

Conservation and Land Management Project



Summary of Validation Feedback, Responses and Actions

1/05/2020

This project includes the review of nine Qualifications, where five have been revised, one has been redesigned and with three are proposed for deletion. The project has also developed two new skill sets and reviewed 71 units of competency, resulting in the proposal to delete three units and the development of 19 new units within the AHC Agriculture, Horticulture and Conservation and Land Management Training Package. Draft materials were developed as a result of initial input from Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) and were made available for broader stakeholder consultation and feedback between 7 November 2019 – 2 February 2020. During this time feedback was received via email, through online surveys, as well as in person at workshops or site visits, and by telephone. Input was received from 152 stakeholders around Australia, including 70 industry employers/employees, 4 from industry associations, 40 from Registered Training Organisations, 38 from Government bodies such as Departments of Environment, Primary Industries, Fire Authorities, Biodiversity, Local Government Authorities and State Training Authorities.

Prior to validation, a questionnaire was circulated to SME group for feedback and direction on concerns raised during the 'Drafts Available' stage relating to name changes of qualifications and the new fire unit being designed within the AHC training package. Eight phone conferences were also coordinated with SMEs to resolve the name of the qualifications and issues raised about the FIR units of competency.

Validation was conducted through on-line surveys, phone calls and email, in place of face to face meetings, due to the social distancing requirement during the COVID 19 pandemic from 20th March through to 19th April 2020 with SMEs. Representation was broad and included:

- Government agencies or their RTOs from NT (2), WA (3), Vic (1)
- Industry Associations – National (2) Qld and WA
- Industry (Employers or Employees) – Vic (4), SA and NSW
- Industry/RTO – Vic (2)
- RTO's Nat (1), NSW (4), NT (2), Qld (1), SA (1), Vic (9) and WA (1)

Due to the COVID 19 pandemic, many stakeholders did not have the time to complete the validation surveys. Instead they sent emails to Skills Impact saying they support all changes and updates made as a part of the project and validate all new and reviewed components. There were eight such emails representing all states and territories except the ACT. ACT stakeholders were offered to provide feedback but at this time have not respond to Skills Impact. The Australian Services Union supported the project being undertaken and has not provided further feedback.

As a direct result of feedback received, changes were made to the documents under review. Most notably amendments and minor adjustments to the Electives for the specialisations in the qualifications. Changes were also made to some units of competency to comply with current industry standards and, in the case of the FIR units to distinguish the outcomes from those found in the PUA Public Safety Training Package.

A new title for the qualifications has been suggested by some industry stakeholders, to describe them as the Certificate or Diploma in Conservation and Ecosystem Management. This suggestion will need broad consultation initially with the Amenity Horticulture, Landscaping, Conservation & Land Management IRC for them to consider an appropriate consultation process. It is not in the scope of this project to make such fundamental changes to qualification names without due consideration being given by all members of the IRC and guidance provided on matters of this magnitude.

Visit the [Skills Impact website](#) to view a full list of the documents that were submitted for consultation during this phase.

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

	ACT	NSW	NT	Qld	SA	Tas	Vic	WA	National
Industry (employer / employee)									
Industry Associations									
Unions									
Registered Training Organisation (RTO)									
Government department									

Note: ACT Stakeholders were involved in the project consultations until December when their priorities shifted due to the bushfires and COVID-19 pandemic. They did not have the time to offer feedback for the validation phase of the project.

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

Acronyms - PC – performance criteria, PE – performance evidence, KE – knowledge evidence, AC – assessment conditions, SMEs – Subject Matter Experts

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

Table of Contents

Summary of validation feedback on Qualifications.....	4
General feedback on qualifications.....	4
Redesigned qualification	6
Revised qualifications	13
Proposed qualifications for deletion	36
Summary of validation feedback on Skill Sets	38
New skill sets.....	38
Summary of validation feedback on Units of Competency.....	39
New units of competency	39
Revised units of competency – Please note all NAR units are now coded ECR.	51
Proposed units of competency for deletion	80

Summary of validation feedback on Qualifications

General feedback on qualifications

General comments during validation		
SMEWG	<p>Just a quick update. From the feedback we received and the discussions had between SME's, this is what has been recommended in terms of the names of the project's components.</p> <p>The Marine sector of units will remain Marine. Feedback suggests that as the sector only covers marine environments, the name is appropriate. If there is a need for more non-marine units to be created in the future these can always have a separate sector be created to house them.</p> <p>The unit sector Natural Area Restoration (NAR) will be renamed Ecological Restoration (ECR). This has been suggested as being a better descriptor of the units within the sector.</p> <p>The names of the Certificates and Diploma - It has been suggested that the name Conservation and Ecosystem Management be brought forward, replacing Conservation and Land Management.</p>	<p>Recommendations have been noted and applied to training package components. See individual components below.</p> <p>In regard to the potential name change of the Certificates and Diploma, this suggestion will need broad consultation initially with the Amenity Horticulture, Landscaping, Conservation & Land Management IRC for them to consider an appropriate consultation process.</p>
RTO Vic	Stakeholder approves of all project name changes recommended	Stakeholder feedback has been noted. Skills Impact will discuss the suggested name change of the qualifications with the Amenity Horticulture, Landscaping, Conservation & Land Management IRC for them to consider an appropriate consultation process.
RTO Vic RTO Vic	<p>I have strong disagreement with this suggested name change, not because of definition in terms of science, but because of branding. Almost all people who manage ecosystems in Australia are not ecologists. The Diploma originally was named the Diploma of Natural Resource Management (NRM). NRM was problematic because it ignored indigenous people; caring for country. Land is a well understood word amongst people who work and live on land. The Mabo case was about land even though the people involved are strongly linked with the sea. The problems on the Great Barrier Reef are linked with land management and activities on land. In Victoria the management of our freshwater aquatic systems concern the Murray Darling Basin Plan, principally about people who live on the land and manage land, and the Catchment and Land Protection Act 1994 (there are equivalents in other states) key principle is the protection of</p>	<p>Thank you for this feedback which has been recorded and noted.</p> <p>All the feedback will be provided to the Amenity Horticulture, Landscaping, Conservation & Land Management IRC for them to consider an appropriate consultation process. It is not in the scope of this project to make such fundamental changes to qualification names without due consideration being given by all members of the IRC and guidance provided on matters of this magnitude.</p>

	<p>vegetation and therefore aquatic systems. If you are a freshwater or marine ecologist you will appreciate the central importance of management on land. These qualifications are not about fisheries. Who is the industry we training for?</p> <p>If you want to want to follow the logic of the idea of ecosystem then let's be more inclusive, and use the word Biosphere. For ecologists it makes sense, but for primary producers, indigenous people, and lay people (ie people who manage land but are not necessarily scientists, the majority), it is exclusive. Our major challenge is not the science but persuading others who will determine the outcome of problems science can help solve.</p> <p>Ecosystem and conservation are exclusive words to many, let's keep land or country in the title, not for science but for a lack of a better word, branding.</p>	
<p>RTO Vic RTO Vic</p>	<p>Just a quick feedback email in response to the Conservation and Land Management validation</p> <p>I wished to pass on that I am supportive of the name change of CLM to Conservation and Ecosystem Management.</p>	<p>Stakeholder feedback has been noted. Skills Impact will discuss the suggested name change of the qualifications with the Amenity Horticulture, Landscaping, Conservation & Land Management IRC for them to consider an appropriate consultation process.</p>

