveg planning unit?</p>	<p>Seed collecting and growing stock are separate units of competency. However, PC1.4 and 1.5 address the acquisition of these materials according to the restoration plan.</p>
<b>AHCECR304 Undertake direct seeding</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>delete 'rehabilitation' and replace with 'revegetation' as used elsewhere. Do this throughout the unit</p> <p>It is not a rehabilitation site but a restoration site. (The National Standards confine the term 'rehabilitation' to a lower level of repair that does not use native species.) (PC 1.7)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Rehabilitation has been replaced with revegetation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Need to add a line that covers 'Prepare or pre-treat seed as required for the particular species according to the revegetation plan. (PC 1.8)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added PC to prepare seed to promote germination.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Add 'basic genetic principles for ecological restoration' - and include below that dot points to do with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- protecting the genetic integrity of local genotypes</li> <li>- ensuring sufficient genetic diversity for survival and adaptation</li> </ul> <p>(Add into KE)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added to KE.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Replace 'local' with 'the appropriate' as 'local may or may not be appropriate in all circumstances considering climate change and fragmentation (PC 1.6)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Reworded PC.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>replace with 'revegetation' (KE 2)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Rehabilitation has been replaced with revegetation.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	Replace 'rehabilitation' with 'restoration' (KE 3.3)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Rehabilitation has been replaced with restoration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	replace 'rehabilitating' with 'restoring' (KE 3)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Rehabilitating has been replaced with restoring.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	Add a dot point to say 'identifying areas with natural regeneration potential and those without (KE)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Dot point added.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	add 'a' i.e. according to a (or the) revegetation plan. (Application)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Grammatical error corrected.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	As direct seeding is a core component to ecological restoration in Western Australia (as well as used in other ER projects), I suggest that we also add to each dot point after site rehabilitation, 'and revegetation'. Happy to also have restoration there as 743 has suggested. Either way, it is more than rehabilitation. So consider adding / changing to 1.1, 1.2, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8 and 1.9 and throughout the document.	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Rehabilitation has been replaced with revegetation.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 743 however if that is NOT written, the view to going too wide in many instances is also an issue. Suggest we write 'local or suitable' (or appropriate) provenance as (comment ' 1.4 Check equipment operation and conduct pre-start checks 1.5 Identify site environmental and heritage issues and implement control measures according to workplace procedures 1.6 Source seed from local provenance for use in rehabilitation activities 1.7 Determine type and proportion of cover crop according to rehabilitation plan and site conditions 1.8 Check seed species and quality against required specifications in rehabilitation plan and report inconsistencies to supervisor 1.9 Prepare rehabilitation site to receive seed 2. Conduct direct seeding operations 2.1 Conduct seeding operations '</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Element 1 has been split into two parts for clarity.</p> <p>PC2.1 Source seed would be specified in the revegetation plan.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>as much direct seeding involves the use of machinery, need to add 'working around machinery' (KE)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added to KE for machinery and equipment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with all 743 comments here</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<b>AHCECR305 Collect native seed</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>I can see the list purpose but the choice of monocotyledon, dicotyledon and gymnosperm is just a bad choice of words and irksome! try using the correct botanical language - Pome, Dupe, Pepo, Hesperidium, Cone, Berry, Aggregate, Siliqua, Silicula, Capsule, Legume, Follicle, Caryopsis, Achene, Nut, Samaras, Schizocarp, Loment</p> <p>you can group them however you see fit e.g. Pome, Pepeo, Hesperidium and Berry can go together as they require a secondary processing. (PE)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changed the list to represent Fleshy fruit, dry dehiscent and dry indehiscent seeds.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	suggest also adding seed collection ethics such as collecting 10% of seed from a range of parent plants to ensure plenty of seed remains for natural processes. Seed collection ethics could sit as a dot point under ecological principles. Similar but perhaps need to provide an example (KE)	Feedback adopted. Added to KE.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Add conditions. particularly wet years or seed collected at sub-optimal time may result in seed going mouldy even if storage is good. (KE)	Feedback adopted. Added to KE.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	Collecting from 20 different species is unrealistic for an individual, unless the nominal hours increase for this unit. (KE)	Feedback adopted. Reduced to 10 still to be confirmed.
<b>AHCECR306 Conduct photography for fieldwork</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No feedback received</li> </ul>		No feedback received for this unit
<b>AHCECR307 Read and interpret maps</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No feedback received</li> </ul>		No feedback received for this unit
<b>AHCECR401 Supervise ecological restoration works</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	Needs to have additional holistic ecological knowledge built into the units KE as it requires a degree of knowledge for performing element 1. Without any prerequisites for the qualification or the unit this could be detrimental for the students. They might come out with the knowledge of being a supervisor but they cannot provide support as a supervisor as they don't understand their work environment. (KE)	Feedback adopted. Knowledge evidence has been expanded to allow for this.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Qld	Change natural area to ecological (title)	Feedback adopted.  Changed Title.
• RTO Qld	Delete "planning and" as planning is what I will tell the supervisor (KE 2)	Feedback adopted.  Removed planning from KE2.
• Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW	agree with 635 (RTO Qld). change 'natural area' to 'ecological' (in title). Also in first two paragraphs of Application.	Feedback adopted.  Replaced Natural Area with ecological.
• Industry (Employer) Vic	Agree with changing Natural area to Ecological through the document	Feedback adopted.  Replaced Natural Area with ecological.
• Industry (Employer) Vic	There is no mention of planning for, ensuring and monitoring adherence to financial specifications/constraints. This is of critical importance! (throughout the whole unit)	This matter has been referred to the SMEWG for their consideration and a decision will be made in the validation phase of the project.
• Industry (Employer) Vic	PC 1.5 Worth specifically mentioning including possible detrimental impact of exotic flora and fauna control on native fauna and abiotic site elements.	No need to specify in the PC's. This has been included in the KE 5 sub point 3.
• Industry (Employer) Vic	PC 1.6 include quality	Principles of quality are specified in the project brief. This PC is about Health and Safety.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• Industry (Employer) Vic	Element 3. sounds like it should be changed to "supervise and monitor"	Feedback adopted.  Added supervise to Element title.
• Industry (Employer) Vic	PC 4.3 Reporting requirements need to include more than just status.	Feedback adopted.  Changed PC 4.3.
