

# New Harvesting Technologies Project

## Summary of Feedback, Responses and Actions



13 March 2020

Draft units of competency for the New Harvesting Technologies Project were made available on the [Skills Impact website](#) for stakeholder review from 23 January and 1 March 2020. Please visit the website to view a full list of the documents that were submitted for consultation during these phases.

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

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

Feedback received during the 'drafts available' period for the units of competency that have been developed for forest management, harvesting and haulage and related sectors has been positive, with minor changes or updates suggested by stakeholders.

Below is a summary of the feedback raised for the draft units of competency developed and reviewed for the New Harvesting Technologies Project, and how these have been dealt with. This involves a consideration of the information provided, views of industry stakeholders and from people who are part of the Subject Matter Expert Working Group process. Resolutions are constructed to consider the needs and views of stakeholders to the extent possible, and to comply with the *Standards for Training Package 2012*. The resolutions may represent a compromise on one or more stakeholder views with the aim of a workable outcome for industry, State and Territory Training Authorities (STAs) and training providers.

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

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

## Content

Background .....	3
Summary of feedback on draft new Units of Competency.....	5
Digital technology .....	6
Winch-assisted harvesting .....	8
Forestry site preparation on steep slopes .....	9
Use of a chainsaw off ground .....	9
Summary of feedback on draft revised Units of Competency.....	14
Cable logging .....	14
Environmental care .....	19
Transport of logs .....	22
Tree felling.....	23
The use of prerequisites.....	23
The use of tree size limits in the definition of basic, intermediate and advanced trees.....	27
The addition of dead trees characteristics in the definition of intermediate trees .....	28
The level of specification in Performance Evidence .....	29
The use of second level dot points in the Knowledge Evidence .....	33
The use of ropes in the units on intermediate and advanced trees .....	35
Other comments.....	36
Wood chipping .....	45
Summary of feedback on deferred new units of competency.....	49
Drone data and digital technology .....	49
Harvesting optimisation data.....	52
Summary of feedback on units proposed for deletion .....	53

## Background

This project includes the review of 24 units of competency and the development of 5 new units, within the FWP Forest and Wood Products Training Package.

Written submissions were received from 20 stakeholders around Australia, including 9 from industry organisations, 8 from registered training organisations and 2 from Government bodies such as State Training Authorities.

As a direct result of feedback received from 23 January and 1 March 2020, a number of changes were made to the documents under review. Mostly notably:

### **Cable logging**

- Knowledge items with second-level bullet points have been consolidated to remove duplication and improve assessment efficiency without downgrading the level of knowledge required for the task.

### **Environmental care**

- Knowledge of cultural heritage protection principles, threatened and endangered plant and animal species and protection zone methods have been added in the relevant units

### **Transport of logs**

- No changes have been made

### **Tree felling**

Five key issues emerged during the consultations on this set of draft units, with the following outcomes:

- No prerequisites have been applied to these units.
- No measurements have been used in the definition of basic, intermediate and advanced trees.
- Dead trees have been added in the definition of intermediate trees
- The specifications in the Performance Evidence for the fall basic and intermediate tree units have been retained with the following amendments:
  - Margins of error have been removed
  - Intermediate tree requirements have been redrafted to include a demonstration of two different scarf and back cutting techniques on 6 intermediate trees
- Knowledge items with second-level bullet points have been consolidated to remove duplication and improve assessment efficiency without downgrading the level of knowledge required for the task.
- Explicit requirements about the use of ropes in the fall intermediate and advanced trees units have been removed and replaced with more generic Performance Criteria

The reasons for these changes are summarised below or in [this briefing paper](#).

### **Wood chipping**

- Specific reference to forestry operations in the wood chipping unit has been removed to allow for its application to a wider range of wood chipping operations

### **New units**

- Minor changes have been made to clarify content and fill some gaps in the Knowledge Evidence

### **Units proposed for deletion**

- Three units, which were originally for deletion, are proposed for being maintained in the FWP Training Package. The feedback received suggests a potential need for these units in the bushfire context or, one unit, in the specialised Sandalwood industry in WA
- One unit, *FWPFGM2210 Implement animal pest control procedures*, is proposed for deletion and to be replaced with a unit of similar content and outcomes from other training packages to reduce duplication across training packages (see section below).

## Summary of feedback on draft new Units of Competency

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>General</b>		
Gov VIC	<p>Are these orphan units? I didn't see any information on where these new units will sit within FWP qualifications. Orphan units (not attached to a qualification) have funding issues in Victoria. I didn't find any new or revised Skill Sets either.</p>	<p>The new units are proposed to be added to the elective bank of the Cert III in Forest Growing and Management and Certificate III in Harvesting and Haulage as shown in the table below.</p>
	<p>I was thinking about the orphan units issue (for new units). Related to this is the issue of recoded units, both equivalent and non-equivalent. If the qualifications they sit in are not reviewed to include them (recoded units), then those units will also effectively be orphaned. Something to consider.</p>	<p>The qualifications which include the revised recoded units (equivalent and no equivalent) will be updated to reflect the new codes and titles where required.</p>
	<p>I must have missed that information somehow. I did see mention of a Skill Set being developed in the Project Plan but not the qualifications being reviewed. So the existing qualifications in Forest Growing and Management will have a new release number rather than a new code?</p>	<p>The project scope did not include a review of these qualifications. We will add these new units to the elective bank and update the codes of electives within these qualifications. This will be classified as a minor change according to the Training Package Policies and, as a result, the qualification will maintain its code but will have a new release number.</p> <p>We have not developed any skill set for this project as people did not longer ask for a skill set.</p>

## Digital technology

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWPCOT3XXX Access, capture and communicate forestry field data using mobile devices</b>		
Industry SA	<p>Ref. Performance Criteria</p> <p>PC 2.1 - I assume that there are already loaded forestry apps on the mobile device. If not, the 1st stage should be to be able to load these apps to the mobile device.</p> <p>PC 3.2 - The following should be included here: determine data storage capacity of mobile device relative to the data that will be collected. If not adequate, provide adequate data storage capacity using SD cards</p> <p>PC 4.3 - Replace the word “fault-finding” with “diagnostic”</p>	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
	<p>Ref. Knowledge Evidence</p> <p>Add the dot points to “basic procedures for using mobile devices ...”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• capturing individual points on screen or streaming</li> <li>• drawing on screen</li> </ul> <p>Add the dot points below to “types of forestry data collected on mobile devices”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• forest damage - windthrow, burnt areas, pest and disease</li> <li>• harvest progress boundaries</li> </ul>	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
Industry TAS	<p>I've reviewed the draft units for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FWPHAR3XXX Read and interpret digital maps and forest operation plans</li> <li>• FWPCOT3XXX Access, capture and communicate forest field data using mobile devices</li> </ul> <p>I don't have any further comments on either unit, and believe they adequately meet requirements for the target audience.</p>	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.
Gov VIC	My only question is whether a device be sufficient in terms of PE. Otherwise no issues with this unit.	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWPCOT3XXX Access, capture and communicate forestry field data using mobile devices</b>		
	Assessment conditions - have not included an environment that accurately represents a forest or plantation setting. Would all skills have to be demonstrated in a forestry or plantation setting? May present a barrier for delivery.	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWPHAR3XXX Read and interpret digital maps and forest operation plans</b>		
Industry SA	PC 1.9 – Replace the word “surface” with “display” and delete “data”	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
	<p>Ref. Knowledge Evidence – Change dot points under “basic concepts of digital maps” as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replace “GPS” with “coordinates”</li> <li>• Add “vector vs raster” before “spatial data”</li> <li>• Replace “application areas” with “legend and symbology”</li> </ul>	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
Industry TAS	<p>I’ve reviewed the draft units for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FWPHAR3XXX Read and interpret digital maps and forest operation plans</li> <li>• FWPCOT3XXX Access, capture and communicate forest field data using mobile devices</li> </ul> <p>I don’t have any further comments on either unit, and believe they adequately meet requirements for the target audience.</p>	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.
Gov VIC	How is this unit different from other similar units?	<p>We reviewed the units with similar focus and determined that they contain requirements not relevant to the forest industry.</p> <p>In addition, forestry operation plans, which are a key document used in forest harvesting operations, are not covered in other units.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWP HAR3XXX Read and interpret digital maps and forest operation plans</b>		
		These plans include specific information for activities associated with harvesting operations, construction and maintenance of roads and tracks, and prescribed burning for regeneration and this is reflected in the knowledge evidence.
	I have noted that this unit differs from other map reading units as it incorporates the forestry plan maps that are not included in any other existing mapping units.	Thanks for your follow-up feedback, your support is noted.

### Winch-assisted harvesting

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWP HAR3XXX Operate harvesting machine with winch-assist system</b>		
RTO WA	Not sure exactly what this is? FWPHAR3213 – conduct mechanically assisted tree felling (pull or push trees)	This new unit covers the skills required to operate a harvesting machine (skidder, forwarder, harvester or feller buncher) that is supported by a winch system on steep slopes to harvest trees.  The unit FWP HAR3213 is for pushing or pulling trees away from their natural direction of fall, primarily in the urban area, by using a piece of machinery, winches and cables.
Gov VIC	Businesses and operators would benefit from understanding the overarching principles outlined in industry standards, codes of practice and guidelines regarding harvesting on steep slopes. It should be added in the Knowledge Evidence.	A new knowledge item was incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
	Not issues identified and thus no comments.	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.