Redesigned qualification

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Certificate III in Conservation and Ecosystem Management		
RTO Vic	<p>See copy of qualification emailed: Titles of qualifications are capitalised - Certificate III in Conservation and Land Management. Capitals also for specialisations here?</p> <p>Re-biosecurity unit: Including biosecurity measures in daily work practices is very important in CLM. With three core and more than 100 units that can be used to select the 14 others, there is considerable flexibility for a range of job roles. However, it does allow the possibility of a qualification that lacks any inclusion of plants, animals, pests, water and biosecurity if that too is removed from the core. The current AHC BIO305 is in the context of biosecurity for a property (farm) so assume the unit referred to is to be the next release (yet to be endorsed). Alternatively the next release of the yet to be endorsed unit AHC BIO201 Inspect and clean machinery, tools and equipment to preserve biosecurity would provide the practical skills for daily work in CLM.</p>	<p>Corrected capitalisation.</p> <p>Comment regarding biosecurity has been noted. The latest version of AHC BIO305 has been reviewed and revised to make it more usable in all AHC Training package qualifications, with all mention of 'farm' removed.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Gov/RTO WA	<p>Group C lands parks and wildlife As one of the main CLM RTOs in WA, this stream of units is what we mostly use on a day to day basis and as such we would like to make the following recommendations</p> <p>It is these units that we do not have on our TAS and are not likely to use anytime in the near future. AHCFAU301 Respond to wildlife emergencies AHCLPW306 Undertake water sampling AHCLPW3XX Operate unmanned aerial system for conservation work STTGDE002 Work as a guide</p> <p>We would like to add the following units below to this stream AHCINF301 Implement property improvement construction and repair AHCINF303 Plan and construct conventional fencing AHCWRK305 Coordinate worksite activities AHCWRK311 Conduct site inspections AHCWRK309 Apply environmentally sustainable work practices FWPCOT3202 Navigate in remote or trackless areas AHCLPW304 Carry out inspection of designated area</p> <p>We would like to see this as one of the bigger streams of units, as all these UOCs are based around and have a strong focus of what Conservation and Land Management is all about</p> <p>Understandably these are only recommendations from WA parks and wildlife point of view, we do feel quite strongly about what changes we would like to see though.</p> <p>Group F Marine</p> <p>MARC037 really like the idea of including this in the package, as it's a life skill that the majority of our rangers that come through our programs are required to have.</p>	Recommendations adopted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<p>COXWAINS units love to see the inclusion of some Coxswains units, as the majority of our rangers are saltwater people, there is a high potential, they will be identified as a candidate to get put through the Coxswains qualification. So, to have a CLM qualification with a specialised marine stream will be of huge benefit. We are a big candidate to see this implemented.</p>	
Industry Assoc Nat	<p>I would like to see AHCPMG414 Apply predator trapping techniques add to the electives under Group E. This would provide the opportunity for students to get a better education in vertebrate pest control and in particular predator management (wild dogs and foxes) for which there is a high industry demand. AHCPMG307 Apply animal trapping techniques does not provide sufficient training to effectively trap wild dogs, foxes and feral cats as it is a far more generic animal trapping competency that focuses on cage traps and other techniques not suited to predator's management in open landscapes.</p>	<p>Recommendation adopted. Added <i>AHCPMG414 Apply predator trapping techniques</i> to Pest Controller specialisation.</p>
Gov/RTO WA	<p>AHCBIO305 Apply Biosecurity measures Strongly do not agree with this unit being a core unit, as it discusses applying criteria, evidence and conditions to farming activities. We at DBCA do not undertake any farming activities and as such, unless the unit is re-written, we would struggle to meet the requirements for this unit.</p>	<p>Adopted recommendation. Biosecurity unit removed from the core and placed in the elective units bank.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Gov/RTO WA	17 units is too many, it should remain at 16 units Core units need to be reviewed as they are achievable in their current context	Adopted recommendation. Biosecurity unit removed from the core and placed in the elective units bank.
RTO NSW	Supports the qualification	Thank you for your feedback and support for the qualification.
Industry (Employer) Vic	AHCCHM307 Prepare and apply chemicals to control pest, weeds and diseases AHCPMG301 Control weeds should be electives in Group B Ecological restoration	These units are available in the general electives as they are generic across most of the specialisations.
RTO Vic	Supports the qualification	Thank you for your feedback and support for the qualification,
RTO WA Gov NT	Add SFICRO2X5 Work safely in crocodile waterways SFICRO3X3 Conduct crocodile surveys SFICRO2X1 Prepare to work with crocodiles to electives in the Certificate III	Adopted recommendation.
RTO NSW	The Apply Biosecurity Measures unit is too farm-based - it needs to be expanded to include the option for natural area contexts such as bushland reserves. Great to see the core unit of Conduct Ecological site inspections. And also good to see Conduct prescribed burning in this qual as well.	The unit <i>AHCBIO305 Apply biosecurity procedures</i> has been reviewed and now encompasses all branches of agriculture, horticulture and land management.
RTO Vic	Just a quick feedback email in response to the Conservation and Land Management validation. I wished to pass on that I am supportive of the name change of CLM to Conservation and Ecosystem Management. I also think that enabling 4 units (from group A or B) be selected, provides RTOs the ability to adapt to the needs of the group.	Thank you for your feedback. Skills Impact will discuss the potential name change of the qualification with the Amenity Horticulture, Landscaping, Conservation & Land Management IRC for them to consider an appropriate consultation process. It is not in the scope of this project to make such fundamental changes to qualification names without due consideration being given by all members of the IRC and guidance provided on matters of this magnitude.
Industry/RTO Vic	Strongly does not support the notion of Conservation and Ecosystem Management would prefer to leave the title as it is or if water needs to be added	Thank you for this feedback which has been recorded and noted. All the feedback will be provided to the Amenity Horticulture, Landscaping, Conservation & Land Management IRC for their consideration and direction on the final naming of the CLM qualifications. It is not in the scope of this project to make such fundamental changes to qualification names without due consideration being given by all members of the IRC and guidance provided on matters of this magnitude.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
RTO NSW	Strongly does not support the notion of Conservation and Ecosystem Management would prefer to leave the title as it is or if water needs to be added Has concerns that conservative environment Land management is understood and accepted term rather than ecosystems	Thank you for this feedback which has been recorded and noted. All the feedback will be provided to the Amenity Horticulture, Landscaping, Conservation & Land Management IRC for their consideration and direction on the final naming of the CLM qualifications. It is not in the scope of this project to make such fundamental changes to qualification names without due consideration being given by all members of the IRC and guidance provided on matters of this magnitude.
Industry (Employer) Vic	The biosecurity unit as a core is too farm orientated. Agree that biosecurity is a real and increasing issue and needs addressing but needs a new unit if it is to be core. Definitely need cert III conduct ecological burn as an option with a pre-requisites of burning. Packaging rules are a bit confusing	The unit <i>AHCBIO305 Apply biosecurity procedures</i> has been reviewed and now encompasses all branches of agriculture, horticulture and land management. Comment for support of new fire unit has been noted.
Industry Assoc Nat, VIC	The new units don't seem to be listed in the Qualifications nor are the old units they are replacing removed. (e.g Carry out NAR is still listed in Cert II when we asked for it to be replaced with 'Perform basic ecological restoration works' and for the revised 'Carry out Ecological Restoration' to be a Cert III unit so that it can also be used in higher quals.) So it is not possible to validate the qualifications till we can see the new units in them and the ones to be replaced removed. Then we can check how these things are packaged and make sure they are deliverable. This comment also applies to Cert II so I will place it there..	AHCNAR201 Carry out natural area restoration works, has been deleted and replaced with <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works</i> . Two units for revegetation/restoration were designed and included in the qualification: <i>AHCECR3XX Implement assisted regeneration works</i> <i>AHCECR3XX Implement ecosystem reconstruction works</i> New codes will also be updated before final documentation.
Industry Assoc Qld	Supports the Qualification	Thank you for your feedback and support for the qualification.
Industry Assoc WA	Seven specialisations (or are they streams) seems rather high. I wonder if 'fire' is not a subset of 'land'? I query whether 'ecological restoration' is not a subset of 'land' also? I also think the word 'parks' should be deleted from 'land parks and wildlife'. Conservation activities occur outside of parks - such as public open space, farms, pastoral stations, aboriginal lands, road verges, riverbanks. Agree with Ron's comment about reducing the number of general Units. No need to specify what could be imported. Just change the title to 'Conservation'!! Yes I am sure someone will say what about restoration, but restoration is a form of conservation; we restore to conserve.	SME advised that the number of electives are representative of the various types of activities possible across the various states and territories for conservation and ecological work. Some rationalisation of the Group H General electives has been made. Thank you for this feedback on the name for the qualifications which has been recorded and noted. All the feedback will be provided to the Amenity Horticulture, Landscaping, Conservation & Land Management IRC for their consideration and direction on the final naming of the CLM qualifications. It is not in the scope of this project to make such