• Industry (Employee) Vic	Agree with comments by 635 (comment about KE). Supervision of one site not sufficient level of experience to meet performance evidence in my opinion	Feedback adopted.  Changed to 2 ecological restoration projects.
• Industry (Employer) Vic	"marine and shore" ` what about inland aquatic systems? (KE 6.5)	Feedback adopted.  Added inland aquatic systems.
• Industry (Employer) Vic	should this point say "such as" - or if "including" is used does this mean all people need to be proficient in land shore and terrestrial species. Should this point say marine shore or terrestrial species. (KE 6.6)	This is a knowledge evidence component and will be assessed on their understanding.  The PE only required one to be demonstrated.
• Industry (Employer) Vic	agree with name (title) change	Feedback adopted.  Change made to title.
• Industry (Employer) Vic	not all work is done by contractors - another word that includes workers who may not be contractors (PC 3.3)	Feedback adopted.  Changed contractors to 'supplementary workers'.

**AHCECR402 Plan the implementation of revegetation works**

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	replace revegetation with reconstruction work (title)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Replaced revegetation with ecological works.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	Staged program of works. Weed control critical first stage (within Element 2)	<p>These are all embedded in the Assessment Requirements.</p> <p>Units of competency are job statements and do not need to specify all parts of an implementation plan.</p> <p>The Assessment Requirements do specify establishment period and maintenance requirements for which weed control would be one.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	What does this mean?! where is reference to weeds and need for sustained control program prior to reveg? Forward planning key to plan process. Heavily weedy sites ideally require 12-18 Weed control prior to reveg works. (PC 2.3) (If you need for this one in the Feedback Hub, I had to clean up the language)	<p>These are all embedded in the Assessment Requirements.</p> <p>Units of competency are job statements and do not need to specify all parts of an implementation plan.</p> <p>The Assessment Requirements do specify establishment period and maintenance requirements for which weed control would be one.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>AHCNAR402 is very 'vegetation' oriented. This should be 'Plan the implementation of ecological restoration works'</p> <p>Similarly 'Manage seed collection' should be 'Manage propagule collection' so that it includes all flora and fauna</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Replaced revegetation with ecological works.</p>
<b>AHCECR501 Manage natural areas on a rural property</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>The unit is good but the use of including..... in the knowledge evidence is not helpful and makes it read like a definition. If that is the case then places them in the Assessment conditions as a glossary of phrases.</p>	<p>The KE is comprised of sub points of the statement at the top of the KE section. They are intended as a guide to help direct RTO's to deliver and assess these specific topics.</p>
<b>AHCNAR502 Conduct biological surveys</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>A biological survey often includes one of the elements (e.g. a flora survey, fish survey).</p> <p>Change to: 'At least one biological survey, and at least two of the following biological elements:' (PE opening paragraph)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Edited the opening statement in the PE.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Surveys may cross over environments, e.g. a single flora survey may cover terrestrial and wetland plants.</p> <p>Change to: Survey(s) must be conducted in environments where flora and fauna are present. They may be ... dot points (PE 2nd paragraph dot points)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Modified statement to better reflect requested outcome.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>If you are going to have 'statistically representative' in skills, you need to include some stats knowledge in the next section (PE)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Included additional dot point in KE.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Not sure what is meant by 'health'. How does one assess the health of a fungus? or a microorganism? Delete health. Include 'condition (if applicable for plants or animals)' (PE 8.4)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Changed to condition.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Detailed analysis is too much for Diploma level. Change to 'analysis' Also check the grammar for this section. It is a bit ordinary (PE 9)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Removed 'detailed' from sentence.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>It is highly unlikely that students will be surveying for microorganisms at this level. Change to: 'which may include' (KE 5)</p>	<p>This unit is also used by other AHC sectors who do survey for microorganisms.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>It is often not practical for individual students to obtain permits and approvals (student experience, timelines). Change to: 'ensured permits and approvals are in place' and then in the knowledge section something about applying for permits and approvals (which can be simulated) (PE 6)</p>	<p>The application for permits is a fundamental requirement and as part of the Performance Evidence they can still be simulated, as detailed in the Assessment Conditions.  It is important that it is assessed as a demonstrated activity to ensure they can complete the paperwork accurately.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Some things may need to be via scenario ... e.g. applying for a permit Also the surveys conducted may not give data that generates planning and decision making. Other data may need to be provided so students can practice these skills. (Assessment conditions)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Changed assessment conditions to reflect a scenario situation.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Workplace work team management procedures. At Diploma level the student is unlikely to be managing a survey team, they are more likely to be working alone, in a pair, or under direction of someone with a degree or more likely, post-grad degree. (KE 9)</p>	<p>Element 3 in the unit does not have to be performed by the individual and as they may supervise the activity, they require skills in managing people, particularly at Diploma level (equivalent to a manager).</p>
<p><b>AHCECR503 Design an ecological restoration project</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat, Employer, VIC</li> </ul>	<p>I understand why 'design' is only introduced at the Diploma level but this is not how the world works. The 'trade' bush regenerator should understand the principles of plant selection for a restoration planting or direct seeding project. (general comment)</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat, Employer, VIC</li> </ul>	<p>In order to comply with the National Restoration Standards, this needs to be substantially revised to include additional elements and rationalise the existing performance criteria. The first new element needed is 'identify a reference ecosystem for the project' - and the second element would be 'identify specific targets, goals, objectives and measurable indicators for the project'.</p> <p>The first 'Identify a reference ecosystem' element in itself would need to include performance criteria such as: (1) examine maps, photographs, historic information and on-site features and species to identify the site's prior ecosystem, (ii) access predictions of likely climate effects on the site , and, (iii) synthesise the information gained into a reference model to guide the design and implementation of the project.' This all needs to be rationalised as the new elements need to be done in tandem with the site analysis.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Required information included new Performance Criteria.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat, Employer, VIC</li> </ul>	This unit needs to be revised with respect to language inclusive of aquatic restoration too.	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changes made to make more inclusive of aquatic and marine environments.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat, Employer, VIC</li> </ul>	I am the same person as 743..and see now that the need for species recommendations in Cert III could be resolved by revision of 'Implement a revegetation project'	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Yes agree with 743 (Tein, the very long comment). Add to Element 2: identify reference ecosystem and, Identify specific targets, goals, objectives and measurable indicators for the project	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added reference ecosystem to Element 2 PC2.3. Added targets goals etc. to Element 2 PC2.2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	change to ecological (PE 4)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changed natural area to ecological site throughout the Unit</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Overall a great unit!! Would be good to extend language to include marine / aquatic systems.	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Unit broadened to include aquatic/ marine environments.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	Absolutely agree with comments. Critical stage of site inspection frequently overlooked is identifying ecosystem function and role of weeds present onsite [windbreak, erosion control, habitat etc.]. Dictate need for staged approach in removal and management. Timelines fit standards framework-measurable outcomes. Trying to do too much too quick often primary cause of failure.	Feedback noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	Assuming reference to natural regen [passive] compared with active reveg Successful Reveg generally requires sustained weed control prior to planting. Forward planning and site preparation critical to outcome. Heavily weed infested sites require minimal time frames 12-18 months. Will reduce post weed maintenance and enhance biodiversity outcomes.(Element 2.6)	Feedback noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	would expect concept plan to give some indication as to projected timeline cost and resources for ongoing management post completion of works. Timeframe and costs will vary according to level of weed control and site preparation undertaken at start. (Element 3)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added timeline to performance evidence.