### Forestry site preparation on steep slopes

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWPHAR3XXX Use mechanised equipment for forestry site preparation on steep slopes</b>		
Gov VIC	<p>Assessment Conditions is the only mention of codes of practice. Should mention of the Codes of Practice be included in the PCs or PE? Victoria has Codes of Practice, Management Standards and Procedures and Management Guidelines for Timber production.</p> <p>Businesses and operators would benefit from understanding the overarching principles outlined in industry standards, codes of practice and guidelines regarding harvesting on steep slopes. It should be added in the Knowledge Evidence.</p>	A new knowledge item was incorporated in the unit, as suggested.

### Use of a chainsaw off ground

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWPCOT3XXX Use chainsaw off ground</b>		
RTO WA	Is this in an EWP? (What is off?)	<p>This new unit covers skills required to apply safety procedures when using chainsaw at heights within a tree. It describes the safe working methods to protect the operator, other people and adjacent assets.</p> <p>The unit is not focused on methods and use of a wide range of specialised equipment for dismantling or pruning trees.</p> <p>The unit title was changed to <i>FWPCOT3XXX Use chainsaw within a tree</i> to eliminate confusions. The Application statement has also been strengthened to reflect the new title and the safety focus of the unit.</p>
Gov VIC	This unit is very similar in outcome to AHCARB303 Perform pruning operations (see AHC Arboriculture Project 2019).	
	Would a learner need existing competence in using a chainsaw or is the intention to teach chainsaw use within the unit?	Yes, the learner will need existing competence in using a chainsaw. However, advice from industry stakeholders suggest we not use prerequisites for this unit as they disadvantage experienced operators. Further details are

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWPCOT3XXX Use chainsaw off ground</b>	
	<p>provided in a section above named Tree felling – Prerequisites.</p> <p>Ref. Performance Evidence, PC 4.8 and 4.11, Knowledge Evidence Directional felling, scarf and back-cuts - assume they are the cuts/cutting techniques referred to in PCs 4.8 and 4.11. These are not specified in the PCs or the KE.</p> <p>Should the cuts mentioned in the PE be included under this KE point – cutting techniques?</p>
RTO NSW,	<p>Phone call notes 17 Feb</p> <p>The title of the unit and the performance evidence need to be redrafted to reflect the scope of the unit, i.e. safe practices when using chainsaw at heights</p> <p>The application statement needs to refer to the two relevant Australian Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AS 2726.2 - 2004 Chainsaws - Safety Requirements - Chainsaws For Tree Service</li> <li>• AS 2727 - 1997 Chainsaws - Guide to safe working practices</li> </ul> <p>PC 3.3 should be clarified to indicate that cold chainsaws are started on the ground at all times and warm chainsaws according to workplace procedures</p> <p>A new PC is required: 3.4 Ensure the chainsaw is running effectively before sending it up</p> <p>PC 4.7 needs to be redrafted to meet the Australian Standards</p> <p>Ref. Knowledge Evidence, pg 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• add “as per Australian Standards” to “one-handed chainsaw use”</li> <li>• add a new knowledge item “heritage-listed trees”</li> </ul> <p>I have noted the changes forwarded as below from the telephone conference on the 17<sup>th</sup> Feb and offer these additional changes:</p> <p><u>Application</u></p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWPCOT3XXX Use chainsaw off ground</b>	
<p>Title of Unit: Use A Chainsaw Within A Tree</p> <p><u>Performance Evidence</u></p> <p>There must be evidence that the individual planned, prepared, safely and effectively operated a chainsaw off the ground and performed cuts on a minimum of four occasions according to a work order or work instructions.</p> <p>In performing this work, there must be evidence that the individual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selected a tree with a minimum height of 15 metres and canopy spread with a minim of 10 metres.</li> <li>• Consistently applied safe and effective fall arrest positioning and cutting positioning prior to performing cuts.</li> <li>• Consistently applied safe and effective cutting techniques.</li> <li>• Performed cutting outcomes are consistent with Australian Standard 4373-2007 (Pruning of Amenity Trees) and Australian Standard 2727.</li> <li>• Appropriate drop zone is selected, used and no cut portion of the tree to exceed selected drop zone.</li> <li>• Effectively carried out routine maintenance on a chainsaw on two occasions.</li> </ul> <p><u>Knowledge Evidence</u></p> <p>Delete</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excavations</li> </ul>	
<p>Looking at the PCs I find as follows a suggestion:</p> <p><u>Performance Criteria:</u></p> <p>3. Start chainsaw on ground</p> <p>Changes of:</p> <p>3. Start chainsaw</p> <p>3.1 Fuel and lubricate saw <del>on the ground</del> according to manufacturer instructions and workplace procedures</p>	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWPCOT3XXX Use chainsaw off ground</b>	
<p>3.2 Perform prestart checks on chainsaw according to manufacturer instructions and workplace procedures</p> <p>3.3 Start chainsaw using cold and warm starting methods <del>on the ground</del> according to workplace safety procedures</p> <p>3.4 Select, communicate to team members and apply appropriate method for sending chainsaw to the operator according to workplace health and safety procedures</p> <p><u>Performance Evidence:</u> As proposed</p>	
<p>Performance Criteria Element 3 Suggest we change the title to: Prestart Chainsaw</p> <p>Add new P.C. 3.4 (not 4.4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure chainsaw is running efficiently prior to ascending tree.</li> </ul> <p>I would suggest that existing P.C. 3.1 – 3.4 wording of “on the ground” remain in place as these PC’s need to be performed <u>before</u> the whole of Element 4 PC’s can be commenced.</p>	
<p>No issue but if we only have a start on ground we are going to have add another PC to allow for starting above ground as this is going to have to happen?</p>	
<p>We wish to suggest the alteration of some minor components as such:</p> <p>Application Statement: Change Australian Standard 2726 to AS2726.2</p> <p>Ref. Performance Evidence:</p> <p>Paragraph 3 - One tree must be in close proximity to a structure or other asset <i>or replicated structure or asset</i> and have a minimum height of 15 meters and canopy spread with a minimum of 10 meters. There must be a <i>designated</i> drop zone <i>and cut material must be placed within this zone.</i></p>	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWPCOT3XXX Use chainsaw off ground</b>	
<p>We consider 4 metre specification to be unreasonable for trainees as cut materials may bounce out of this small designated drop zone.</p> <p>This specified drop zone should be determined by the judgement of the Trainer and/or Assessor.</p> <p>There must also be evidence that for each tree the individual has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• applied safe and effective fall arrest positioning and cutting positioning to perform cuts consistent with the AS 2726 or successor. Need to change the AS2726 to AS2726.2 and AS2727</li> </ul>	
<p>May I suggest that the dimension of the tree may be hard to always obtain of: Selected a tree with a minimum height of 15 metres and canopy spread with a minim of 10 metres?</p>	<p>The height and diameter of tree were maintained based on advice from arboriculture representatives that suggested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• students need to be assessed when accessing difficult positions in large trees to make sure that they can safely do this at work.</li> <li>• specific requirements prevent assessments from being conducted quick in tiny trees.</li> <li>• buildings can be simulated, and the actual height and canopy spread can be adjusted.</li> <li>• the unit does not say that similar sized trees must be used for nervous or still-learning students to practice on. Beginners should absolutely be in smaller trees, under closer supervision.</li> <li>• as written, the assessment requirements do not prohibit multiple students being assessed in this one tree - each one could dismantle one branch and stem, for example.</li> </ul>

## Summary of feedback on draft revised Units of Competency

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
General		
Gov VIC	The review of existing units has been very thorough and the detail in the summary of changes document provided clarity to the changes that have been made. No equivalence status had been included in units. Am assuming that all the units are to be recoded and that those with major changes will not be equivalent.	