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
		fundamental changes to qualification names without due consideration being given by all members of the IRC and guidance provided on matters of this magnitude.
Industry (Employer) NT Gov NT Industry (Employer) NT	<p>Review of the elective units has resulted in a request for units of competencies become available within the certificate III in Conservation and Land Management. Although 'ACMGAS305 Rescue animals and apply basic first aid' is currently under review within the Animal Care and Management qualifications and scheduled to be updated to ACMGAS305 Provide basic animal first aid revised unit', this unit is also available within the certificate III in Conservation and Land Management as an elective. There would be an opportunity for an additional five units to be added as an elective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACMACR3X5 Support veterinary activities in remote communities - New unit • HLTPOP010 - Monitor and maintain dog health in the community – under review, scheduled to be re coded as HLTPOP034 • ACMINF301 - Comply with infection control policies and procedures in animal care work • ACMINF304 - Promote environmental health and safety for companion animals in remote communities • ACMCAS304 - Capture, handle and transport companion animals <p>The purpose of utilising these units within the conservation and land management qualification would support the ongoing working currently occurring across the Northern Territory including the healthy homes program in the Thamarrurr Region with the vision for accredited training to support the workforce. The program builds capacity and awareness of community members by inducing people</p>	The ACM units are rather unique to a small sector of the CLM industry and provision for the importation of up to 4 units has been provided to allow the importation of these units if required by clients.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<p>about various health issues and ways each household can make improvements to combat these issues with a collaborative approach. Beyond this program Rangers' groups across the Northern Territory undertaking these activities as part of their current job role.</p>	
<p>Industry (Employer) NT Gov NT Industry (Employer) NT</p>	<p>Review of the Marine OR Aquatic specialisation the following request has been received. • Remove unit – AHCMAR2XX Identify and collect marine life • Replace with – SFIOBS302 Collect reliable scientific data and samples Replace all MAR units with one unit to give an overview of safety as these units are covered under elements of shipboard safety and if a person partaking in this work is on the job, they should actually be looking towards a coxswain due to safety measures. The unit/s that could replace this from our experience is – SFICPL301 Maintain operational safety AND AHCWRK304 Respond to rescue incident's.</p>	<p>Support has been secured for the new unit and the MAR specialisation in the Certificate III qualification Changes recommended would not meet the outcomes sought by industry. The Unit <i>SFIOBS302 Collect reliable scientific data and samples</i> is at too high a level for the Certificate II and does not have the same focus required by <i>AHCMAR2XX Identify and collect marine life</i>.</p>
<p>Industry (Employer) NT Gov NT Industry (Employer) NT</p>	<p>A list of 18 electives was recommended to be included in the Certificate III qualification in soft copy</p>	<p>The list of units was reviewed. All but two units are included in the electives. <i>MARN008 Apply seamanship skills aboard a vessel up to 12 metres</i> and <i>AHCPGD306 Implement a maintenance program for an aquatic environment</i> were recommended as imported units due to their specific outcomes.</p>