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	don't forget Fungi, Flora, fauna and fungi (KE)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added fungi.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	Understanding of ecosystem function and role of species interaction Functional role of small mammals in soil disturbance , wetting, nutrient recycling and reduction in surface litter. (KE)	Statements in the KE are generally quite broad at level 5 as there is an understanding that the KE is very detailed and to list all requirements would be far to detailed for the document.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat, Employer, VIC</li> </ul>	Title change to Design an ecological restoration project	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Title has been changed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat, Employer, VIC</li> </ul>	Application: This unit of competency describes the skills and knowledge required to design an ecological restoration project in conservation or production areas. This unit applies to restoration managers who analyse information and exercise judgement to complete a range of skilled design and project management activities.	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Edited and updated Application statement.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat, Employer, VIC</li> </ul>	Unit Sector - Ecological Restoration (ECR)	This will be decided in the validation phase of the project. This piece of feedback will be raised in the discussion.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat, Employer, VIC</li> </ul>	Soft copy submitted with detailed changes recommended for Elements, PC's and Assessment Requirements	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Updated entire document with recommended changes from soft copy.</p>
<b>AHCECR504 Manage ecological restoration programs</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>The entirety of (Element) "2" needs to be reworked</p> <p>2.5 - This is an employability question or maybe for RPL - This is impossible to assess</p> <p>2.8 - Another point that cannot be assessed except if by RPL</p>	<p>Units of competency are job outcomes not assessments. However, the PE and KE are assessment requirements and can be assessed in many ways including a simulated environment if on the job is unavailable.</p> <p>See also assessment conditions dot point 1.1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	change to ecological (every mention of Natural Area to change to ecological in unit	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changed natural area to ecological.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Consider changing to approaches.</p> <p>Techniques can be many and would require more detail post deciding on general approach / strategy. (Elements and PC's)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changes PC 2.2 to approaches.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Not sure what this means? Consider re-wording. (Element 2)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changed 2.4 for a risk analysis and control procedures.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Agree that 2.5 is not achievable. It could be re-worded to: Determine staffing / personnel requirements to achieve the goals of the project. For 2.6 Identify all permits, licences and authorisations required to complete the work</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Editing changes to PC2.5 and 2.6.</p> <p>Comment: Recruitment would be conducted by a manager in this role and should be stated in the Unit of Competency. However, the Assessment Requirements may simply require a scenario or simulation to ensure the individual to be assessed can demonstrate the skill.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Cracking unit - what a beauty!! Could also include seascapes as most points are written in a way that learning could be extended to include seascapes.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>section 2. needs to include selection of monitoring elements/criteria relevant to the project (He means Element 2)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Additional PC created for monitoring strategy and KPI's.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>2.4 needs rewording as a coverall statement on health, safety, environment and quality (PC 2.4)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changed 2.4 for a risk analysis and control procedures.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>(PC) 1.3 Including faunal dependencies on exotic plant species. There is a risk that weed species can be removed at the expense of fauna habitat.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>The comment relates to specific details. These would be addressed in the knowledge evidence section under ecological principles KE10.2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>(PC) 1.1 Some assessment of faunal and abiotic elements should also be included.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changed to biotic and abiotic assessment report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Change Natural Area to Ecological or Biodiversity restoration throughout the document (Title)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Title has been changed to 'Ecological restoration' This will be confirmed in the validation phase of the project.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>This unit has more potential than what it is given. The difficult in the uptake is the unit needs to be more generalized. It needs to be on aquatic environments.</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to consider this piece of feedback. SMEWG requested that this piece of feedback will be resolved in the validation phase of the project.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Yes I agree with 635. This unit could be great and one that encompasses both land AND aquatic systems. Ideally it would cover planning, site analysis, communication (i.e. such as identified in Element 1), development of strategy, as partly identified in Element 2 (though Element 2 requires more work), practical planning (i.e. that links to broader strategies) etc.</p> <p>The way it is currently written suggests earthworks are required and while this may be the case and a good area of reconstruction to explore, it is not always the case. Teachers and students alike need to be able to determine when, where, how and if it is actually required.</p>	<p>SMEWG asked to consider this piece of feedback. SMEWG requested that this piece of feedback will be resolved in the validation phase of the project.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Element 1.2 could also be Determine current legislation and policies impacting site</p> <p>Element 1.3 consider modifying to: Discuss possible restoration strategies and confirm most appropriate approach</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changed made to PC 1.2 and 1.3.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Consider re-wording Element 2 to: Develop the strategy facilitate river restoration. Or something better than utilise</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changed title to Element 2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Add to Element 2 Carry out (or complete) a detailed site assessment. This will assist determining pre-existing vegetation type, site history, geology, water flows etc. and facilitate teachers / students determining best restoration approach.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Site assessment added to Element 2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Rivers and creeks tend to have some of the more complicated ownership and consents as changes from size of water body and according to districts and states so change authority to authorities (Element 3)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>PC 3.3 changed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>verbal communication skills also essential for good stakeholder management. Especially important if needing to get a sense of how the river used to look if talking to traditional owners, farmers and a range of stakeholders (Foundation Skills)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Updated Foundation skills with oral communication.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	add suitable as no sense in adding any old habitat feature (PE)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changed opening sentence in Performance Evidence.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	consider simplifying to water legislation as this is governed differently in different parts of the country and differently on different sized rivers (KE 1)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Changes made to KE 1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	These are sub dot points so consider indenting the list from this point (KE)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Rearranged dot points.</p>
<b>AHCECR506 Develop and implement sustainable land use strategies</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No feedback received</li> </ul>		No feedback received for this unit
<b>AHCNRM301 Establish an Australian native stingless bee colony</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No feedback received</li> </ul>		No feedback received for this unit
<b>AHCNRM501 Develop a coastal rehabilitation strategy</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Tas</li> </ul>	Industry (Employee) Tas- remove labour hire/HR elements from KE	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Removed labour hire reference in the KE.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	The unit would is a good template (formula) other units that require a strategy to be developed. It does contain the annoying including... statements that should be in the Assessment Conditions as it can make the knowledge unnecessary complex. Making some parts of a unit complex will reduce the selection of the unit.	Feedback noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	add restoration so it includes management, restoration and rehabilitation techniques etc. (KE)	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added restoration to KE 6.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	Good unit though I am UNCLEAR about what makes this part of the NRM stream and not part of NAR?	SMEWG asked to consider this piece of feedback. SMEWG requested that this piece of feedback will be resolved in the validation phase of the project.