## Cable logging

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR2XXX Hook up felled trees (choker)		
Industry TAS	<p>Ref. Application</p> <p>Replace “cutting” with "falling"</p> <p>Change “line shifts” to "other duties"</p> <p>Add “codes of practice”</p>	All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.
	<p>Ref. Performance Criteria</p> <p>PC1.2 and 1.2 - replace “Review” with “Apply”</p> <p>PC1.7 - remove “type and quantity of logs”</p> <p>Remove “close to end of logs” in PC 2.7. Not always practical or the best option.</p> <p>Remove PC 2.8 and add 3.4 and 3.5 from Rigging slinger performance criteria</p> <p>PC 2.9 - remove “Record and”</p> <p>PC 3.2 - Add “assist with notching of stumps”. Also add “site requirements”.</p> <p>PC 3.4 - Change to “Assist with dismantling of”</p>	All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR2XXX Hook up felled trees (choker)		
	PC 3.5 - remove	
	Ref. Foundation Skills, Numeracy Change to "Estimate distances"	All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.
	Ref. Performance Evidence Remove "rigging slinger" - may be upon instruction from a Hook tender etc.	All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.
	Ref. Knowledge Evidence Change to "key features of varying site conditions, hazards and their effects on log recovery" and remove the second level dot points Remove second level dot points from "techniques used by choker.." Change "chain of command" to "codes of practice" Remove "recording" from the last knowledge item	All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.
	Ref. Assessment Conditions Replace with "skills must be demonstrated on a working cable logging operation." Remove dot points regarding yarder, rigging equipment and signal system - redundant if cable operation is active. Change "operator" to chokerman	All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR2XXX Perform landing duties (chaser)		
Industry TAS	Ref. Application	All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR2XXX Perform landing duties (chaser)	
<p>Add codes of practice</p> <p>Ref. Performance Criteria</p> <p>PC 1.1 and 1.2 - Change "Review" to "apply"</p> <p>Remove PC 1.7, not a chaser's role.</p> <p>PC 2.2 – Remove "with single and multiple logs" - multiple log turns may not apply dependant upon forest size/type</p> <p>Remove PC 2.5 as covered in 2.6</p> <p>Change PC 2.6 to "Assist with installation, removal, adjustment and checking of rigging as required"</p> <p>PC 2.7 and 2.8 - change "yarder" to "appropriate personnel"</p>	<p>All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.</p>
<p>Ref. Foundation Skills, Numeracy</p> <p>Change to "Estimate distances"</p>	<p>All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.</p>
<p>Ref. Performance Evidence</p> <p>Add "at least two of these turns containing multiple logs"</p>	<p>All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.</p>
<p>Ref. Knowledge Evidence</p> <p>Change to "key features of varying site conditions, hazards and their effects on log recovery" and remove the second level dot points</p> <p>Remove "land" from "techniques ..." - not a chaser role</p> <p>Change "chain of command" to "codes of practice"</p> <p>Remove "recording" from the last knowledge item</p>	<p>All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.</p>
<p>Ref. Assessment Conditions</p> <p>Replace with "skills must be demonstrated on a working cable logging operation.</p> <p>Remove dot points regarding yarder, rigging equipment, stems and signal system - redundant if cable operation is active.</p>	<p>All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR2XXX Perform landing duties (chaser)		
	Change “operator” to chaser	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR3XXX Monitor log recovery (rigging slinger)		
Industry TAS	<p>Ref. Performance Criteria</p> <p>PC 1.1 and 1.2 - Change “Review” to “apply”</p> <p>PC 2.1 – Add “and site procedures”</p> <p>PC 2.7 - Change “Establish” to “Identify” and “rigging” to “rigging requirements”</p> <p>PC 3.7 Remove “Record”</p>	All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.
	<p>Ref. Foundation Skills, Numeracy</p> <p>Change to “Estimate distances”</p> <p>Change to “Estimate payload”</p>	All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.
	<p>Ref. Knowledge Evidence</p> <p>Change to “key features of varying site conditions, hazards and their effects on log recovery” and remove the second level dot points</p> <p>Remove the second level dot points from “techniques used..”</p> <p>Change “chain of command” to “codes of practice”</p> <p>Remove all after “cable systems:”</p> <p>Remove “recording” from the last knowledge item</p>	All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.
	<p>Ref. Assessment Conditions</p> <p>Replace with “skills must be demonstrated on a working cable logging operation.</p>	All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR3XXX Monitor log recovery (rigging slinger)		
	Remove dot points regarding yarder, rigging equipment, stems and signal system - redundant if cable operation is active. Change "operator" to "rigging slinger"	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR3XXX Operate yarder		
Industry TAS	Ref. Performance Criteria Remove PC 1.2 - not yarder duties PC 1.3 - Change "Review" to "apply" Remove PC 1.8 - Bush boss role PC 2.2 – Remove "contractual" and add manufacturer PC 4.5 – Remove "anticipate hang-ups and obstacles" and add "hang-ups and obstacles" after "clear" PC 4.6 – Remove "bridling" Remove PC 4.7 – yarder does not do this PC 5.1 – Remove "park" Ref. Foundation Skills Remove last dot point from numeracy - not yarder operator role Ref. Performance Evidence Remove "planned, prepared" Change "on for occasions" to "performing at least four turns" Remove "on two occasions" from the last dot point	All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.
	Ref. Knowledge Evidence	All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR3XXX Operate yarder		
	<p>Change “forest” to “cable”</p> <p>Remove the tree dot points after landings usage - Bush Boss/ Hook tender role</p> <p>Remove “application, maintenance and handling” from “cable systems used ...”</p> <p>Remove “manoeuvre obstacles”</p> <p>Remove “techniques for positioning and staking logs” - not yarder role</p> <p>Remove “block completion”</p>	
	<p>Ref. Assessment Conditions</p> <p>Change - make these the same across all units noting changes as mention in other cable packages</p>	The Assessment Conditions section was edited, and it is now consistent with the other cable logging units.

## Environmental care

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
General		
RTO NSW	<p>Ref: Issues and Options Paper – Environmental Care</p> <p>Option 1 is preferred – keep it generic (possibly referencing hardwood forests and plantation forests?). I concur with the sentiment in the Options sub-note re other units being available to supplement/substitute.</p> <p>Option 1 is preferred but can see the benefit of Option 3 if Option 2 in Issue 1 above is adopted</p>	<p>Your comments are noted and will be considered in a future project as these proposed options were not actioned due to insufficient feedback from the industry stakeholders.</p> <p>In addition, any major changes to these units presented in the discussion paper (listed below) would require a full qualification review as they are core units in a range of qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FWPCOR2203 Follow environmental care procedures</li> </ul>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
General		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FWPCOR2205 Follow WHS policies and procedures</li> <li>• FWPCOR3201 Implement safety, health and environmental policies and procedures</li> </ul>
	Option 2. is preferred, but maybe genericising the theme/Element to 'Salvage', in which case disruptions such as windthrow, and soil erosion/water quality matters can also be added to fire salvage issues?	<p>The unit <i>FWPCOT3252 Use environmental care procedures to undertake fire salvage operations</i> may need to be reviewed again in a future project due to the recent bushfire response and actions within the industry.</p> <p>The IRC investigates the need for potential new and/or improved units to provide for extra care measures in the fire salvage operations.</p>
	We use <i>FWPSS00024 Skill set for soil and water protection (roading)</i> but have found that the unit <i>AHCSAW302 Implement erosion and sediment control measures unit</i> is too complex for the needs of most forest owners, and will consider an RTO skill set without that unit into the future. This is not a criticism of the quality of AHCSAW302.	<p>This issue was discussed further with the person who gave the feedback and it was determined to maintain the AHC unit in the skill set as it may be needed by the roading crews of forest managers.</p> <p>The national enrolments data shows that the skill set <i>FWPSS00024 Skill set for soil and water protection (roading)</i> has been used in NSW, with 27 enrolments in 2017.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPCOT3XXX Rehabilitate tracks, quarries and landings		
RTO TAS	Ref. Performance Criteria PC 1.6 – Remove “teams members” as operators may work alone PC 3.4 – Add industry codes of practice Remove PC 3.6 - May only be tasked with rehabilitating the site and not required to plant trees.	All changes were incorporated into the unit as suggested.
	Ref. Knowledge Evidence For the items with second-level dot points, add "which may include some of the following" - may not require all of these	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPCOT3XXX Use environmental care procedures to undertake fire salvage operations		
RTO SA	Ref. Performance Criteria PC 1.1 – needs to include Aboriginal Cultural heritage e.g. significant trees	A minor change was made to PC 1.1 to indicate “and cultural heritage protection requirements”.
	Ref. Knowledge Evidence Add legislative requirements about watercourse - rivers, creeks, wetlands and spring sites	No change was made as watercourse protection requirements are already in the Knowledge Evidence, second dot point.
	Add recognition, identification and protection of Indigenous cultural sites	Cultural heritage protection principles were added in the Knowledge Evidence, third dot point
	Add remnant habitat needs to be given some indicators ... areas which haven't been burned, trees with hollows and roost sites (which may be dead or alive)	No change was made. These indicators are part of the teaching content not the standard (unit of competency).
	Add working with Traditional Owners in the identification of sites	Working with Traditional Owners is covered under cultural heritage protection principles added to the Knowledge Evidence.
	Add demonstration of respect for Traditional Owners and other authorities whose values may differ from harvesting values	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPCOT3XXX Apply biodiversity protection principles		
RTO SA	Is there a similar unit for the protection of Indigenous cultural heritage values?	Yes, the unit listed below covers cultural heritage requirements: FWPCOT3257 - Follow cultural heritage requirements
	Ref. Performance Criteria PC 1.4 comes before PC1.3? PC 1.8 and 1.9 come before getting ready for the job as well. The controls may prevent a job happening under some conditions (e.g. weather) This process of preparing for work is a bit repetitive and mixed up.	The Performance Criteria was reordered.
	Ref. Foundation Skills, Numeracy Be clear that graphical information includes maps, diagrams. Also need digital literacy. Being able to use GPS or similar technology so that location is clear for interpreting maps, and also for recording new sites and location of protection measures.	No change was made. The use of digital technology goes beyond Foundation Skills and this unit. This material is covered in other units.
	Ref. Knowledge Evidence Habitats include standing trees with hollows (dead and alive), stags with roost sites, wetlands, springs	Habitat elements were added to the Knowledge Evidence, as suggested.
	Add knowledge of plant and animal ID as is required for PC 2.1	Knowledge of threatened and endangered plant and animal species was added.
	Add knowledge of protection measures and protection zone methods and materials as is required for PC 2.3 and 2.4	Knowledge of protection zone methods was added.

### Transport of logs

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPCOT3XXX Transport forestry logs using trucks		
RTO WA	Agree with the proposed changes in Draft 1	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWPCOT3XXX Transport forestry produce using trucks</b>		
RTO WA	Agree with the proposed changes in Draft 1	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.