Revised qualifications

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Certificate I in Conservation and Ecosystem Management		
RTO Vic	<p>See soft copy of qualification emailed</p> <p>Re Title: Agree that the CLM is well recognised in industry at this time after 18 years of use. When CLM was first used for the TP RTD02 it replaced accredited course titles such as Natural Resource Management. Those qualifications were also well recognised in industry at that time and the change of title and use of the word 'land' in the title was hotly disputed given that it was not inclusive of marine and freshwater environments. Qualification titles should reflect the industry they serve. For the purpose of industry recognition, whatever the title, the Cert I should be consistent with the other certificates.</p> <p>Re - import level 3 units Can see the advantage but level III is probably too high for the outcomes of a level I qualification. Foundation skills levels mismatched.</p>	<p>Thank you for this feedback which has been recorded and noted.</p> <p>All the feedback will be provided to the Amenity Horticulture, Landscaping, Conservation & Land Management IRC for their consideration and direction on the final naming of the CLM qualifications. It is not in the scope of this project to make such fundamental changes to qualification names without due consideration being given by all members of the IRC and guidance provided on matters of this magnitude. Recommendation adopted re AQF level.</p>
RTO Qld	Yes supports the Qualification	Support for the qualification has been noted.
RTO NSW	The title should be Certificate 1 in Conservation and Ecosystem Management	Feedback noted
Industry (Employer) Vic	Yes supports the qualification	Support for the qualification has been noted.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
RTO NT, RTO NT, Gov NT	Support was obtained for changes to the core within the certificate I in Conservation and Land Management qualification. Unsure of the benefits to changing the name of the qualifications considering ecological activity is linked to, but not limited to biological or bacteria environment assessment and this function is done at a higher level qualification.	Support for the new qualification structure has been recorded. All the feedback will be provided to the Amenity Horticulture, Landscaping, Conservation & Land Management IRC for their consideration and direction on the final naming of the CLM qualifications. It is not in the scope of this project to make such fundamental changes to qualification names without due consideration being given by all members of the IRC and their guidance provided on matters of this magnitude.
Industry Assoc Qld	Supports the Qualification	Support for the qualification has been noted.
Certificate II in Conservation and Ecosystem Management		
RTO Vic	Re-Title: I note that the header suggests that the qualification title may change. Same comments as for Cert I – suggest keep qualification titles consistent. Re-Bio Unit Applies to all field work – suggest next release version (yet to be endorsed) should be in Group A. Extraneous wording in the Mapping table	Recommendations adopted. Moved BIO unit into Elective A Group with new title and code. Qualification titles are consistent. Removed extraneous wording from mapping table.
RTO Qld	The number of general electives needs to be reduced to avoid duplication with horticulture	SMEWG were happy with the flexibility the number of units presents for this qualification.
RTO NSW	The title should be Certificate 2 in Conservation and Ecosystem Management	Thank you for this feedback which has been recorded and noted. All the feedback will be provided to the Amenity Horticulture, Landscaping, Conservation & Land Management IRC for their consideration and direction on the final naming of the CLM qualifications. It is not in the scope of this project to make such fundamental changes to qualification names without due consideration being given by all members of the IRC and guidance provided on matters of this magnitude.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry (Employer) Vic	<p>This course has the same issue as the old Cert IV - you can study the course and not be required to look at plants animals or ecosystems - just do machinery, First aid, business etc . Would like to see more core units, or an arrangement that made students at least required to study plants, animals or ecosystem. AHCILM202 Observe and report plants or animals would be the closest - better if this was a core of "Observe and report plants AND animals". The issue with having the ability to do lots of imported units is that you can get a qualification in CLM and not study any CLM core aspects.</p>	<p>SMEWG were happy with the core list of units and the flexibility the number of units presents for this qualification.</p>
RTO NT, RTO NT, Gov NT	<p>Support was obtained for changes to the Certificate II in Conservation and Land Management qualification. Unsure of the benefits to changing the name of the qualifications considering ecological activity is linked to, but not limited to biological or bacteria environment assessment and this function is done at a higher level qualification.</p>	<p>Thank you for this feedback which has been recorded and noted.</p> <p>All the feedback will be provided to the Amenity Horticulture, Landscaping, Conservation & Land Management IRC for their consideration and direction on the final naming of the CLM qualifications. It is not in the scope of this project to make such fundamental changes to qualification names without due consideration being given by all members of the IRC and guidance provided on matters of this magnitude.</p>
Industry Assoc Nat	<p>This is the same comment I have made for the other qualifications. The new units don't seem to be listed in the Qualifications nor are the old units they are replacing removed. (e.g Carry out NAR is still listed in Cert II when we asked for it to be replaced with 'Perform basic ecological restoration works' and for the revised 'Carry out Ecological Restoration' to be a Cert III unit so that it can also be used in higher quals.) So it is not possible to validate the qualifications till we can see the new units in them and the ones to be replaced removed. Then we can check how these things are packaged and make sure they are deliverable</p>	<p>Updated Group A electives with current confirmed electives: <i>AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works replaced AHCNAR3XX Carry out natural area restoration works.</i></p> <p>Further code changes will appear in final documentation.</p>
Industry Assoc Qld	<p>Supports the Qualification</p>	<p>Support for the qualification has been noted.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry Assoc WA	I agree with developer comment in that there are far too many electives in groups A and B. I suggest that any Unit that is not AHCxxx be closely examined and removed unless vital. Most of them can be additional or imported units.	SME advised that the number of electives are representative of the various types of activities possible across the various states and territories for conservation and ecological work.
Certificate IV in Conservation and Ecosystem Management		
RTO Vic	<p>I wish to provide feedback in relation to the additional entry requirements which have recently been added to two qualifications i.e. Certificate IV in Conservation and Land Management and Diploma of Land Management i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cert IV CLM - Completed at least 6 months equivalent full time working experience in a job related to Conservation and Land Management • Diploma CLM - Completed at least 12 months equivalent full time working experience in a job related to Conservation and Land Management <p>We have a robust student cohort who are studying both qualifications many of whom wish to pursue a career in Conservation and Land Management. If this stipulation is introduced it would severely restrict any students from undertaking these qualifications. Many of our students undertake study to pursue a career and if this is introduced it will dramatically reduce their opportunities. Even if they undertook a Certificate III in Conservation and Land Management there is no opportunity of progression as the current wording states that only if they can demonstrate full time work (not even part time over a defined period).</p> <p>If a student does not have already have a career they will not be able to access either of these two qualifications.</p> <p>This would be extremely detrimental to the fairness of providing students with an opportunity to pursue a career in this industry. Many of our students are employed at the conclusion of their training as employers know that they have been given a strong</p>	Entry requirements have been removed.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	knowledge and opportunity for valid practical development of skills.	
RTO Vic	I am concerned about the addition of entry requirements for the Certificate IV and Diploma in CLM at this validation stage.	Entry requirements have been removed.
RTO Vic	<p>Recommend remove this entry requirement. What evidence is there to include an entry requirement? There is no entry requirement for AHC40916 current release 5 or any previous releases. This entry requirement is vague in terms of pre-existing skills and will be a barrier to the uptake of this qualification by learners who want this course to help them enter the industry and are not eligible for funding support for the Certificate III. There is plenty of scope to customise the course for the learner/cohort with up to 4 out of 12 units able to be imported from AQF III.</p> <p>Re Packaging rules: There are 70 in the Group A and Group B elective lists from which to select at least 7 units. Does including the requirement for at least 3 out of the 16 units listed in group A strengthen the qualification?</p> <p>Re Group B Electives Suggest review the included imported units included in this list. They could be imported under the rules given that up to four units can be imported from any other currently endorsed Training Package at AQF III.</p> <p>Re- AHCPMG 507,508,509 Units in Electives: These three PMG diploma units could be imported under the rules rather than be included in this list for this Cert IV. Also is specialist Cert IV CLM PMG qual AHC41716</p> <p>Re PUA units in the Group B Electives: Should all these PUA units be included? There is PUAFIR402 in the Group A list (it has three PUA prerequisites – two units at AQF II and one at III). Selecting that unit would include four out of 12 units to be fire related. Then can select another 4 PUA units and/or required prerequisites to make 8 PUA units out of the 12 required for this AHC CLM qualification. Suggest review.</p>	Entry requirements have been removed.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
RTO Qld	My preference would be seeing a merging of the two Certificate IV qualifications. The concept of streams as done at the Certificate III should be applied. I find the new Certificate III a significantly enhanced product compared to be beforehand.	Pest management is a separate qualification supported by the Pest Management sector. This qualification was reviewed as it was not included in a previous review and was not intended to be merged with CLM qualifications.
RTO NSW	The title should be Certificate IV in Conservation and Ecosystem Management	Thank you for this feedback which has been recorded and noted. All the feedback will be provided to the Amenity Horticulture, Landscaping, Conservation & Land Management IRC for their consideration and direction on the final naming of the CLM qualifications. It is not in the scope of this project to make such fundamental changes to qualification names without due consideration being given by all members of the IRC and guidance provided on matters of this magnitude.
Industry/RTO Vic	The addition of a prerequisite will reduce the number of people enrolling in the course which will lead to RTOs to stop delivering the qualification which will reduce the level of knowledge within the industry. And push training back onto industry. Even volunteering with a friends group (which may or may not be considered equivalent to work) for 3 hours a week means approx. 6 years to get to the equivalent of 6months full time work (maybe my maths is wrong but it would be a long time).From experience, in the average class of 15 students possibly 2 would meet the proposed pre-requisite condition. There would be no incentive for someone to take a chance and enter the industry. Some of the best students who are now working quite successfully in industry would not have been allowed to undertake the training which allowed them to get into the industry. I understand the desire for some prerequisite but maybe a lower qual and/or the experience would not reduce student numbers to unviable levels.	Entry requirements have been removed.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
RTO SA	<p>Can you please explain the reasoning behind the following prerequisites for the Cert IV and Diploma which were not in the documents for comment in the draft stage?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cert IV CLM - Completed at least 6 months equivalent full time working experience in a job related to conservation and land management • Diploma CLM - Completed at least 12 months equivalent full time working experience in a job related to conservation and land management <p>We have a pathways program in TAFE SA where students can apply for the Diploma in CLM with pathway to University. The prerequisite make it very hard for our Uni pathway model to survive. Can there be changes to this to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cert IV CLM - Completed at least 6 months equivalent full time working experience in a job related to conservation and land management or a certificate III in CLM or related industry • Diploma CLM - Completed at least 12 months equivalent full time working experience in a job related to conservation and land management or a certificate III in CLM or related industry 	<p>The prerequisites were added through feedback received late in the public consultation period.</p> <p>There has been a significant push to remove these prerequisites, and the original person who requested their inclusion has since withdrawn this request.</p> <p>As such, there will be no pre-requisites in the final drafts.</p>
RTO NSW	<p>I did suggest AHC BIO305 Apply biosecurity measures should be a core in feedback earlier in the process. But I guess if I am the only one who has that view then I understand it would not be feasible.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. SMEWG advised to remove this unit from the core list of units and have it as an elective.</p>
RTO WA	<p>Add SFICRO4X1 Manage crocodile incidents SFICRO4X4 Capture transport and release crocodiles to electives in the Certificate IV</p>	<p>Adopted recommendation.</p>
Industry (Employer) Vic RTO Vic	<p>RE the prerequisite requirement of students to have done 6 or 12 months of volunteer labour. I have run a bushland regeneration business for almost 25 years. I currently have 25 staff, 20 of which work in the field. So I'm speaking from the point of view of an employer of Tafe graduates, both Cert IV and Diploma in Conservation or Horticulture. I have deep concerns about the</p>	<p>Entry requirements have been removed.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<p>new requirement of asking people to do 6 months or 12 months volunteer work in the field, before they are able to study. This is a huge commitment for a prospective student trying to enter a Cert IV. It's unheard of. On a 36-hour week, this equates to approx. \$20,000 of labour in 6 months, plus the fact they couldn't work elsewhere while doing this. This is a huge figure. What happens if they can't get into a course at the end of that time? As an employer, I would be 'hiring' someone for 6 to 12 months, and their initial mistakes and training would be at my risk. Not all employees work out as you surely know. Any people that show promise, I would then lose to the TAFE course for several years at least. While the volunteer would get experience, I'm not sure how the industry would accommodate such 'volunteers'. If anything, this system is likely to lead to a perpetuation of using unskilled volunteer labour in place of skilled paid labour. Conservation has always suffered from the perception that 'anyone can chuck a plant in the ground'. Its completely untrue and creating yet another avenue of volunteer labour devalues the reputation of contractors and those they employ. If the idea of this volunteering is to boost the practical skills of TAFE graduates, there are other ways this can be achieved that are more in line with other industries. Shorter time periods of work placement/work experience is an obvious one. This should be done as part of the course within the course timeframe, so only enrolled students need do it. Then when they graduate, they are able to fully commit to a long-term arrangement with an employer, free of other commitments/interruptions. On a slightly separate note, students should have a better opportunity to do small certificates such as chain sawing, 4wd operation, Chemcert. Every government contract wants these, not to mention the requirements of WHS. This has always been the case. Yet TAFE has always treated these as casual add-ons because they are not done in-house. This needs to change. I encourage you to contact me to discuss further if you wish.</p>	
<p>RTO Vic</p> <p>I am very concerned about the recent proposed changes to the entry requirements in the (Revised) final draft. I have 20 years experience in the industry as a practitioner, academic and teacher and am aware of the complexities of aligning qualifications with different areas of expertise. However, I foresee</p>	<p>Entry requirements have been removed.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<p>that to mandate a minimum requirement of 6-month and 12-month work experience for prospective certificate IV and diploma students respectively, would be detrimental to the industry across all sectors. I also foresee that this would cause the collapse of many conservation courses at VET level. The implementation of these changes is like putting the cart before the horse. In my experience, most students undertaking these courses, are either school leavers or people seeking a change in career. Many bring a wealth of prior experiences and skills (e.g. management, trade skills, finance, law, risk management, planning etc.) that can be useful for a range of job roles. Particularly, if this industry continues to develop and diversify. Each year, approximately one-third of our students end up gaining paid, part-time work whilst completing their studies. Many other students gain experience by volunteering for environmental groups. For the majority of prospective students, these changes will undermine their ability to receive an education in the field and find a pathway into the industry or further education at university. It could also increase the number of unskilled and undereducated people working in the field. The science and policy surrounding conservation and land management (i.e. restoration, fire management, pest control) is constantly evolving. I have received a lot of positive feedback about the calibre of our graduates and how they have performed in the workplace. These graduates have been seen as dependable by their employers, in terms of being able to effectively communicate conservation science and practices with colleagues and with clients. I cannot stress more that the proposed changes to the entry requirements for cert IV CLM should be revoked.</p>	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
RTO NSW	<p>This qual needs an ecology unit as a core. The entry requirement of 6 months work experience in the CLM industry will preclude most students from enrolling in this course, in my experience as a Tafe teacher over the last 5 years. This is too restrictive in my opinion. An alternative option is they could do a practicum unit through voluntary or paid work experience. The WHS unit is written to suit WHS officers in a workplace. If unemployed students are doing this unit, it is really difficult for them to be able to complete it.</p>	<p>Entry requirements have been removed. SMEWG approves of the current list of core units.</p>
Industry (Employer) Vic	<p>Need Conduct an Ecological and cultural site assessment unit as core, or another method of having to have ecology, plants and animals having to be studied. Would be good to have the unit Conduct an ecological burn as an elective. Entry requirement of 6 months work experience is not agreed but if industry requires more practical experience could require a practicum unit for those who don't have work experience. cert IV is a good level of learning.</p>	<p>SME felt the range of Group A electives would address this by focussing on industry specific units.</p> <p><i>PUAFIR402 Conduct simple prescribed burns</i> has been included in the electives</p> <p>Entry requirements have been removed.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<p>RTO Vic</p> <p>I am stunned and extremely concerned about the recent proposed changes to the entry requirements in the (Revised) final draft of the Certificate IV and Diploma in Conservation & Land management (CLM) training packages where it states; “Pre-requisite for Cert IV CLM – Must have completed at least 6 months equivalent full time working experience in a job related to conservation and land management and pre-requisite for Diploma CLM – Must have completed at least 12 months equivalent full time working experience in a job related to conservation and land management” I have over 30 years’ experience in the industry employed as a Park ranger and as a Park manager, 26 of these years was with Parks Victoria and five years with local councils. I have been teaching both the Cert IV and Diploma CLM for the past 15 years and am well aware of the intricacies of supporting qualifications with different areas of expertise. For a person to gain part-time or full-time employment in an industry sector the person would first need to gain experience in that sector. With no experience the only way to gain that experience would be to do voluntary work in that sector. How long would a person need to do voluntary work to gain enough work experience and knowledge to be able to address the position description and criteria for employment in the CLM sector? The answer would possibly be many years. The person would then find out to their dismay that they may also, in many cases, be required to be the holder of a Cert IV or Diploma in CLM. It reminds me of the age old saying “How can I get enough experience required to address the experience requirement to get employment without first getting a job to gain the experience...?” To me, this seems absolutely ludicrous. No school leavers could apply to study; No career changers could apply to study; No person wanting to increase their knowledge of CLM could apply: Currently these three cohorts make up about 90% of our class enrolments. Even a part-time employee in the CLM sector who has been employed for less than 6 or 12 months could not apply. For these reasons I would completely expect that to include this pre-requisite as a minimum requirement of 6-month and 12-month work experience for prospective certificate IV and diploma students would be damaging to the industry sectors and that this entry requirement could possibly cause the end of many conservation and land management courses that are currently</p>	<p>Entry requirements have been removed.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues

Consideration and Proposed Resolution

operating with each year about a third of our students attaining paid part-time work whilst still completing their studies. The best alternative to gaining experience in a sector is to enrol in a reputable RTO and training course which will provide you that experience. Therefore it is important that RTO's understand the Industry's entry requirements and ensure that they offer the appropriate units of learning to address this matter so that students gain a thorough appreciation and experience that they will require to gain employment. This can be delivered successfully, whilst addressing the performance criteria, by providing the necessary practical experience with industry related field trips or by encouraging and connecting students with volunteer opportunities, whilst completing their studies, with industry organisations. It is also achieved by offering and encouraging students to enrol in additional short courses such as chainsaw operation, Chemical users' certificate, White card and plant & machinery operation...." If RTO's cannot satisfy this practical experience or are unable to work closely with industry groups then a far safer alternative to enable those students with little or no practical experience in the CLM related industry would be for the Cert IV CLM training course to include one or two of the following Cert III units: AHCMOM305- Operate specialised machinery and equipment; AHCMOM302- Perform machinery maintenance; AHCMOM304- Operate machinery and equipment "As far as the Diploma CLM is concerned we could either return to the days of when a Cert IV CLM was a pre-requisite for the Diploma CLM or to continue to recognise the Diploma CLM as it is, which is a Diploma level course and understand that requiring twelve months of full time or part time employment experience (after many years of voluntary work experience to gain that experience) in the industry is as absurd as expecting any other training package to expect the same of their applicants, eg. Nursing, Legal, IT, hospitality, etc. etc....." If the reason for the inclusion of the pre-requisites is being driven by a lack of work experience in the sector of some job applicants then I would prefer we look closely at the RTO's requirement to provide that experience as part of their training package requirements rather than creating a circle of frustration and hopelessness for those wanting to gain experience as a pre-requisite to obtaining and or furthering their education in the CLM sector. In summary, the