<b>AHCNRM502 Develop a water quality monitoring program</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No feedback received</li> </ul>		No feedback received for this unit
<b>AHCNRM503 Support the implementation of waterways strategies</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	The KE is a little light on the Aquatic ecology which should be provided at this level. Otherwise call the unit implement a strategy.	Feedback adopted. KE includes aquatic.
<b>AHCNRM504 Interpret and report on catchment hydrology</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No feedback received</li> </ul>		No feedback received for this unit
<b>AHCNRM505 Provide technical advice on sustainable catchment management</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No feedback received</li> </ul>		No feedback received for this unit
<b>AHCNRM506 Plan and monitor works projects in catchments and waterways</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No feedback received</li> </ul>		No feedback received for this unit
<b>AHCNRM508 Investigate suspected breaches of natural resource management legislation</b>		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No feedback received</li> </ul>		No feedback received for this unit
<b>AHCNRM601 Review ecological management plans and strategies</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>The word "land" excludes aquatic environments. Suggest replacing with "ecological" (title)</p> <p>This applies to the use of the word land throughout the document.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Land replaced with ecological throughout the unit</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>The performance criteria and or foundation skills and assessment criteria need to reference knowledge of the National and Principles &amp; Standards for the Practice of Ecological Restoration. These incorporate the principals of developing management plans.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added 'national standards for the practice of ecological restoration' to the KE</p>
<b>AHCNRM602 Develop a monitoring, evaluation and reporting program</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) WA</li> </ul>	<p>NRM602 - Make sure it captures MERI requirements in full</p>	<p>MERI has been included in the PC's, PE and KE</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat VIC, employer</li> </ul>	<p>This should be a Level V unit because a monitoring design must be done concurrently with a restoration design. If you don't know the goals of the restoration project you can't monitor whether those goals have been attained.</p> <p>This should include identification of not only targets and outputs but also OUTCOMES and indicators for identifying whether they have been reached.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Used respondents soft copy to amend unit to make it suitable for level 6.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>the word "land" needs to be replaced with something that encompasses aquatic environments e.g. biodiversity management (Application)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended Application</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>The performance criteria and or foundation skills and assessment criteria need to reference knowledge of the National and Principles &amp; Standards for the Practice of Ecological Restoration. These incorporate the principals of developing monitoring evaluation and reporting programs.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Reference added to KE</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat VIC, employer</li> </ul>	<p>See Soft Copy with all changes recommended to Application, PC's, PE and Additional KE</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Updated PC's in Elements 1, 2, 3 and 5.</p> <p>Amended Performance Evidence and Knowledge Evidence according to stakeholder feedback.</p>
<p><b>AHCNRM603 Implement a monitoring, evaluation and reporting program</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>The performance criteria and or foundation skills and assessment criteria need to reference knowledge of the National and Principles &amp; Standards for the Practice of Ecological Restoration. These incorporate the principals of developing and implementing a monitoring, evaluation and reporting program.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Updated KE with reference to National Standards for the Practice of Ecological Restoration.</p>
<p><b>AHCSAW201 Conduct erosion and sediment control activities</b></p>		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Application: Given that disturbing the earth to install erosion control measures (land forming activities), it would be good to bring biosecurity into the unit. Soil borne diseases and weeds carried on plant, equipment, footwear. E.g. fire track rehabilitation in areas with phytophthora or weeds.</p> <p>Would be good to have a unit that was for non-plant operators - where erosion control is achieved by revegetation/increasing ground cover, fencing to remove grazing pressure etc.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Minor amendments to PC, PE, KE for inclusion of biosecurity.</p>
<b>AHCSAW301 Construct conservation earthworks</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	KE 5 types and application....- Bottom of the hierarchy of control	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Included in KE dot point lower down.</p>
<b>AHCSAW302 Implement erosion and sediment control measures</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	No comment at this stage other than erosion and sediment control measures do not always involve machinery.	Feedback noted.