## Tree felling

### The use of prerequisites

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
The use of prerequisites		
RTO WA	<p>Ref. the units tree felling and harvesting (advanced)</p> <p>Pre-requisites? Require Basic or intermediate level?</p> <p>I have taken people with just a chainsaw ticket through to advanced BUT I have assessed and passed them at intermediate during the training. Otherwise, if they were to get seriously hurt/killed falling advanced complex trees with only a 'trim and cut' unit it might be difficult to convince worksafe that you stretched them too far!</p> <p>Some chainsaw operators could go straight to advanced but most would need to learn basics and be comfortable and competent before attempting advanced trees.</p>	<p>The prerequisites issue was discussed extensively with the project participants and it was determined by unanimous consent that the units should maintain the status quo – no prerequisites.</p> <p>The discussion and decision were based on two criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of the feedback received. Most of the feedback received was against enforcing prerequisite units for reasons of causing disadvantages to experienced operators. Two responses were for prerequisites, one suggesting reasons of personal safety and one suggesting the lack of benchmarks to identify existing skills.</li> <li>• Analysis of the Training Package Products Policy specifications about the use of prerequisites. The policy states that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>2.2.2 Pre-requisite units must only be used where essential to achieving the subsequent competency.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
RTO NSW	<p>I just wanted to have my little say on pre requisites as they have been included in all the felling units, while it make's sense to me that you need basic chainsaw skill to be able to fell trees, the need for adding them to the felling units I don't understand unless you also include the previously level of felling. If we look across all industries that deliver these units, there are many ways in which you can gather prior experience.</p> <p>If you take the rural sector which is slowly coming on board with training. They would normally have prior knowledge and experience of chainsaw</p>	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
The use of prerequisites		
	<p>operation over the years. For them to achieve a basic felling they would now have to do two courses which puts them at a disadvantage of a school leaver just starting out and wanting to make a career using the chainsaw. The school leaver will complete the levels required to become qualified.</p> <p>In simple terms, I can get my L plates (pre requisite Trim and cut) Then go straight to a B double driver (advance felling)??</p> <p>I agree with previous comments in past conversations this will not address the compliance of some RTO's or trainers. This can also disadvantage some industries that RTO's deliver to.</p>	<p><i>The must not be used for the purpose of driving delivery order or sequencing.</i></p> <p>The word "essential" was interpreted as follows:</p> <p>a) when competency could not be achieved without first gaining essential knowledge and skills from other units. Specifically, when the necessary knowledge and skills requirements is not included in the unit itself but a different unit.</p> <p>b) when competencies from other units are considered necessary for reasons of personal safety.</p>
	<p>Yes opposed to the prerequisite unless you put each level in prior, I believe this is against the packaging rules as well.</p>	
	<p>I'm happy not having prerequisites</p>	
RTO QLD	<p>Not really happy to have any Prerequisites at all unless is legally required.</p> <p>Disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student must enrol and complete the required Prerequisites prior entry in the desired course of felling</li> <li>• Extra cost to student</li> </ul>	
RTO NSW	<p>Prerequisite units suggested for the tree felling and harvesting (advanced)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FWPCOT2239 Trim and cut felled trees or equivalent</li> <li>• FWPFGM3212 Fall tees manually (intermediate) or equivalent</li> </ul> <p>It seems that prerequisite units may have provided an issue for some providers of training, however, I believe prerequisites form a logical benchmark for each felling unit.</p> <p>In Queensland, I find it extremely rare now, to encounter a participant requesting a higher level of felling competency identification e.g. Intermediate or Advanced, where they have had NO prior formal training or assessment, as chainsaw competency certification was broadly introduced to Queensland on July 1999.</p>	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
The use of prerequisites	
	There is nothing to suggest that a participant has to or should be charged by the RTO or Assessor for prerequisite units but it does provide a benchmark to identify existing skills.
RTO NSW	The only problem with the prerequisite conditions is that 'Trim and cut felled trees' is already listed as a prerequisite for advanced tree falling – implying that the candidate needs to know how to use a chainsaw but doesn't need to have any prior experience in tree falling. This could be quite a loophole for training providers who want to exploit it. It would be better to remove all prerequisites if you don't want to create barriers for experienced operators.
Industry TAS	<p>Ref. the prerequisite requirement. Think that if we set good benchmarks of competency / performance evidence requirements for the intermediate and advanced felling units, these should stand alone. Someone is either deemed competent to operate at that level, or not - the other units they have achieved previously shouldn't be any part of that question.</p> <p>A given trainer or RTO would still be smart to structure their course to deliver the precursor units in sequence. But if someone comes in (eg from overseas, or someone who holds older units) who wants to be assessed directly in the advanced unit, I don't think that we should force a prerequisite chain that requires additional (easier) trees to be felled.</p>
	<p>A GOOD use of a prerequisite is where it is impossible for the higher level unit to fully include all of the prerequisite knowledge. For example (from Arboriculture) to perform aerial rescue one has to be able to climb to the casualty. Packaging the requisite climbing knowledge WITHIN the rescue unit means that everything like setting a line, tying a climbing system etc has to be repeated within the assessment requirements of the rescue unit, making it unwieldy. In this case, the use of the prerequisite is sensible, as it avoids the repackaging of repeated content.</p>
	<p>A BAD use of a prerequisite is to try and enforce a particular learning or experience path. This was how prerequisite units were used in the last arb package. This seems sensible at first, but actually introduces unnecessary barriers. The basic &gt; intermediate &gt; advanced chain works well if you're imagining training a new candidate... but it's just a pain if you imagine an experienced and highly competent person with older coded or foreign tickets</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
The use of prerequisites	
	<p>who wants direct access to the higher-level unit. Even with an inexperienced worker, if they want to get the higher level tickets, they should be able to be trained in basic then intermediate then advanced skills, but only be assessed in the tickets they actually want.</p> <p>To say it a different way, if the advanced ticket is solid in terms of the assessment requirements, we should avoid the prerequisite chain wherever possible. We should introduce prerequisites ONLY if they contain knowledge or performance evidence requirements which we don't want to include in the higher-level unit. I think this may be true from trim and cords cut, but is not true for the basic felling units.</p> <p>We have allowed scope in the Arb package for trainers and RTOs to include the basic felling if needed to allow more scope for skill progression with novice candidates, but are only requiring the intermediate for the Cert III qual. I highly recommend this approach - it allows access to the basic for skills development if required, but doesn't waste a unit on an outcome/unit that will become redundant if the candidate is going to proceed to a higher-level ticket.</p>
Gov VIC	<p>The inclusion of the unit FWPCOTXXX Trim and cut felled trees as a prerequisite to FWPCOTXXX Fall trees manually (basic), FWPCOTXXX Fall trees manually (intermediate) and FWPFGMXXX Fall trees manually (advanced) would support the OHS aspects of these units. The current versions of units FWPCOT2236 and FWPFGM3212/ 3213 have no prerequisites and are core units within some of the current Arboriculture qualifications. However the unit FWPCOT2239 has also been included as a core in the qualifications. It seems that the Arboriculture industry had also recognised the need for FWPCOT2239 to go alongside the other tree felling units.</p>

The use of tree size limits in the definition of basic, intermediate and advanced trees

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
The use of tree size limits		
RTO NSW	<p>I am also worried about the size limitations that are proposed to be added, Once you do this it may make the access to trees to suit difficult, just thinking from a broad spectrum. Accessing trees to complete assessments can be difficult in most areas on the east coast. Please consider.</p> <p>Limits were in before, and removed as experienced trainers a small tree with heavy lean can be very dangerous? Just need to get wording right, I thought it was fine in the last chainsaw manual.</p> <p>Size restrictions on basic and intermediate, 15 metre's high is not a very high tree in the likes of hoop pine. The diameter and height restriction in certain areas seem to put a tree from one level to the next, when they are really still a basic tree.</p> <p>Previously these were taken out as you can have a 300 diameter tree with a heavy lean or other defects can be classed as Advanced. I am not sure putting height and length descriptions is the best way to go. Intermediate states the tree must be over 500 diameter, so no tree under this is classed as an intermediate tree ? This is not correct, this could also limit availability of timber that can be used for these assessments. (no simulation)</p>	<p>The characteristics of tree size were amended in all units – fall trees and harvest trees manually (basic, intermediate and advanced) – to remove specificity about tree diameter and height.</p> <p>This change is based on feedback suggesting that diameter and height limits (or ranges) may exclude trees, which have all other features of basic, intermediate or complex trees, from the scope of their appropriate unit.</p> <p>The specifications for the tree size in each unit are now as follows:</p> <p>Basic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• small or medium size diameter trees that can be safely felled using standard and basic falling techniques</li> </ul> <p>Intermediate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• small or medium size diameter trees that can be safely felled with intermediate falling techniques</li> </ul> <p>Advanced</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• large diameter trees, but not exclusively, that can be safely felled with complex falling techniques</li> </ul>
RTO QLD	<p>Suggestion:</p> <p>Basic – up to 500mm diameter, Non-complex, Able to fall using basic felling technique eg; Scarf, hingewood, backcut and able to fall with natural lean/weight distribution.</p> <p>Intermediate - Diameter greater than 500mm or degree of complexity eg; Forward lean, backward lean, side lean, multi – stem, wind velocity more than 10 knots.</p> <p>Advanced – Include all of Intermediate specs but includes, Heavy forward lean, multiple felling techniques, burnt out, hollow, lightning strike etc.</p> <p>In the basic unit, replace “up to” with “approximately” 15 meters in height</p>	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
The use of tree size limits		
RTO WA	Advanced .... complex, difficult and hazardous but not dangerous. Do not fell dangerous trees	
RTO TAS	"Greater than bar length" in intermediate should read "greater than 30cm diameter"	
	Remove 2.5 times my bar length may not place the faller in ADVANCED trees (small bar ?)	