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<p>current Cert IV and Diploma CLM certificates already provide for many opportunities that address the performance criteria, knowledge and skills to gain experience in the CLM sector, both within the training modules and during non-training days and term breaks and by attending short courses as mentioned previously and therefore the pre-requisites for both Cert IV and Diploma CLM must be removed so that RTO's can ensure the continuation of ever increasing student enrolments in these courses.</p>	
<p>Industry Assoc Qld</p>	<p>Consider removing the requirement for students to have done 65 months full time work in the industry as this may prove to be an impediment to training.</p>
	<p>Entry requirements have been removed.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry Assoc WA	<p>Add AHCWRK401 Implement and monitor quality assurance procedures to the Core. There are way to many electives. Many of the elective Units need to be reconsidered. Many are quite specific when a Cert IV should be broadening out skills across many areas. They could be combined with foci on planning, supervising and reviewing a range of conservation activities. Also, some may sound nice, but no one is using them!! AHCCCF415 for example has had only 3 commencements in 2015 to 18. The overall qual still looks like a mish-mash of current Units thrown together rather than built from the ground up. This should be draft for consultation - not ready for validation.</p>	<p>During the Draft stage of development SME advised that the number of core and electives are representative of the various types of activities across the different states and territories for conservation and ecological work. SMEWG reviewed the units within the qualification and do not believe that the qualification looks like a mish mash of units, rather they feel it reflects the work undertaken by a worker at this AQF level. Work undertaken during the 3 month public consultation stage was thorough and completed with a great deal of feedback received.</p>
RTO NSW, Industry Assoc Nat Industry (Employer) Qld Industry Assoc Vic	<p>SME's recommended adding the Certificate III New core unit <i>AHC3XX Conduct an ecological and cultural site inspection prior to works</i> into the core of the Certificate IV to ensure some ecological understanding is acquired in the Certificate IV. This task would be conducted on a job site at this level as a matter of course and contributes to an industry outcome.</p> <p>Change the requirement for electives to 3 to retain 12 units maximum in the packaging rules.</p>	<p>Adopted recommendation.</p>
Certificate IV in Pest Management		
RTO Qld	<p>My preference would be seeing a merging of the two Certificate IV qualifications. The concept of streams as done at the Certificate III should be applied. I find the new Certificate III a significantly enhanced product compared to be beforehand.</p>	<p>Pest management is a separate qualification supported by the Pest Management sector.</p> <p>This qualification has been reviewed as it was not included in a previous PMG review some years ago and was not intended to be merged with CLM qualifications. Pest Management experts where not eager to see the qualifications merged.</p>
Diploma of Conservation and Ecosystem Management		
RTO Vic	<p>I wish to provide feedback in relation to the additional entry requirements which have recently been added to two qualifications i.e. Certificate IV in Conservation and Land Management and Diploma of Land Management i.e.</p>	<p>Entry requirements have been removed.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cert IV CLM - Completed at least 6 months equivalent full time working experience in a job related to Conservation and Land Management • Diploma CLM - Completed at least 12 months equivalent full time working experience in a job related to Conservation and Land Management <p>We have a robust student cohort who are studying both qualifications many of whom wish to pursue a career in Conservation and Land Management. If this stipulation is introduced it would severely restrict any students from undertaking these qualifications. Many of our students undertake study to pursue a career and if this is introduced it will dramatically reduce their opportunities. Even if they undertook a Certificate III in Conservation and Land Management there is no opportunity of progression as the current wording states that only if they can demonstrate full time work (not even part time over a defined period).</p> <p>If a student does not have already have a career they will not be able to access either of these two qualifications.</p> <p>This would be extremely detrimental to the fairness of providing students with an opportunity to pursue a career in this industry. Many of our students are employed at the conclusion of their training as employers know that they have been given a strong knowledge and opportunity for valid practical development of skills.</p>	
<p>RTO Vic</p> <p>Re Entry Requirements: Concerned about this added entry requirement which was not included at the draft stage for comment and has not existed for any previous versions of this course. Where is the evidence to justify the addition of an entry requirement?</p> <p>The Diploma of CLM has long been established as a pre-vocational course and is successfully used by post-year 12 students and career changers as an entry point to work in the industry and as a pathway to further study. It is also used by International students as a pathway course into related degree</p>	<p>Entry requirements have been removed. Removed <i>NWPHYS002</i> from Electives list. Erosion worked into Knowledge Evidence for <i>AHCNRM501</i>.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution	
<p>programs. This requirement will be a barrier to the majority of students who currently enter this course.</p> <p>The 12 month work requirement is vague and not specific about the skills and knowledge required. To quote your response to feedback on applying knowledge units “RTOs are charged with the process of delivering training that incorporates the underpinning knowledge...” This could also apply to the need for an entry requirement for this qualification. If two or four units can be imported from AQF level 4 then it would be possible to adjust the training plan for specific learners/cohort. Recommend remove entry requirements.</p> <p>Re added Geology unit added to Group A electives: This unit will fill the geology gap nicely.</p> <p>Re AHCSOL503 - Could work for coastal erosion. While erosion is not specified in AHCNRM501 it could be included in the KE under environmental degradation process and rehabilitation techniques.</p> <p>Re NWPHYS002 - This is a specialist unit for hydrographers. Suggest this could be imported under the rules rather than listed as an elective.</p>		
<p>RTO Qld</p>	<p>The Diploma has several unresolved issues that need addressing. Understandably the complexity of CLM did not provide enough time to address these issues. I think that further consultation and broader consultation is required.</p>	<p>Consultation commenced in November 2019 through to January 2020, the longest of any Skills Impact project to date. SMEWG have reviewed the qualification and support it as defined. Compromised validation period due to COVID 19 pandemic will be mentioned in the Case for Endorsement.</p>
<p>RTO NSW</p>	<p>1. The title should be Diploma of Conservation and Ecosystem Management for consistency with the changes to the Cert 3.</p>	<p>Thank you for this feedback which has been recorded and noted.</p> <p>All the feedback will be provided to the Amenity Horticulture, Landscaping, Conservation & Land Management IRC for their consideration and direction on the final naming of the CLM qualifications. It is not in the scope of this project to make such fundamental changes to qualification names without due consideration being given by all members of the IRC and guidance provided on matters of this magnitude.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution	
	2. Disagree with the entry requirements, do not want the 12 month industry work experience requirement.	Entry requirements have been removed.
Industry/RTO Vic	<p>Same for cert IV i.e. The addition of a prerequisite will reduce the number of people enrolling in the course which will lead to RTOs to stop delivering the qualification which will reduce the level of knowledge within the industry. And push training back onto industry. Even volunteering with a friends group (which may or may not be considered equivalent to work) for 3 hours a week means approx. 6 years to get to the equivalent of 6months full time work (maybe my maths is wrong but it would be a long time).From experience, in the average class of 15 students possibly 2 would meet the proposed pre-requisite condition. There would be no incentive for someone to take a chance and enter the industry. Some of the best students who are now working quite successfully in industry would not have been allowed to undertake the training which allowed them to get into the industry. I understand the desire for some prerequisite but maybe a lower qual and/or the experience would not reduce student numbers to unviable levels.</p>	Entry requirements have been removed.
RTO Vic	The entry requirements mean that there will be very few students who can do this qualification. It excludes those looking for a career change and school leavers	Entry requirements have been removed.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
RTO Vic	I believe that there should not be a prerequisite of one year work experience. It should be 1 year work, volunteer or Completion of key Certificate IV units. For example AHCLPW405 and AHPCPM401 or similar so there is baseline knowledge that allows students to complete Diploma units successfully.	Entry requirements have been removed.
Industry (Employer) Vic	RE the prerequisite requirement of students to have done 6 or 12 months of volunteer labour. I have run a bushland regeneration business for almost 25 years. I currently have 25 staff, 20 of which work in the field. So I'm speaking from the point of view of an employer of Tafe graduates, both Cert IV and Diploma in Conservation or Horticulture. I have deep concerns about the new requirement of asking people to do 6 months or 12 months volunteer work in the field, before they are able to study. This is a huge commitment for a prospective student trying to enter a Cert IV. It's unheard of. On a 36-hour week, this equates to approx. \$20,000 of labour in 6 months, plus the fact they couldn't work elsewhere while doing this. This is a huge figure. What happens if they can't get into a course at the end of that time? As an employer, I would be 'hiring' someone for 6 to 12 months, and their initial mistakes and training would be at my risk. Not all employees work out as you surely know. Any people that show promise, I would then lose to the TAFE course for several years at least. While the volunteer would get experience, I'm not sure how the industry would accommodate such 'volunteers'. If anything, this system is likely to lead to a perpetuation of using unskilled volunteer labour in place of skilled paid labour. Conservation has always suffered from the perception that 'anyone can chuck a plant in the ground'. It's completely untrue and creating yet another avenue of volunteer labour devalues the reputation of contractors and those they employ. If the idea of this volunteering is to boost the practical skills of TAFE graduates, there are other ways this can be achieved that are more in line with other industries. Shorter time periods of work placement/work experience is an obvious one. This should be done as part of the course within the course timeframe, so only enrolled students need do it. Then when they graduate, they are able to fully commit to a long-term arrangement with an employer, free of other commitments/interruptions. On a slightly	Entry requirements have been removed.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<p>RTO Vic</p> <p>I am very concerned about the recent proposed changes to the entry requirements in the (Revised) final draft. I have 20 years experience in the industry as a practitioner, academic and teacher and am aware of the complexities of aligning qualifications with different areas of expertise. However, I foresee that to mandate a minimum requirement of 6-month and 12-month work experience for prospective certificate IV and diploma students respectively, would be detrimental to the industry across all sectors. I also foresee that this would cause the collapse of many conservation courses at VET level. The implementation of these changes is like putting the cart before the horse. In my experience, most students undertaking these courses, are either school leavers or people seeking a change in career. Many bring a wealth of prior experiences and skills (e.g. management, trade skills, finance, law, risk management, planning etc.) that can be useful for a range of job roles. Particularly, if this industry continues to develop and diversify. Each year, approximately one-third of our students end up gaining paid, part-time work whilst completing their studies. Many other students gain experience by volunteering for environmental groups. For the majority of prospective students, these changes will undermine their ability to receive an education in the field and find a pathway into the industry or further education at university. It could also increase the number of unskilled and undereducated people working in the field. The science and policy surrounding conservation and land management (i.e. restoration, fire management, pest control) is constantly evolving. I have received a lot of positive feedback about the calibre of our graduates and how they have performed in the workplace. These graduates have been seen as dependable by their employers, in terms of being able to effectively communicate conservation science and practices with colleagues and with clients. I cannot stress more that these proposed changes to the entry requirements need to be revoked!</p>	<p>Entry requirements have been removed</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
RTO NSW	10 units is preferred to 12	The SMEWG has considered the feedback and have confirmed that they maintain the need for 12 units to be completed for this qualification. The SMEWG is more confident that a graduate with at least 12 units studied would have a greater amount of skills than that with 10, and that any number less than 12 studied may leave a graduate underskilled for the role.
RTO Vic	<p>I am stunned and extremely concerned about the recent proposed changes to the entry requirements in the (Revised) final draft of the Certificate IV and Diploma in Conservation & Land management (CLM) training packages where it states; “Pre-requisite for Cert IV CLM – Must have completed at least 6 months equivalent full time working experience in a job related to conservation and land management and pre-requisite for Diploma CLM – Must have completed at least 12 months equivalent full time working experience in a job related to conservation and land management” I have over 30 years’ experience in the industry employed as a Park ranger and as a Park manager, 26 of these years was with Parks Victoria and five years with local councils. I have been teaching both the Cert IV and Diploma CLM for the past 15 years and am well aware of the intricacies of supporting qualifications with different areas of expertise. For a person to gain part-time or full-time employment in an industry sector the person would first need to gain experience in that sector. With no experience the only way to gain that experience would be to do voluntary work in that sector. How long would a person need to do voluntary work to gain enough work experience and knowledge to be able to address the position description and criteria for employment in the CLM sector? The answer would possibly be many years. The person would then find out to their dismay that they may also, in many cases, be required to be the holder of a Cert IV or Diploma in CLM. It reminds me of the age old saying “How can I get enough experience required to address the experience requirement to get employment without first getting a job to gain the experience...?” To me, this seems absolutely ludicrous. No school leavers could apply to study; No career changers could apply to study; No person wanting to increase their knowledge of CLM could apply: Currently these three cohorts make up about 90% of our class enrolments. Even a part-time employee in the CLM sector who has been employed for less than 6 or 12 months could not apply.</p>	Entry requirements have been removed.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<p>For these reasons I would completely expect that to include this pre-requisite as a minimum requirement of 6-month and 12-month work experience for prospective certificate IV and diploma students would be damaging to the industry sectors and that this entry requirement could possibly cause the end of many conservation and land management courses that are currently operating with each year about a third of our students attaining paid part-time work whilst still completing their studies. The best alternative to gaining experience in a sector is to enrol in a reputable RTO and training course which will provide you that experience. Therefore it is important that RTO's understand the Industry's entry requirements and ensure that they offer the appropriate units of learning to address this matter so that students gain a thorough appreciation and experience that they will require to gain employment. This can be delivered successfully, whilst addressing the performance criteria, by providing the necessary practical experience with industry related field trips or by encouraging and connecting students with volunteer opportunities, whilst completing their studies, with industry organisations. It is also achieved by offering and encouraging students to enrol in additional short courses such as chainsaw operation, Chemical users' certificate, White card and plant & machinery operation...." If RTO's cannot satisfy this practical experience or are unable to work closely with industry groups then a far safer alternative to enable those students with little or no practical experience in the CLM related industry would be for the Cert IV CLM training course to include one or two of the following Cert III units: AHCMOM305- Operate specialised machinery and equipment; AHCMOM302- Perform machinery maintenance; AHCMOM304- Operate machinery and equipment "As far as the Diploma CLM is concerned we could either return to the days of when a Cert IV CLM was a pre-requisite for the Diploma CLM or to continue to recognise the Diploma CLM as it is, which is a Diploma level course and understand that requiring twelve months of full time or part time employment experience (after many years of voluntary work experience to gain that experience) in the industry is as absurd as expecting any other training package to expect the same of their applicants, eg. Nursing, Legal, IT, hospitality, etc. etc...." If the reason for the inclusion of the pre-requisites is being driven by a lack of work</p>	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
<p>experience in the sector of some job applicants then I would prefer we look closely at the RTO's requirement to provide that experience as part of their training package requirements rather than creating a circle of frustration and hopelessness for those wanting to gain experience as a pre-requisite to obtaining and or furthering their education in the CLM sector. In summary, the current Cert IV and Diploma CLM certificates already provide for many opportunities that address the performance criteria, knowledge and skills to gain experience in the CLM sector, both within the training modules and during non-training days and term breaks and by attending short courses as mentioned previously and therefore the pre-requisites for both Cert IV and Diploma CLM must be removed so that RTO's can ensure the continuation of ever increasing student enrolments in these courses.</p>	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry Assoc Nat	<p>1. The Diploma of includes a requirement for a person to have already done 12 months full time equivalent in the field before enrolling. This is not going to work in our industry sector, particularly Victoria, because some people do go to the Diploma as their first course, to accompany their first field employment. (This seems to be very popular because they can do that cheaper than a cert III which his prohibitive in VIC.) Also, it would mean that, in NSW a person who may have done Cert III and be employed in the industry can't go straight on to Diploma. They would have to wait at least a year if not more to do the Diploma. A number of RTOs are now not offering Cert IV - and I know that SERA and AABR are going to be recommending that people do move to Diploma from Cert III. So having 12 months equivalent employment is a totally unacceptable impost and would mean that our sector would largely not take up this training...WHICH IS THE CURRENT PROBLEM!! Certainly we would require 5 years prior experience for a teacher. But there is no reason why it is needed for a student.</p> <p>2. The new units don't seem to be listed in any of the Qualifications nor are the old units they are replacing removed. So I could onky validate the qualifications when we can see the new units in them and the ones to be replaced removed. Then we can check how these things are packaged and make sure they are deliverable.</p>	<p>Entry requirements have been removed.</p> <p>Unit codes are updated when confirmation has been achieved. See individual units for confirmed unit titles. Codes are allocated at the time of confirmation of titles.</p> <p>Qualifications are updated when all Units are confirmed.</p>
Industry Assoc Qld	<p>Consider removing the requirement for students to have 12 months industry experience. Yes it is ideal but with the cost of training combined with other hurdles, it may prove to be an impediment to doing the course</p>	<p>Entry requirements have been removed.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry Assoc WA	<p>Same comments as for Cert IV and to a large extent the Cert III. Again this looks like a mish-mash of every possible existing Unit without any attempt to rationalise or consideration of their take-up. At least seriously review all non AHC Units for removal from electives.</p> <p>From Cert IV comment: There are way too many electives. Many of the elective Units need to be reconsidered. Many are quite specific when a (sic Diploma) should be broadening out skills across many areas. They could be combined with foci on planning, supervising and reviewing a range of conservation activities. Also, some may sound nice, but no one is using them!!</p> <p>The overall qual still looks like a mish-mash of current Units thrown together rather than built from the ground up. This should be draft for consultation - not ready for validation.</p>	<p>During the Draft stage of development SME advised that the number of core and electives are representative of the various types of activities across the different states and territories for conservation and land management work. The SMEWG approves the format and units within the new diploma.</p> <p>Maybe state it in the following manner:</p> <p>The SMEWG considered this feedback. Great consideration was given to the list of units within this qualification and as this is a national qualification it has to cater for the various types of activities across all states and territories for conservation and land management work. RTOs will still have the ability to select the most appropriate units in the elective bank to meet their students and local industry needs.</p>