<b>AHCSAW401 Set out conservation earthworks</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No feedback received</li> </ul>		No feedback received for this unit
<b>AHCSAW403 Supervise implementation of conservation earthworks plans</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PC 1.6 - include biosecurity	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended PC 1.6.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PE 2 'identified hazards and implement controls for the site' - Includes pest control?	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added PE to reflect Pest control and strategy.</p>
<b>AHCSAW501 Design control measures and structures</b>		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Design of control measures and structures may be the work of engineers e.g. works on waterways. Need to know the limitations for those not qualified as engineers. Also in Victoria there is Indigenous Heritage legislation that requires a cultural heritage assessment to be carried out in many circumstances. Designers would need to know about the Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006 (relates to land development and planning). This also applies to any earthworks that go beyond a certain depth, are near waterways or known heritage sites.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended KE to include dot point on legislation including heritage and cultural regulations.</p>
<b>AHCSAW502 Plan erosion and sediment control measures</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Application re 'control plans'. For a development on a site (reading through element 1)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended Application.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC1.4 Legislation - and Aboriginal Cultural Heritage legislation</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended PC1.4.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>KE 1 add Cultural Heritage</p> <p>KE 3 and following 4 sub points - Vague topics. May need knowledge of how surface water/groundwater interactions may influence erosion</p> <p>KE3.5 Have to be able to calculate runoff and peak flows or get engineering advice on possible flows.</p> <p>KE 3.6 Does this also cross into the role of an engineer?</p>	<p>Feedback adopted and amended KE1.</p> <p>Amended KE3 and sub points.</p> <p>KE3.5 runoff and peak flows calculations included</p> <p>KE3.6 The SMEWG have confirmed that this is not the case.</p>
<b>AHCSAW503 Plan conservation earthworks</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Application Statement: Quite a bit of engineering here.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC1.3 Need to include cultural heritage legislation</p> <p>PC2.5 Not sure what is meant by this. Soil erodibility tests?</p>	<p>PC 1.3 would include all legislation governing the project.</p> <p>Feedback adopted. Amended PC2.5.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	KE's 1 Legislation - and heritage 3 incomplete sentence 4needs rewording 5Vague 6 soils and... vague. Need the engineering properties of soil 7&8 Vague 9 Total catchment - need to specify that they are issues related to erosion/land degradation 10 Vague 11 how to manage peak...need to be able to estimate these first 12 and 13 need to be more specific. Also need some knowledge of surface water/groundwater interactions	Feedback adopted.  KE as listed have been amended as suggested.
<b>AHC FIR201 Assist with prescribed burning</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	should be 2 occasions (PE, for how many times things must be demonstrated)	Feedback adopted.  Changed PE for 2 occasions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	This should be: . assist with mop-up and clean-up operations according to... (PE Dot Point 7)	Feedback adopted.  Changed PE 7.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	This should be "record" not report. It is recorded on the daily burn record with weather observations. (PC 2.7)	Feedback adopted.  Changed PC2.7 to record.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	as above. should be "record", not "report" (PC 2.8)	Feedback adopted.  Changed PC2.8 to record.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> </ul>	<p>There is a need for a unit at Certificate III that follows on from this one: AHC FIR301 Conduct prescribed burning</p> <p>Rangers do progress to the point where they conduct and lead the on-ground prescribed fire operation. This is not the Level IV Plan and Supervise level stuff, it is just leading an on-ground crew. At present there is nothing there.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>This comment will be raised during the upcoming AHC or PUA FIR webinar.</p>
<b>AHC FIR501 Manage wildfire hazard reduction programs</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO/Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Phone conversation with developer: Supports the use of this unit. Development was conducted in concert with the Fire industry.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>This comment will be raised during the upcoming AHC or PUA FIR webinar.</p>
<b>AHC FIR502 Plan prescribed burning for fuel, ecological and cultural resource management</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Need to identify clear targets to monitor outcome of fire. Setup quadrants to measure change in litter post fire and regeneration of vegetation to better understand recruitment processes and subsequent change in vegetation and associated fuel loads. post fire over time. Need to include fauna survey post fire (PC 2.3)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added PC 2.7 Develop objectives and procedures for monitoring ecological response to burn.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>See comments above re setting up monitoring plots as part of process. (PC's)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added PC 2.7 Develop objectives and procedures for monitoring ecological response to burn.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Include monitoring response of vegetation post fire and need for follow-up weed management (PC 3.4)</p>	<p>Weed management is another unit of competency in managing a site.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Resources should include equipment to measure fire intensity, soil temperatures etc. to better understand dynamics of fire management and impact on ecological values (PC 2.7)</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added to the Resources in AC.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Include monitoring response of vegetation post fire and need for follow-up weed management</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added to KE Pest Plants.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Resources should include equipment to measure fire intensity, soil temperatures etc. to better understand dynamics of fire management and impact on ecological values</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added to the Resources in AC.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>See comments above re setting up monitoring plots as part of process.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added PC 2.7 Develop objectives and procedures for monitoring ecological response to burn.</p> <p>Monitoring plots is one strategy for monitoring.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Need to identify clear targets to monitor outcome of fire. Setup quadrants to measure change in litter post fire and regeneration of vegetation to better understand recruitment processes and subsequent change in vegetation and associated fuel loads. post fire over time. Need to include fauna survey post fire</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Added PC 2.7 Develop objectives and procedures for monitoring ecological response to burn.</p> <p>Monitoring plots is one strategy for monitoring.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO/Industry (Employer) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Phone conversation with developer: Supports the use of this unit. Development was conducted in concert with the Fire industry.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>This comment will be raised during the upcoming AHC or PUA FIR webinar.</p>
<p><b>AHCFAU201 Recognise fauna</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer)/RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>It is recommended that a unit of competency be developed at a higher level for field identification of fauna at level 3.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted. New unit <i>AHCFAU3XX Identify fauna in the field</i> created to address this skills gap.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Qld	PC 3.3 the word notifiable is not required.	Feedback adopted.  Removed notifiable from PC3.3.
• RTO Qld	Numbers should not be used as their	Feedback adopted.
• RTO Qld	PC 1.3 at Level 2 they will not be determining a location they will be told.	Thank you for the feedback and the issue around retaining 1.3 will be raised again during the validation phase of the project.
• RTO Qld	PC 1.5 and the Element 1 do not agree. Are they preparing to go to the field or are they in the field?  PC 1.6 needs changing to make sure that a persons has implemented WHS prior to going into the field.	They are planning to enter the field for identifying fauna.  Feedback adopted. Changed PC1.6.
• Industry (Employer) Vic	Does recognition include Calls, Scats, Tracks, diggings, Skulls, ...	Yes.
• Industry (Employer) Vic	would have been interested to see what 635 going to continue with. I think a minimum indication is good and also some indication about how many different types of fauna - can you get the unit with 5 bird species - no, but without some more details it's hard to enforce a minimum standard	This piece of feedback will be clarified and resolved in the validation phase of the project.