### The addition of dead trees characteristics in the definition of intermediate trees

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
The addition of dead trees characteristics		
RTO NSW	At the moment dead trees are classed as advanced only, is there an option to have a class (limited) of these in intermediate felling? In my experience there are a lot of chainsaw operators that require to fall some simple dead tree's on fire lines that are not up to the advanced standard? Currently they are only aloud to fall these if they are advanced under the standards.  Suggestion: Add a new dot point in the definition of intermediate trees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dead trees that do not add significant complexity</li> </ul>	<p>The characteristics of trees were amended in the intermediate units for fall trees and harvest trees manually to add dead trees as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dead trees with minimal visible damage or defects that do not add significant complexity to the cutting technique</li> </ul> <p>Other additions to the definition of trees for basic and advanced include, as per feedback in the tables below:</p> <p>Basic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• uniform in structure</li> </ul> <p>Advanced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• damage or defect that requires complex felling techniques, including trees with visible lightning damage, burnt out trees and those with fire damaged butts</li> <li>• hung up trees that can be removed safely</li> </ul>
RTO QLD	Dead trees should be not limited to only Advanced Tree Felling providing they measure on assessment to be that of a Basic or Intermediate tree	
RTO NSW	Suggestion: Add a new dot point in the definition of intermediate trees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dead trees with minimal visible damage or defects</li> </ul>	

The level of specification in Performance Evidence

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
The level of specification in Performance Evidence		
RTO NSW	<p><b>Ref. FWPCOT2XXX Fall trees manually (basic)</b></p> <p>In the assessment requirements this section is listed, do we really require the bottom requirements?</p> <p>The top passage cover's what is required I believe. If they meet the standards they would meet the bottom requirements?? I would suggest this should be on all tree's not just 1 out of 6?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>assessed, planned and conducted the felling of six basic trees following a work order or instruction workplace policy and procedures and current workplace health and safety legislation and regulations. In completing this work, the individual must demonstrate that, for each tree, the falling technique was consistent with current Australian Standards and industry codes of practice applicable to tree felling operations.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>In falling one of these six trees, the individual must demonstrate cuts with the following accuracy:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a scarf cut facing the intended direction of fall, including a top cut angled at 45° with a margin of error of ± 2° and a depth of 1/4 of the tree diameter with a margin of error of ± 50 mm, and a horizontal flat bottom cut that meets precisely with the lowest part of the top cut</i></li> <li><i>a back cut parallel to and 10% of the tree diameter above the bottom cut of the scarf, that continues along that plane until 10% of the tree diameter remains uncut leaving straight hinge wood</i></li> </ul>	<p>The issue of prescriptive cutting requirements for skills assessment was discussed extensively with the project participants and it was agreed to maintain prescriptive requirements for fall tree manually basic and intermediate with some amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove the margins of errors</li> <li>Redraft the intermediate requirements to include a demonstration of four different techniques (standard cut, split back cut and forward-leaning and side leaning techniques) on 6 trees, by performing the Standard scarf and Humboldt scarf at the agreed specifications on 2 of the 6 trees. This considers that these cuts and specifications are not appropriate for every situation and showing on 2 of the 6 trees allows for flexibility.</li> </ul> <p>The main reason given by project participants during the early stages of the project for introducing prescribed specifications to the cutting techniques in falling basic and intermediate trees was the need to provide for a capstone task for assessment that tells how well the task is performed. This is, if students can make these cuts accurately, they will be able to make other cuts in other situations accurately.</p>
RTO NSW	<p>I disagree 100% that the performance Evidence should have "detailed cutting requirements and parameters" as these guidelines are clearly covered in AS2727.</p> <p>See AS2727 Section 4.5.3.4 Figure 4.9 and AS2727 Section 4.5.3.5 Figure 4.10</p> <p>Remove</p>	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
The level of specification in Performance Evidence	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>a scarf cut facing the intended direction of fall, including a top cut angled at 45° with a margin of error of ± 2° and a depth of 1/4 of the tree diameter with a margin of error of ± 50 mm, and a horizontal flat bottom cut that meets precisely with the lowest part of the top cut</i></li> <li>• <i>a back cut parallel to and 10% of the tree diameter above the bottom cut of the scarf, that continues along that plane until</i></li> </ul> <p>Leave in apart from “Straight”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>10% of the tree diameter remains uncut leaving <del>straight</del> hinge wood</i></li> </ul> <p>If you have a tree diameter of 400 mm and the scarf has a depth of 150mm into the tree (less than ¼), it simply isn’t undermined enough in the direction of intended fall to allow free movement when performing the backcut. So margin of error +/- 50mm may be dangerous. We need to stick with reference to AS2727.</p> <p>Yes, the margins of error are problematic as basic felling techniques should be accurate otherwise these supposedly “minor errors” set a poor precedent for an individual moving onto the higher skill levels required in Intermediate and Advanced. The specifications are great if the margins of errors are removed.</p> <p>I would also like to see the six basic trees in bullet point one reduced to four for assessment, as sometimes we may have up to 10 individuals and four trees per person is ample and creates less of an environmental impact or concern with regards to availability of trees.</p> <p>I suggest 4 trees instead of 6 only for basic tree felling only as Intermediate &amp; Advanced require more trees due to the additional cutting techniques that must be performed on individual trees.</p>
RTO QLD	<p>I feel from my vast experience stick to the standards at all times on principle of felling! No room for error at all!</p> <p>Agree with removing the margins of errors.</p> <p>Numbers of trees and students in a one cohort for tree felling:</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution	
The level of specification in Performance Evidence		
	<p>Maximum student assessor ratio:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It sounds from this like we should set a maximum student assessor ratio?- other industries do this?</li> <li>• I recommend no more than 6 students at one time under assessment (and training)</li> </ul> <p>Number of trees in assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have always had issues with this in terms of large difficult advanced trees that you may not be able to fall 6 each student in 1 or even 2 days?</li> <li>• While I like to have 6 trees minimum it may not be practical to achieve this in reality?</li> <li>• I would not like to accept lower than 4 for each student in any level though?</li> </ul>	
	<p>Number of trees is an issue but I think due to normal training groups that there is a need to implement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum numbers of students in any one group to 6</li> <li>• Maximum number of trees to be 4 in all levels</li> <li>• I do suggest a maximum of 4 tree at any level only because I do not think we can meet 6 at all times unconditionally!</li> </ul>	
RTO NSW, WA, QLD	<p><b>Ref. FWPFGM3XXX Fall trees manually (intermediate)</b></p> <p>Bullet point one should be redrafted as follows. It must be noted that my suggested changes are due to the fact that Intermediate is a unit of competency out of Cert III pertaining towards the highest skill level achievable in this country therefore “margin of error” is <u>not</u> acceptable in maintaining accuracy in felling direction control at this operator competency level.</p> <p>There must be evidence that the individual has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change the wording from “felling six basic trees” to Assessed, planned and conducted the felling of six trees using standard, split back cut, forward leaning tree &amp; side leaning tree techniques. Following a work order or instruction workplace policy and procedures and current</li> </ul>	<p>The issue of prescriptive cutting requirements for skills assessment was discussed extensively with the project participants and it was agreed to maintain prescriptive requirements for fall tree manually basic and intermediate with some amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove the margins of errors</li> <li>• Redraft the intermediate requirements to include the demonstration of four different techniques (standard cut, split back cut and forward-leaning and side leaning techniques) on 6 trees, by performing the Standard scarf and Humboldt scarf at the agreed specifications on 2 of the 6 trees. This considers that</li> </ul>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution	
The level of specification in Performance Evidence		
	<p>workplace health and safety legislation and regulations. In completing this work, the individual must demonstrate that, for each tree, the falling technique was consistent with current Australian Standards and industry codes of practice applicable to tree felling operations. In falling one of these six trees, the individual must demonstrate accuracy in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making a scarf cut facing the direction of intended fall using two scarfing methods, Standard scarf and Humbolt scarf. Standard Scarf - Top cut 45 degrees, Horizontal bottom cut. Humbolt Scarf - Horizontal top cut, 45 degrees bottom cut.</li> <li>• Scarf opening to be a minimum of ¼ diameter of tree and maximum 1/3 diameter of tree. Cuts must meet at the apex of the scarf line.</li> <li>• Back cut must be above the scarf line junction but a maximum of ½ the scarf opening above the scarf line.</li> </ul>	<p>these cuts and specifications are not appropriate for every situation and showing on 2 of the 6 trees allows for flexibility.</p> <p>The main reason given by project participants during the early stages of the project for introducing prescribed specifications to the cutting techniques in falling basic and intermediate trees was the need to provide for a capstone task for assessment that tells how well the task is performed. This is, if students can make these cuts accurately, they will be able to make other cuts in other situations accurately.</p>
RTO NSW	<p><b>Ref. FWPFGM3XXX Fall trees manually (intermediate)</b></p> <p>Add the dot point below to “In performing these scarf cuts the individual must have ensured that”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hinge wood must be retained (minimum 10deg diameter of tree)</li> </ul>	
RTO TAS	<p><b>Ref. FWPFGM3XXX Fall trees manually (intermediate)</b></p> <p>Replace performance evidence wording the same as "ADVANCED"</p> <p>This will greatly restrict tree fellers from using other scarfs in trees such as, box, v or humbolt.</p> <p>Some times you cannot leave 10% of scarf. Should read "ADEQUATE"</p> <p>We should not be dictating what size scarf to place in a tree. Reason being, the faller may wish to use a certain type of scarf in their felling method, as in Box, V, Humbolt, peg or normal scarfs. The depth of the scarf “should” be a ¼ to ½ the diameter of the tree “where possible”, we cannot say “must be” because this may not be possible on some trees.</p> <p>Hinge wood should also read “ADEQUATE” hinge wood, again, because you may not be able to leave 10% of hinge wood in some species of trees.</p>	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
The level of specification in Performance Evidence		
	The “assessor” must have the experience to acknowledge the above issues to assess in this area.	
Industry VIC	Agree with feedback above, restrictive and doesn't reflect accepted industry techniques.	
Industry WA	Ref. feedback above - great idea. great comment	
RTO NSW	<b>Ref. FWPFGM3XXX Fall trees manually (advanced)</b> Add the words “used was appropriate and” after the “falling technique	The change was incorporated in the unit, as suggested.