Proposed qualifications for deletion

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Certificate III in Lands, Parks and Wildlife		
•	No feedback or opposition to the deletion of this qualification has been received.	There has been overall support for the new Certificate III specialisation structure which includes a specialisation with these skill sets.
Certificate III in Natural Area Restoration		
•	No feedback or opposition to the deletion of this qualification has been received	There has been overall support for the new Certificate III specialisation structure which includes a specialisation with these skill sets.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Certificate III in Conservation Earthworks		
•	No feedback or opposition to the deletion of this qualification has been received	There has been overall support for the new Certificate III specialisation structure which includes a specialisation with these skill sets.

Summary of validation feedback on Skill Sets

New skill sets

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AHCSSXXXX Introduction to Conservation and Ecosystem Management Skill Set		
RTO Qld	AHCSSXXXXXX Introduction to Conservation and Ecosystem Management Skill Set Yes supports skill set	Support for the Skill Set has been noted.
Industry (Employer) Vic	<p>AHCSSXXXX Seed Processing Skill Set: I have not reviewed the units of competency but would like to know if "storage of seed" is included.</p> <p>AHCSSXXXXXX Introduction to Conservation and Ecosystem Management Skill Set Yes supports skill set</p>	<p>Yes seed storage is covered in the unit: <i>FWPFGM3202 Extract seed</i> element 3 <i>AHCECR305 Collect native seed</i> also Element 3 and included in the Knowledge Evidence.</p>
Industry Assoc Nat	<p>I am not yet sure if this skills set is appropriate or who needs it. I have not seen this before or had a chance to discuss it. Firstly - this should not include the unit 'Carry out NAR' as we want that unit replaced by 'Perform basic ecological restoration works'. Also - is "Recognise animals' the best third unit to include? (Perhaps it is but a weed unit might be better given that you can't perform basic ecological restoration works without that.) I actually wonder what is the value of a skills set like that without more units. However I am open to validating it if there is a particular need that can't be met by a larger cluster of say five units.</p>	<p>This Skill set was designed by an industry stakeholder who already applies the units specified in their training and recommended it be adopted as a skill set.</p> <p>The Skill Set was supported during the development phase.</p> <p>Please note: All unit Title and Codes will be updated on confirmation/validation of the units.</p>
AHCSSXXXX Seed processing skill set		
RTO Qld	AHCSSXXXX Seed Processing Skill Set Yes Support skill set	Support for the Skill Set has been noted.
Industry (Employer) Vic	<p>AHCSSXXXX Seed Processing Skill Set: I have not reviewed the units of competency but would like to know if "storage of seed" is included.</p> <p>AHCSSXXXXXX Introduction to Conservation and Ecosystem Management Skill Set Yes supports skill set</p>	<p>Seed storage is covered in the unit: <i>FWPFGM3202 Extract seed</i> element 3 <i>AHCECR305 Collect native seed</i> also Element 3 and included in the Knowledge Evidence.</p>