• Industry (Employer) Vic	not quite clear - comma after inhabit? (AC, 1)	Feedback adopted.  Added a comma for clarity.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Hi Ron. Many fauna surveys are undertaken in accordance Standard Operating Procedures and in the case of animals, Animal Ethics approval. It is a regulated environment, permits are needed and so on. Some of these projects require expert supervision. Would not be selecting the fauna survey process at this level for many animal surveys.</p>	<p>This unit is about recognising fauna not necessarily conducting a survey.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Application: Not a unit for rare and threatened species?</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Removed commonly from the Application.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PE RB comment re at least X(20): Given the range of fauna/habitats, including a number will mean that fauna that have large ranges or are rare will be excluded as you would never see 20. Alternatively you could see one mob of 20+ kangaroos at once, one time. Hard to include a volume in a meaningful way.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PE2 delete 'and selected'</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.  Deleted 'and selected'.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PE7 Many surveys need Animal Ethics approval, which will have Standard Operating Procedures attached.</p>	<p>The unit is not about conducting surveys but observation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>KE 7 Need to be aware of the processes, that permits may be needed, Animal Ethics approval granted, need to follow Standard Operating Procedures. At this level they would be following procedures.</p>	<p>The unit is not about conducting surveys but observation.</p>

**AHCFAU301 Respond to wildlife emergencies**

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Vic	I know this unit was developed for Park Rangers but it seems to me more of an ACM Animal Incident Management unit.	Feedback noted.
• RTO Vic	PC2.5 What about awareness of Zoonotic diseases/ hygiene	Feedback adopted.  Reworded PC 2.5.
• RTO Vic	PC5.3 Advice from?	Feedback adopted.  Added veterinary.
• RTO Vic	PC7.2 ? Needs clarification	Feedback adopted.  Modified element 7.
• RTO Vic	PE6 Not always required. Would need to be simulated for assessment?	Simulation is acceptable and AC provides for this capability.
• RTO Vic	KE11 Should there be more about relevant legislative requirements. What if the animal is a pest species? Zoonotic disease issue.	Feedback adopted.  Added legislation to the KE.
<b>AHCFAU501 Manage fauna populations</b>		
• RTO Vic	PE environmental list: I don't think these are necessary at all as wherever you are, you are in some kind of ecosystem, terrestrial or aquatic.  My suggestion is to change the PE to - There must be evidence that the individual has prepared and implemented a fauna management plan for at least one fauna species in a natural area (or within its natural habitat or similar)	Feedback adopted.  Changes have been made as recommended.
<b>AHCEXP301 Handle and store explosives</b>		
• RTO Vic	KE5 Does this include the emergency procedures as in 2.3?	Feedback adopted.  Reworded KE5 for emergency procedures.
<b>AHCEXP302 Identify and select explosive products</b>		
• RTO Vic	KE Hazard identifications/WHS?	Feedback adopted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
		Added work health and safety and hazard identification to Knowledge Evidence
<b>AHCEXP303 Prepare and use explosives</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	Would be interesting to know why this unit was deleted as it seems to complete the other two. Perhaps due to regulation/other existing training.	Unit has been brought back as a result of pre-public consultation feedback with explosives and pest experts.
<b>AHCPMG410 Implement the pest monitoring and evaluation plan</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	KE 5 land management... - This is a bit open ended and supports the second dot point, more than it does the PCs. Maybe don't need it here?	Feedback adopted.  Deleted reference to land management and production processes in KE.
<b>AHCPMG411 Ensure compliance with pest legislation</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	KE 2 - Interview skills, conflict avoidance and resolution techniques are listed but the PCs and PE mention notifying stakeholders and providing advice and support to stakeholders. Perhaps add something here?	Feedback adopted.  Amended KE according to feedback.
<b>AHCPMG414 Apply predator trapping techniques</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	AC:- In the field with live animals involved in the assessment or can they be simulated in the field?	Feedback adopted.  Amended AC to include: 'or an environment that accurately represents workplace conditions'.
<b>AHCPMG506 Manage the implementation of legislation</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	Application Paragraph 1 - Doesn't match PC 1.7 which is about developing policy to support	Feedback adopted.  Amended Application.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	KE5 Vague KE 7 A bit vague KE12 Vague	Feedback adopted.  Amended KE5, 7, 12.
<b>AHCPMG507 Develop a regional pest management plan</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	Title - Is this plan for a range of pests or just a target pest species. Pest management plans are often for a target species. Clarification needed.	The unit can address either one or many pests.  The outcome of the unit is to develop a pest management plan for a region, irrespective of the number and type of pests.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	Element 3 Seems to be more than just identifying PC3.3 suggest adding assessment after management	Feedback adopted.  Amended as recommended.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	PE first level Dot point 2 alternative man....Not specified in PCs. Perhaps 1.5 should be pest management options. Needs to be clarified. PE Second cluster - Management plan dot points: Not all of these aspects are specified in the PCs PE third cluster: 2 Needs rewording for clarity 3 Defining the pest problem should be somewhere in the PCs at the start. Perhaps 1.1 4 And other legislation?	Feedback adopted. Amended PC 1.5.  PE second cluster. While they are not specifically stated in the PC's they are fundamental to a management plan (PC1.5) and are be listed here to ensure they are assessed.  Amended PE third cluster 2.  Amended PC1.1 to include defining pest problem. Amended PE 4.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	KE 6 Could be more specific e.g. types and use of monitoring technology for pest management 7 Could be more specific e.g. the impact of pests on terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and production enterprises. 13 vague 16 heritage legislation can also impact on land use activities	Feedback adopted.  Amended KE as suggested.
<b>AHCPMG508 Develop a system to monitor and evaluate the pest management plan</b>		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• RTO Vic	Title: Assuming that the pest management plan did not include this	Feedback noted.
• RTO Vic	PC 1.1 add pest management plan after Identify.. PC 1.3 Delete result of and add outcomes after investigation	Feedback adopted.  Amended PC1.1 and PC1.3.
• RTO Vic	PE 4 access - Determine? This is not specified in PCs. Maybe add to PCs in element 2	Feedback adopted.  Deleted reference to access from PE 4 as is covered in broader terms in the KE.