### The use of second level dot points in the Knowledge Evidence

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
The use of second level dot points in the Knowledge Evidence		
RTO TAS	<p>Remove second level dot points for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Typical tree defects</li> <li>• Hazards and related risks</li> <li>• Environmental protection measures</li> <li>• Hazard control measures</li> <li>• Types, use and maintenance of chainsaw</li> </ul> <p>We feel the unit descriptor(knowledge evidence )shouldn't nominate what the tree defects/hazards/risks should be for the tree faller in these types of trees (ADV/INTER ).</p> <p>As you may realise, these may differ from state to state or from coupe to coupe, and because of the “must” statements it should be up to the trainee to nominate what these defects/hazards/risks are on their work place.</p> <p>The “assessment” could ask the trainee to nominate a number of these defects/hazards/risks that exist on their worksite, and it would be up to the “assessor” to acknowledge that these defects/hazards/risk are present in that workplace.</p>	<p>The issue of second-level dot points in the knowledge evidence for all units – fall trees and harvest trees manually (basic, intermediate and advanced) – was discussed extensively with the project participants.</p> <p>The feedback given highlighted repetition of knowledge items and requirements that generate unnecessary or excessive knowledge for workplaces that are in varying geographical locations and apply local industry codes of practice.</p> <p>As a result, the following agreed changes were implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge items with second-level dot points were consolidated to remove duplication and streamlined to provide efficiency for assessment without downgrading the level of knowledge required for the task</li> </ul>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution	
The use of second level dot points in the Knowledge Evidence		
	<p>We don't think it is "fair" that a trainee should be asked to explain how to treat a defect/hazard/risk if they don't exist on their worksite.</p> <p>In Tasmania, all forest industry tree fallers must abide by the Tasmanian Forest Practice Code to protect the environment in their workplace, so any environmental issues (hazards/risks ) have to be dealt with as per the code ,but this may differ in other states, so our "assessment" may ask questions on this code of practise, which may not exist in the other states.</p>	
RTO NSW	<p>Just some considerations that may have not been mentioned as yet, there is a lot in the knowledge an practical component that revolve around fires, firefighting equipment, first aid procedures, emergency procedures. I can see the big need for this in the HARVESTING units as you require all this to go into the Forest in summer period in my area. Not necessary in the forest growing and management units where this could be just the local farmer, council worker, Arborist etc.</p> <p>The question I have is this a requirement of the job? yes if your harvesting, firefighting, national parks maybe? by putting all these components in, we are creating a huge knowledge and assessment tasks to the units.</p> <p>Maybe I am reading this wrong. But I have seen assessments developed to meet compliance, that require you to do mock emergencies, first aid and use fire fighting equipment because this is listed. This means we have to not only assess but teach these components?</p> <p>We may be able to word this different in the knowledge requirements but putting in "relevant to your current work site"? The basic is a level 2 units we don't want to over assess. I don't think this should be in any practical component as this would be an industry requirement and up to the RTO's and trainers to structure the training for them specific groups.</p>	
Industry WA	<p>Not sure if the highlighted areas here (second level do points in the Knowledge Evidence) have been suggested for removal but my thought would be to leave them in there so there is continuity between Basic, intermediate and advanced falling. Also, they are major key points that should get revisited when training.</p>	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
The use of second level dot points in the Knowledge Evidence		
RTO NSW	<p>Agree with the streamlined knowledge evidence except:</p> <p>Ref. hazards and risks related to falling trees with chainsaws and methods to minimise associated risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>escape roots not clearly identified</i> (Remove - not applicable with basic tree felling)</li> <li>• <i>kick-back or recoil from the chainsaw</i> (Remove from all fall tree units. Covered in Trim &amp; Cut Felled Trees)</li> <li>• <i>methods used to remove trees that are hung up and procedures for removal</i> (requires much higher knowledge, experience and skill level than should be required for basic trees. Keep in Intermediate &amp; Advanced)</li> </ul>	

### The use of ropes in the units on intermediate and advanced trees

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
The use of ropes in the units on intermediate and advanced trees		
RTO NSW, WA, QLD	<p>Remove ropes from PC 3.7 and this unit. The specific skill to deal with ropes learnt from units such as dismantle trees and mechanised felling of trees.</p> <p>Delete – “rope or other means” from the performance evidence.</p>	<p>The issue of installation of ropes for the fall trees intermediate was discussed extensively with the project participants during the development work and public consultations.</p>
RTO TAS	Redraft PC 3.7 to remove the use of ropes	
RTO NSW	<p>Delete “and install” from PC 3.7 and add new PC in Element 4 for Installing suitable pulling rope(s) to control tree if required and suitable for site and tree</p> <p>Element 4, Bullet point 4.2</p> <p>Install suitable rope/s etc if required.</p> <p>How is the rope installed? Throwline? Bigshot? Ladder? EWP? Climbing? How does assessor assess this?</p> <p>In my experience and that of many competent tree fallers and arborists I have communicated with on this would suggest that a rope has <u>NO</u> benefit if the</p>	<p>The feedback given suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• arborists often use ropes in urban environments for the directional falling of trees while other unit users do not need to use ropes</li> <li>• where required, the installation of ropes constitutes a competency itself which involves a particular assessment of the tree and the appropriate use of different equipment</li> </ul> <p>On this basis, it is recommended that the explicit requirements about the installation of ropes are removed</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
The use of ropes in the units on intermediate and advanced trees		
	<p>faller stuffs up in accuracy of assessing the tree weight distribution, wind factors, environment, cutting technique used.</p> <p>A competent “Advanced” faller will either be able to safely and accurately fell the tree using advanced cutting techniques or leave that particular tree until another means of security in felling can be established.</p>	<p>from these two units and include a generic Performance Criteria as this below:</p> <p>3.8 Assess need, safety and suitability of an industry approved technique and associated equipment to control tree fall</p> <p>4.2 Apply an industry approved technique and associated equipment, as required, to ensure that the tree falls in the direction of the scarf cut</p> <p>Where industry requires, the RTO will need to prepare the learner for assessment, and this could include the use of associated units such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AHCARB317 Dismantle trees</li> <li>FWPBAR3213 Conduct mechanically assisted tree falling operations</li> </ul> <p>If these associated units are deemed not suitable, the IRC needs to be advised for considering and proposing the development of a new unit.</p>
	Remove PC 4.2 Install suitable rope(s) for site and tree to control tree if required. If a rope is required it would strongly suggest that the tree has influences that go over and above normal means of felling an advanced tree safely using advanced techniques.	
RTO Qld	<p>Element 4, Bullet point 4.2 Install suitable rope/s etc if required</p> <p>This concerns me to no end also.</p> <p>What roles, pulleys, winches etc?</p> <p>May be best just to remove this and apply tree felling techniques as per Standards</p>	
Industry WA	Add new point in Element 3; Identify and implement tools and equipment needed to direct trees fall; wedges, tree jacks, ropes or earthmoving equipment.	

### Other comments

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPCOT2XXX Fall trees manually (basic)		
RTO WA	Agree with the proposed changes	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.
RTO NSW	<p>Ref. Application</p> <p>Add to the definition of basic trees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uniform in structure</li> <li>Able to be felled safely using standard and basic felling techniques</li> </ul>	New elements were added to the tree definition in the Application, as suggested.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPFGM3XXX Fall trees manually (intermediate)		
RTO WA	Agree with the proposed changes	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.
RTO NSW, WA, QLD	Add a new PC 4.4 as follows: 4.4 Monitor accuracy of cuts and consistency with cutting technique	A new Performance Criteria was added in the unit, as suggested.
	Replace "Monitor" with "Maintain" in PC 4.4	
RTO TAS	Ref. Application  Remove dot point "species prone to free splitting and adverse reactions during felling" as it is a characteristic for advanced trees  Replace "heavy" from forward leaning trees with "substantial". Heavy is advanced	All changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested
	Ref. Performance Criteria  PC 3.8 – Remove "Assess limitations of own skills in safely felling trees" as the learner has done this by completing the following  PC 3.8 – Remove "exclude". Can't EXCLUDE if providing assistance. This is also covered in 2.4  PC 4.6 – Remove "Implement". Will not see them do this. As long as they KNOW how to do this.  PC 5.2 - Remove. Doesn't have to do this every time they cut a piece of timber  PC 5.3 – Replace "identify" with "Inspect for" and add "if required" at the end  PC 5.4 - Add sharpen  PC 5.5 - Remove. Doesn't have to do this every time they cut a piece of timber	All changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested
	Ref. Foundation Skills  Replace all with the same as "ADVANCED"	The change was incorporated in the unit, as suggested

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPFGM3XXX Fall trees manually (intermediate)		
	Ref. Knowledge Evidence Add industry, state and local codes of practices for environmental protection for tree felling operations Add “intermediate” to dot point identifying trees	All changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPFGM3XXX Fall trees manually (advanced)		
RTO WA	Agree with the proposed changes	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.
RTO NSW	Ref. Application Add to tree definition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>trees with visible lightning damage, burnt out trees and those with fire damaged butts”</li> <li>hung up trees that are able to be removed safely</li> </ul>	New elements were added to the tree definition in the Application, as suggested.
	Ref. Performance Criteria Add new PCs in Element 3 for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>identifying tree unsafe to fell manually and offer alternative safe options</li> <li>planning a suitable escape route</li> </ul>	Two new PCs were added in the unit as follows:  3.4 Identify alternative actions to be taken if tree is deemed unsafe to fell according to workplace practices, environmental requirements and workplace health and safety procedures  3.7 Plan suitable escape routes and clear routes of growth and other obstacles according to environmental care, workplace and regulatory requirements

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPFGM3XXX Fall trees manually (advanced)	
<p>PC 4.2 - add "appropriate" techniques and safe distance from "machinery/infrastructures"</p> <p>Agree with PC 3.10 and 3.9 to be deleted as these are covered in PC 3.3 and 3.4</p> <p>Agree with replacing "Identify" with "Inspect for" in PC 5.3 and Remove PC 5.5 as is cover in PC 5.4</p>	<p>These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested</p>
<p>RTO TAS</p> <p>Ref. Application</p> <p>Replace "substantial" with "heavy forward" lean in the definition of advanced trees.</p>	<p>This change was incorporated in the unit, as suggested</p>
<p>Ref. Performance Criteria</p> <p>PC 3.8 – Remove "Assess limitations of own skills in safely felling trees" as the learner has done this by completing the following. How does the assessor assesses this</p> <p>PC 3.9 – Remove "exclude". Can't EXCLUDE if providing assistance. Remove, this PC is also covered in 2.4</p> <p>PC 4.6 – Remove "Implement". It means the assessor has to see the tree feller to do this. As long as they KNOW how to do this.</p> <p>PC 5.2 - Remove "cutting". Doesn't have to do this every time they cut a piece of timber</p> <p>PC 5.3 – Replace "identify" with "Inspect for" and add "if required" at the end</p> <p>PC 5.4 - Add sharpen</p> <p>PC 5.5 – Remove, it is the same as PC 5.4</p>	<p>These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWPCOT2XXX Maintain chainsaws</b>		
RTO WA	<p>Does anyone use this unit?</p> <p>All chainsaw units have an element of maintaining saw.</p> <p>It is primarily for technicians (dealers).</p>	<p>Yes, the unit is used by a significant number of people (about 5,000 people) each year according to the enrolment data.</p> <p>It covers tasks and skills for periodic maintenance that is more complex than the routine maintenance covered in all the chainsaw units. As expected, this unit would be more for technicians.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWPCOT2XXX Trim and cut felled trees</b>		
RTO TAS	<p>Ref: Application</p> <p>Add "industry codes of practice"</p>	This change was incorporated in the unit, as suggested
Industry WA	<p>Ref. Performance Criteria</p> <p>Add new point after PC 4.4, apply retrieval techniques for stuck, pinched or jammed part of chain saws.</p> <p>Ref. Performance Evidence</p> <p>Add to this list: step cuts</p>	These changes were incorporated in both units, trim and cut harvested trees and trim and cut felled trees, as suggested.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWPCOT3XXX Operate a pole saw</b>		
RTO WA	Agree with the proposed changes in Draft 1	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.
RTO TAS	Ref. Application	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPCOT3XXX Operate a pole saw		
	Remove - Why does it have to be with a "telescopic extension"? Some poles saws are short shaft as in the "multi-tool" so therefore the license/competency would not allow the operator to use this tool.	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
	Ref. Performance Criteria PC 3.8 – Remove. Not always conducted. If doing a one-off assessment, why is this required	
	Ref. Foundation Skills Oral communication - Remove “open and closed probing”. As long as they are ASKING questions should be sufficient	
	Ref. Performance Evidence Add “replacing” to the last dot point	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR2XXX Trim and cut harvested trees		
RTO WA	Agree with the proposed changes in Draft 1 Need to find a better word for the material being cut as they are no longer trees once on the ground .... Unless we say ‘felled trees’ or logs?	The wording “felled trees” was incorporated in both units, trim and cut harvested trees and trim and cut felled trees, as suggested.
RTO TAS	Ref. Application Add industry codes of practice	This change was incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
	Ref. Performance Criteria PC 1.7 - Correct spelling mistake “site” PC 2.3 – Remove “and suitable transport method”. Not chainsaw operators task	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR2XXX Trim and cut harvested trees	
<p>PC 4.2 – Remove. Same as 3.1</p> <p>PC 4.5 - Remove KNOTS. Replace with bumps, burls</p> <p>PC 4.6 – Remove. Covered by all the above in Element 4</p> <p>PC 5.4 – Replace first “and” with OR. Some operators carry several chains and only CHANGE the chains not sharpen them</p>	
<p>Ref. Foundation Skills</p> <p>Writing – Remove “tree trimming and cutting process. Chainsaw operators don’t do this</p> <p>Numeracy – Remove dot point 1. How is this assessed?</p>	<p>These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.</p>
<p>Ref. Performance Evidence</p> <p>Remove “following” and add “a variety of cuts which can include the following”. May not be able to conduct all</p> <p>In last dot point, remove “one chain on two occasions” and add “or changed a saw chain on one occasion”</p>	<p>These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.</p>
<p>Ref. Knowledge Evidence</p> <p>Dot point 1 – Delete. Should all be in PERFORMANCE</p> <p>Dot point 2 - Remove. Should read “methods to identify cuts, tension and compression in logs”</p> <p>Dot point regarding features of site conditions - this should read “the effects of site hazards on chainsaw operations”. We don’t think a unit should dictate what site hazards may be.</p> <p>Dot point regarding tree defects – Remove. Listed defects may not be onsite This should read “identify and explain how site timber defects may affect the cutting process”.</p>	<p>These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR2XXX Trim and cut harvested trees		
	Lat dot point - Replace “forest and plantations” with “harvesting operations”. Remove 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> sub dot points. How does a chainsaw operator do this?	
	Ref. Assessment Conditions Replace “operator” with “chainsaw operator”	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR3XXX Harvest trees manually (intermediate)		
RTO WA	Agree with the proposed changes in Draft 1	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.
RTO TAS	Ref. Application Diameter of 30cm or greater Remove “species prone to free splitting ... “ this is "ADVANCED "Replace “heavy” with “Substantial”	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
	Ref. Performance Criteria PC 3.6 - Remove “assess limitations of own skills”. As long as the tree feller can "IDENTIFY" trees outside their skill PC 4.5 – Remove “implement”. May not have to do this. As long as they know what the procedure is PC 5.2 - Remove "cutting" PC 5.3 – Replace “identify” with “Inspect for” PC 5.4 - Add "sharpen"	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
	Ref. Foundation Skills Numeracy - Remove all dot points and add the same as ADVANCE	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR3XXX Harvest trees manually (intermediate)		
	<p>Ref. Knowledge Evidence</p> <p>Remove sub dot points for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• tree defects</li> <li>• hazards and related risks</li> <li>• environmental protection measure</li> <li>• key features of site conditions</li> </ul> <p>Add " Industry, state and local" to environmental protection measures</p>	<p>These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR3XXX Harvest trees manually (advanced)		
RTO WA	Agree with the proposed changes in Draft 1	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.
RTO TAS	<p>Ref. Application</p> <p>Remove "with a diameter up to 2.5 times the chainsaw guide length"</p> <p>Replace "substantial with "Heavy"</p>	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
	<p>Ref. Performance Criteria</p> <p>PC 3.6 - Remove "assess limitations of own skills". As long as the tree feller can "IDENTIFY" trees outside their skill</p> <p>PC 4.5 – Remove "implement". May not have to do this. As long as they know what the procedure is</p> <p>PC 5.2 - Remove "cutting"</p> <p>PC 5.3 – Replace "identify" with "Inspect for"</p> <p>PC 5.4 - Add "sharpen"</p>	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR3XXX Harvest trees manually (advanced)		
	PC 5.5 – Remove. Same as PC 5.4	
	Ref. Knowledge Evidence Remove sub dot points for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• tree defects</li> <li>• hazards and related risks</li> <li>• environmental protection measure</li> <li>• key features of site conditions</li> </ul> Add “ Industry, state and local” to environmental protection measures Remove the last dot point regarding risk assessments	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.