• RTO Vic	KE 2 Would this just be for pests relevant to the plan? 7 Is this covered in the first dot point? 8 Is this repeated in dot point 1 9 Maybe dot point 1 is redundant. 10 Should this be monitoring points for target pests? 12 This is very broad. The unit requires economic identification, monitoring and recording.	Feedback adopted.  Updated KE as suggested.
<b>AHCPMG509 Investigate a pest control failure</b>		
• RTO Vic	Title - Does a pest control failure only relate to the ineffectiveness of control measures on the pest or could it fail in other ways e.g. unintended consequences such as harm caused to non-target species?	It is developers understanding that it may be any form of failure.
• RTO Vic	RB Comment re current chemical licence - Respondent unsure	Feedback adopted.  Replaced reference to legislation with standard paragraph.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC1.1 change planning to plan - ? Is this PC about pest management techniques or management techniques generally?</p> <p>PC 1.2 Does this include the original plan, planning for the implementation of the plan and planning for the monitoring and evaluation - the total process?</p> <p>PC1.5 Is staff the right word here. Do regional pest control officers always have staff? Needs clarification on intent</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended PC's in Element 1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Element 2 Would pest control failure the same as treatment failure? Should the element be 'Assess pest control failure'?</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Element 2 is assessing the treatments used.</p>
<p><b>AHCPMG510 Develop a pest survey strategy</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Possible new PC between 2.2 and 2.3 Should relevant legislation, regulations, Codes of Practice etc. be considered in the preparation of a survey plan?</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended PC2.3.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Elements 3 and 4 can be combined</p> <p>PC 4.1 Including WHS/OHS?</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Combined Element 3 and 4 and included WHS.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>PC 5.1 I would have thought that the post-survey review process would be part of the methodology for the whole plan as you will need those resources (element 3) to be part of the approved plan (element 4).</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Moved PC5.1 into Element 2 and deleted Element 5.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Vic</li> </ul>	<p>KE 2 suggest removing 'and pathogens'.. - Isn't this unit just about pests?</p> <p>KE 4 Specific to pest animals. However there should be some knowledge of relevant legislation, regulations, Codes of Practice etc. etc.</p>	<p>Feedback adopted.</p> <p>Amended KE 2 and 4. Added reference to legislation, regulations, codes of practice and standards relevant to pest surveys.</p>

### Proposed units of competency for deletion

AHCNAR201 Carry out natural area restoration works		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Tas</li> </ul>	<p>Use the word 'communities' instead of 'environments'. That's the current terminology Instead of saying 'sown seeding' say 'direct seeding'</p> <p>First dot point of PE, put assist in natural regeneration first. Aligns with the continuum in the standards - Second should be 'direct seeding' -Third could be planting.</p> <p>Use 're-establishing vegetation' not just 'planting vegetation' in PE</p> <p>Make sure to keep distinguishing between restoration and rehabilitation</p> <p>Put the word ecosystem into the KE</p> <p>If you can add Ecological Resilience to the KE that would be good too</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Tas</li> </ul>	<p>only risk is that my separating them out, some might not get much uptake</p> <p>Needs to have site assessment, and what people should do about it. Regardless of whether it's pristine or altered already. Things like not causing soil compaction, or proper soil hygiene.</p> <p>I look at things as terrestrial and aquatic, so Marine should be its own stream</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Tas</li> </ul>	<p>Use the word 'communities' instead of 'environments'. That's the current terminology</p> <p>Instead of saying 'sown seeding' say 'direct seeding'</p> <p>First dot point of PE, put assist in natural regeneration first. Aligns with the continuum in the standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Second should be 'direct seeding'</li> <li>-Third could be planting.</li> </ul>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>The name of the unit should be changed to 'Carry out restoration of native vegetation' (if it remains vegetation focussed) or 'Carry out ecological restoration' if it were to be amended to be more inclusive of fauna as well as flora. This is to be consistent with terminology of the National Standards and to avoid the problem associated with the previous which it appears was often misconstrued as applying only to protected areas. Ecological restoration can be carried out anywhere and to any degree as long as it focuses on recovering the native biota of the appropriate local ecosystem.</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>The Unit Sector should be changed to 'Ecological Restoration'</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 743 the name is not reflective of the type of work which undertaken by those in the field of Restoration.</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p>

		This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	There is concern that 'prepare herbicides' implies that the only way to treat weed is by herbicide. This should say prepared tools for weed control whether manual, herbicide or a combination.	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	Agree with 743 and should be select weed control measures	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	Planting or sowing seed or any other propagate brought onto site does not recognize what may already be present that only requires encourage from reduced competition to enable regeneration. (PE 4)	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	KE is good for being holistic but in terms of techniques and process the list is rather dated. As in it is still focused on changing the site not on rehabilitating or restoration of the site.	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Qld</li> </ul>	The unit need to be split into two as re vegetation still occurs but restoration/rehabilitation can use different techniques. It like having a unit called AHCXXX101 - Life on a farm the unit would be so varied it could not encapsulate all that is done on a farm. This is what AHCNAR201 is it a unit that contains everything for working in the industry.	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) NT</li> </ul>	<p>This is a potentially great unit at cert 2 level that can cover a holistic approach and skills to look after natural areas. As a worker/trainer in remote NT the focus is often too much on restoration, whereas in our context we don't need reveg etc., the trees are still there, we need holistic management of threats such as fire weeds and feral.</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc NSW</li> </ul>	<p>reestablishment or reintroduction? (PC 4.1)</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc NSW</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 743 that name should change. Carry out Ecological Restoration gives it broader appeal for restoration in different landscapes, including aquatic, rather than thinking of just conservation-type areas.</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc NSW</li> </ul>	<p>suggest 'Identify Weeds' be included before 'Select Weed Control Measures' (PC 2.1)</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc NSW</li> </ul>	<p>dispose of waste sustainably, (maybe burn piles or compost) (PC 5.3)</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) NSW</li> </ul>	<p>I agree with 743's comment regarding name of unit</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>I appreciate what 218 is saying about the remote NT areas not needing replanting or seeding, but ecological restoration is not just about replanting or seeding ecosystems. It is about repairing all degrees of impairment, even minor. We are emailing a Word file to Ron with lots of suggestions for revision to ensure this unit is somewhat simplified and updated so it acts as an introductory unit to restoration and can be complemented by two other units based on the competencies of assisted regeneration (where replanting is hardly needed) and (ii) reconstruction (where the ecosystem needs to be rebuilt).