### Wood chipping

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR2XXX Operate a mobile chipper/mulcher		
RTO NSW	Ref. Performance Criteria PC 2.7 - Replace “truck” with “stock pile” and add “if required” at the end of the PC PC 3.4 – Delete. The operator does not remove cutters	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
	Ref. Performance Evidence Replace “six loads of material” with “two different species of material”	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
	Ref. Knowledge Evidence: Remove “cutter removal” from the item about operator maintenance procedures Add a new knowledge item “processes for removing, replacing and disposing of cutters according to manufacturer recommendations, workplace procedures and environmental protection practices”	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR2XXX Operate a mobile chipper/mulcher		
	<p>Ref. Assessment Conditions</p> <p>Clarify “track or transport vehicle” in resources, equipment and materials by adding “if required by site requirements”</p> <p>Remove “suitable” from “material to chip or mulch”</p>	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
Industry SA	<p>Ref. Performance Criteria</p> <p>PC 2.5 Remove. This chip size is not variable with the mobile wood chippers used by the Arborist industry. Its all about removal of the tree waste, not about end product dimension.</p>	This change was incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
	<p>Ref. Performance Evidence</p> <p>We need to clarify what constitutes a load! A truckload of chips could represent an arborist crews entire day of work. 1 person in the arborist industry is unlikely to be physically capable of filling a 4-6 ton chip truck during a day at work. In the arboriculture field this would be impossible to accommodate during a training course. If we are all going to use the same UOC then this will be difficult.</p>	The requirement of “six loads of material” was replaced in the Performance Evidence with “two different species of material” as per feedback above.
Industry VIC	<p>Ref. Performance Criteria</p> <p>Agree, remove PC 2.5</p>	This change was incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
	<p>Ref. Performance Evidence</p> <p>Agree, remove “six loads of material”. Unrealistic expectation even if a "load" was defined.</p>	The requirement of “six loads of material” was replaced in the Performance Evidence with “two different species of material” as per feedback above.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPXXXXXX Operate integrated or split flail and wood chipper with crane		
RTO NSW	<p>Ref. Performance Criteria</p> <p>PC 4.4 – Remove. The operator does not replace parts of equipment</p>	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPXXXXXX Operate integrated or split flail and wood chipper with crane		
	<p>Ref. Knowledge Evidence:</p> <p>Add “procedures for removing, replacing and disposing of chains, chipper knives, counter knives and anvil according to manufacturer recommendations, workplace procedures and environmental protection practices”</p>	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPHAR3XXX Operate split flail and wood chipper fed by excavator with log grapple		
RTO NSW	<p>Ref. Application</p> <p>Replace “excavator with log grapple” with “mobile machine” to allow for other machines that are used to feed flail and chipper</p> <p>Add “in forest, plantation or land clearing settings”</p>	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
	<p>Ref. Performance Criteria</p> <p>Delete PC 3.2 and 3.3 as the tasks are performed by a different operator (the mobile machine)</p> <p>Amend PC 3.4 to read “Operate flail/chipper at feed rate applicable to safety and stability of machine, characteristics of material to be chipped, chip quality, capacity of flail and chipper and loading capacity of transport vehicles</p> <p>Amend PC 3.5 to read “Operate flail/chipper safely and efficiently to avoid harm to people, flail / chipper, other machines and the environment”</p> <p>Amend PC 3.10 to indicate site applicability (if applicable) for the task to load chipped material into transport vehicles</p> <p>Delete PC 4.4 the operator does not replace parts of equipment</p>	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
	<p>Ref. Performance Evidence:</p>	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<b>FWP HAR3XXX Operate split flail and wood chipper fed by excavator with log grapple</b>		
	<p>Replace “on four separate occasions” with “on one occasion” for the first requirement about planning, preparing and operating the machine effectively</p> <p>Replace “on two occasions” with “on start up and shut down operations” for the second requirement about routine inspection</p>	
	<p>Ref. Knowledge Evidence</p> <p>Add “procedures for removing, replacing and disposing of chains and cutters according to manufacturer recommendations, workplace procedures and environmental protection practices”</p>	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.
	<p>Ref. Assessment Conditions</p> <p>Add “if applicable” to “truck to load under resources, equipment and material</p>	These changes were incorporated in the unit, as suggested.

## Summary of feedback on deferred new units of competency

### Drone data and digital technology

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
General feedback		
Industry TAS	<p>I have reviewed both the digital data collection and UAV competency standards and have no issues with either.</p> <p>I assume with the UAV standard that the CASA requirements will be fully outlined and followed.</p>	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.
Industry SA	<p>As a side comment regarding drones, an issue we have is these cannot be used for monitoring fires presently. There are a number of CASA rules prohibiting the use of drones in this situation due to air traffic at low altitude combatting fires.</p> <p>Otherwise, another type of UAV sensor used in forestry is infrared (thermal). Similarly, the assessment of environmental aspects post-harvest can be completed this way.</p>	Thanks for your feedback, your comments are noted.
Industry VIC	The units looked very comprehensive to me	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.
Industry NSW	I have reviewed all document and the look good. There is nothing to add, they are very comprehensive and cover the basis.	Thanks for your feedback, your comments are noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPFGM4XXX Interpret and use image data in forestry planning and management		
Industry SA	<p>Ref: Knowledge Evidence</p> <p>Is "the delineation of burned areas" similar to "forest fire extent and damage"?</p> <p>Is "identification of cleared areas" similar to "identification and mapping of cutover areas"?</p>	These changes were incorporated as suggested

<b>Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues</b>		<b>Consideration and Proposed Resolution</b>
FWPFGM4XXX Interpret and use image data in forestry planning and management		
	Would it be better if we can re-state “assessment of impact of natural events on forests” as “forest damage assessment - fires, windthrows, pests, diseases” to consolidate the list?  Add “assessment of natural features, e.g. inliers, etc.” to the list.	
Industry VIC	Agree, covers all the necessary aspects.	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.

<b>Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues</b>		<b>Consideration and Proposed Resolution</b>
FWPFGM4XXX Plan unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) collection of forestry data		
Industry SA	PC 2.7 – Add “flying height and image overlaps”	This change was incorporated in the unit as suggested
Industry VIC	Agree, covers all the necessary aspects.	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.

<b>Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues</b>		<b>Consideration and Proposed Resolution</b>
FWPFGM4XXX Quality assure forestry data acquisition by unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV)		
Industry VIC	Agree, covers all the necessary aspects.	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPFGM4XXX Create digital forest operational map		
Industry SA	<p>Ref. Performance Criteria</p> <p>PC 1.7 - Remove the word “package” from “GIS software package” and add the word “other” before “equipment needed for the work”</p> <p>PC 2.1 – Add “map size”</p> <p>PC 2.2 - Replace with “Determine of availability of data according to work requirements”</p> <p>Add PCs as below and delete PC 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6. Configure maps for offline use is necessary to account for areas with no network coverage.</p> <p>2.3 Change map layout according to work requirements and software developer instructions</p> <p>2.4. Select base map according to work requirements and software developer instructions</p> <p>2.5 Configure maps for offline use and pop-ups according to work requirements and software developer instructions</p>	<p>These changes were incorporated in the unit as suggested.</p>
	<p>Ref. Knowledge Evidence</p> <p>Add to “procedure to create digital maps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• define and change map extent</li> <li>• change map scale</li> </ul>	<p>These items were added in the unit, as suggested.</p>
Industry VIC	<p>Agree, I think it would also be good to give them basic concepts of cartography.</p> <p>For example, how to use colours and symbology in a map, don't want hydro line to be in black.</p>	<p>A new knowledge item was added in the unit as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• basic concepts of cartography <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• colours and symbology used in a map</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Harvesting optimisation data

<b>Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues</b>		<b>Consideration and Proposed Resolution</b>
General feedback		
Industry SA	Our staff reviewed and was ok with the content of the optimisation units.	Thanks for your feedback, your support is noted.

## Summary of feedback on units proposed for deletion

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPFGM3209 Construct and maintain forest roads and tracks		
RTO NSW	I suspect that this is well-covered in the 'Civil Construction' training package, and with the advent of more external contracting and less new road construction, this unit likely has a limited-use future.	While this unit is underutilised, we will recommend the Industry Reference Committee to maintain it in the FWP Training Package based on the feedback stating that it may be required in the bushfire context.
Industry National	The unit may be useful and required in the bushfires context	
Gov WA	We have very limited enrolments in Western Australia in the four units of competencies which you are proposing to delete. We therefore support the deletion of these units	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPCOT3252 Use environmental care procedures to undertake fire salvage operations		
Industry National	The unit should be retained for salvage operations in NSW & VIC	While this unit is underutilised, we will recommend the Industry Reference Committee to maintain it in the FWP Training Package based on the feedback stating that it may be required in the bushfire context.
RTO WA	Disagree with deleting the unit ... covered already in fire salvage unit?	
Gov VIC	These four units have had very little/no delivery in Victoria. However, the scale of this seasons bushfires and changes to log supplies suggests a possible need for the skills offered in FWPCOT3252 Use environmental care procedures to undertake fire salvage operations.	
Gov WA	We have very limited enrolments in Western Australia in the four units of competencies which you are proposing to delete. We therefore support the deletion of these units	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPFGM2210 Implement animal pest control procedures		
Gov VIC	Pest control has been reported as a need to support the retention of biodiversity in fire zones but there are around 25 existing specialist pest management units in the AHC that could be applied for e.g. AHCPMG309 Apply pest animal control techniques and AHCPMG409 Implement a pest management plan that could be imported into FWP qualifications under the rules to replace FWPFGM2210 Implement animal pest control procedures.	<p>We reviewed the AHC units and will recommend the Industry Reference Committee to replace FWPFGM2210 with AHCPMG309 in the relevant FWP qualifications because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the content of <i>AHCPMG309 Apply pest animal control techniques</i> is very similar in scope and requirements with <i>FWPFGM2210 Implement animal pest control procedures</i>.</li> <li>no industry-specific item was identified in <i>AHCPMG309</i> that could affect training delivery or assessment in different industries or contexts.</li> </ul>
Gov WA	We have very limited enrolments in Western Australia in the four units of competencies which you are proposing to delete. We therefore support the deletion of these units	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
FWPCOT3262 Transport forestry produce using trucks		
RTO WA	Disagree with deleting the unit. Might be required in Sandalwood industry in WA	<p>While this unit is underutilised, we will recommend the Industry Reference Committee to maintain it in the FWP Training Package based on the feedback stating that it may be required in the Sandalwood industry in WA.</p>
Gov WA	We have very limited enrolments in Western Australia in the four units of competencies which you are proposing to delete. We therefore support the deletion of these units	