</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>The unit is too big and we suggest move much of this to either the new 'assist regeneration' unit or the revised 'Implement revegetation' unit.</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry Assoc Nat</li> </ul>	<p>Suggest that it would be disadvantageous to try and specify the individual has to know both marine and terrestrial. (KE 3.2)</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>add another performance criteria to No 1. Suggest, identify aim and objectives of the ecological restoration intervention</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>suggest adding, 'Identify the most appropriate weed control techniques for the goals of the project and site characteristics' (PC 2.1)</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>change to 'or' (PC 2.3)</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>and equipment (i.e. add to 2.2) (PC 1.1 or 1.2)</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>preparing the soil suggests it is a planting / revegetation like unit. planting may NOT be required. Good to understand soils and other substrates but not sure 'preparing the soil' should be in a unit titled 'carry out ecological restoration'. (Element 3)</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>suggest changing 'ground' to site so more consistent with general industry language that can better encompass a range of ecosystems (PE)</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>suggest this point be modified to, transported tools and equipment to site' (PE 3)</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>the unit could be applied to both land and sea management programs</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>in response to 218 - ecological restoration is a holistic practice that does involve weed management as well as pest mgt. Revegetation is planting but restoration and specifically assisted regeneration is more about facilitating recovery through other actions such as weed control. Ecological restoration practice and terminology has advanced over the last 20+ years and on thousands of sites across the country, the approach to recovery and management does NOT necessarily include revegetation or planting</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Qld/NSW</li> </ul>	<p>I think I agree with 744 . A really good unit but perhaps a bit big and one that could be broken down so both teachers and students are able to better understand and communicate the differences between restoration approaches and have time to go into a bit of detail as is required by industry.</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with all comments re narrow focus on weed control methods. Too much bias towards herbicide use. Identify weed, select appropriate control method and timing. (Element 2)</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with comments 743 (title change)</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Agree with 635 (RTO Qld). Does not refer to natural regeneration only assisted revegetation (PE 4)</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Suggest rewording. Reads like you are trying to replace native vegetation. Should be reinstating or re-establishing native vegetation (Element 4)</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO NSW</li> </ul>	<p>This unit should be deleted and replaced by the new carry out basic ecological restoration works</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Should there be any other element here namely Monitoring and Evaluation? Where does this fit into the competencies as far as setting management outcomes, objectives and measurable targets set in the site assessment and planning phase? (after element 5)</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) Vic</li> </ul>	<p>Focus of unit is on VEGETATION. Where is habitat component??  Functional role of weeds, reintroduction of Logs, coarse litter, nest boxes etc.?  Needs specific element Reinstatement of fauna habitat</p>	<p>This unit has been replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> on the advice of industry and the SMEWG.</p> <p>This piece of feedback was used to assist in the development of the new unit.</p>
<p><b>AHCNRM401 Plan and implement a biosecurity program</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO Tas</li> </ul>	<p>AHCNRM401. To be replaced with AHCBIO403. All- this is fine</p>	<p>This unit to be replaced with <i>AHCBIO403 Plan and implement a biosecurity program</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry SA</li> </ul>	<p>Deleted units-  All- agree with deleted units</p>	<p>This unit to be replaced with <i>AHCBIO403 Plan and implement a biosecurity program</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) SA</li> </ul>	<p>Deleted units-  All- agree with deleted units</p>	<p>This unit to be replaced with <i>AHCBIO403 Plan and implement a biosecurity program</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry SA</li> </ul>	<p>Deleted units-  All- agree with deleted units</p>	<p>This unit to be replaced with <i>AHCBIO403 Plan and implement a biosecurity program</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>Gov WA</li> <li>Industry (Employer) WA</li> <li>RTO WA</li> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	<p>All- agree to delete AHCNRM401</p>	<p>This unit to be replaced with <i>AHCBIO403 Plan and implement a biosecurity program</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gov RTO WA</li> <li>Gov WA</li> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>RTO WA</li> <li>RTO WA</li> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>Gov WA</li> <li>Industry NT</li> <li>Gov/RTO WA</li> <li>Industry (Employer) WA</li> </ul>	<p>No Objection</p>	<p>This unit to be replaced with <i>AHCBIO403 Plan and implement a biosecurity program</i></p>

<b>AHCNRM507 Manipulate and analyse data within geographic information systems</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employer) Tas</li> <li>Industry (Employee) Tas</li> <li>RTO Tas</li> <li>Gov Tas</li> <li>Industry (Employee) Tas</li> </ul>	AHCNRM507. To be replaced with CPPSIS5064 Industry (Employee) Tas- logic is sound, just do it All- Agree	This unit is to be replaced with: CPPSIS5064 - Coordinate GIS data manipulation and analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry SA</li> </ul>	Deleted units- All- agree with deleted units	This unit is to be replaced with: CPPSIS5064 - Coordinate GIS data manipulation and analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry (Employee) SA</li> </ul>	Deleted units- All- agree with deleted units	This unit is to be replaced with: <i>CPPSIS5064 Coordinate GIS data manipulation and analysis.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry SA</li> </ul>	Deleted units- All- agree with deleted units	This unit is to be replaced with: CPPSIS5064 – Coordinate GIS data manipulation and analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTO WA</li> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>Gov WA</li> <li>Industry (Employer) WA</li> <li>RTO WA</li> <li>Gov WA</li> </ul>	All- agree to delete AHCNRM507	This unit is to be replaced with: <i>CPPSIS5064 – Coordinate GIS data manipulation and analysis.</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gov RTO WA</li> <li>• Gov WA Industry (Employee) WA RTO WA RTO WA Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>• Industry (Employee) WA</li> <li>• Gov WA Industry NT Gov/RTO WA Industry (Employer) WA</li> </ul>	<p>No objection to deleting unit</p>	<p>This unit is to be replaced with: <i>CPPSIS5064 - Coordinate GIS data manipulation and analysis.</i></p>
--	--------------------------------------	---