Summary of validation feedback on Units of Competency

New units of competency

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AHCECR2XX Capture digital media for fieldwork		
RTO Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry (Employer) Vic	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Still referencing the Conservation and Land Management Industry	Amended Application to reflect current terminology.
AHCECR2xx Perform basic ecological restoration works		
RTO Qld	I believe that a terminology error occurred in knowledge evidence requiring the word cell change to clonal, which would be technically correct.	Changed 'cell' to 'clonal' as recommended.
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
RTO NT, RTO NT, Gov NT	Support obtained for the deletion of AHCNAR201 Carry out natural area restoration works (replaced with AHCECR2XX Perform basic ecological restoration works). There was always difficulty in delivering AHCNAR201 unit and required 4 – 6 months to acquire competence due to the assessment requirements.	Support for the new unit has been recorded.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry (Employer) Vic	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
Industry (Employer) Vic	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
AHCECR3XX Conduct a site inspection for ecological restoration		
RTO Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
AHCECR3XX Conduct an ecological and cultural site assessment prior to works		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Gov/RTO WA	<p>AHCNARXXX Conduct an ecological and cultural site inspection prior to operational works. As a WA leading government agency, we cannot emphasize enough the importance that this unit be removed or retitled. It's not culturally appropriate that we can deliver this unit. Potentially only indigenous people with local cultural activity experience would be in a position to deliver and assess. And it being a core unit, we will have no choice. In our opinion we need a rename e.g. Conduct an ecological and site inspection prior to operational works. Or we remove the unit all together.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback this issue was directed to SME's and the unit has now been reviewed and amended to address cultural issues raised.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
RTO WA	<p>I've adjusted the cultural site inspection stuff as discussed previously so that it should be achievable as part of a core unit.</p> <p>I have also made adjustments to the performance and knowledge evidence which I think make these more accurate. Hopefully not too many of these are contentious. But there are one or two that I know need further discussion. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identified and located protected elements including at least one of the following... some people may like to see this increased to 3 or more, but we have to remember this is a core unit, and it has to be teachable, so the trainer will have to find examples of however many we specify here, and this needs to be do-able in all CLM contexts not just ecological restoration. <p>There was one bit that I found confusing. At the start of the Performance evidence there is a statement...</p> <p>"There must be evidence that the individual has conducted site inspections on at least 3 ecologically different sites prior to site works"</p> <p>I shifted this to the Assessment Conditions, as it seemed to me to be about competency in this unit, bearing in mind this unit is not about the actual works stage.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback this issue was directed to SMEWG and the unit has now been reviewed and amended to address the cultural issues raised.</p> <p>Adopted all other recommendations.</p>
RTO Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry Assoc Nat	A couple of minor suggested edits in Soft Copy add replace ecology with ecosystem in Element, Minor edit to PC3.1 Minor edit to 4.1 Changed at least one occasion to two for PE dot point 4 add proposed to PE dot point 5	Adopted recommended changes.
RTO NSW	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Supports the unit with changes recommended from stakeholders	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
RTO Vic	Inspection - consistent with Application language. If assessment then the Application should be amended. The Application does not fully match the elements and PCs. The Application is to inspect sites and report discrepancies, but the elements include PCs that require recommendations to be made on environmental threats, cultural heritage and biosecurity (PC 1.5, 2.6, 3.3). To complete those actions, make recommendations/assessments requires a considerable depth of knowledge as per the KE, and an ability to analyse information and come up with solutions to what may be complex and unpredictable problems. While the Application, as it presently reads, would suggest a level III, the unit is aligned more to a Cert IV or even Diploma level.	Recommendation adopted.
Industry Assoc Nat	Advised to retain PC2.5 as this is an ongoing problem in the industry and that legal checks must be made of plans on site Advised to change PC2.6 remove recommendations and replace with 'report concerns to supervisor for direction'.	Adopted recommendations.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry (Employer) Vic	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	There are a number of modifications required in the wording within the knowledge evidence section i.e. dot points 2, 3 and 10. Dot point 2 - doesn't make sense Dot point 3 should read - value of remnant vegetation and original soil profiles in ecological restoration system works Dot point 10 - doesn't make sense	Minor recommended edits adopted.
AHCECR3XX Implement assisted regeneration works		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
Industry (Employer) Vic	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat	Really this is not a problem and you will probably pick it up but there is a typo in the row 'Applications'. The phrase 'a degraded terrestrial or aquatic ecosystems' should be changed to either 'ecosystem' (singular) or the 'a' that precedes 'degraded' should be dropped. Probably singular is best?	Minor recommended edit adopted. Left as singular.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
AHCECR3XX Implement ecosystem reconstruction works		
RTO Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the new unit has been recorded.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
RTO Vic	Implementation of plans PC 2.5, 2.6 coordination of the team suggests a supervisory responsibility - level IV (is not in AHCNAR303)	At AQF Level 3 Individuals are able to coordinate and lead small teams. PC's 2.5 and 2.6 are consistent with this level of expected performance.
Industry Assoc Nat	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
AHCFAU3XX Identify fauna in the field		
RTO Qld	The units contain some grammatical errors which may lead to confusion, e.g. 5 of e groups. Five of what I will assume species if so insert the word species.	Adopted recommendation.
Industry (Employer) Vic	Yes - Supports the unit	Support has been recorded.
RTO Vic	Amend application to ...observe fauna characteristics for identification in the field... Ref PE dot points: Some of these points are repeats of the PCs. Suggest revise.	Adopted recommendation.
Industry Assoc Qld	Change the industry name to ensure ecological restoration is referenced rather than conservation and land management	Adopted recommendation.
AHCFIR3XX Undertake burning for fuel, ecological and cultural resource management		
RTO Qld	The unit fills a significant gap in the CLM field, but the unit itself is trying to be too much. To improve the unit a possible solution is to delay the unit and separate/remove the leadership aspect and make a lead a crew unit. In terms of dealing with the ecological burning change conduct to interpret ecological burn plans which marry the content of the unit better once the leadership aspect	Support for the development of this unit has been noted. Further consultation with industry and fire SME's has refined the unit. Title has been changed and supported by SME's.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	removed. The unit still requires further consultation. Overall the unit title creates further confusion as the naming convention is not followed through with all the rest of the units, i.e. ecological burning, prescribed burning and hazard reduction burning. We should stick to one name and use it consistently.	
Gov/RTO WA	This should be a PUA unit, not a CLM unit.	Further consultation with industry and fire SME's has refined the unit. Target is not the same as that expected in the PUA and this sector now support its development. PUA burners have recommended to Skills Impact that this should be an AHC unit.
Industry (Employer) Vic	"interpret burn plan" could be made more obvious- one of the reasons this is different to just managing a burn is the need to be able to read the landscape to be able to interpret the burn plan I would be happy with 2 burns instead of 3 but there needs to be more requirement for the person to have had fire experience or pre-req of the AHCFIR201. I think its important that this is an AHC unit	Adopted recommendation. Pre-requisite fire units are now in place for AHC FIR related units as recommended by the SMEWG and burning experts from the ILM, PUA and CLM sectors.
Industry NSW (Employer)	Emailed supporting documents regarding indigenous burning practices	Support for the development of this unit has been noted.
RTO Vic	How achievable is this in terms of delivery of this unit? Dependent on weather conditions, and other factors relating to opportunities.	Developer consulted heavily with Indigenous burners, CLM burners and PUA burners during the validation period, as well as RTO's that would deliver the training and it has been confirmed by all parties that the unit is deliverable.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry (Employee) Vic	<p>Re Application</p> <p>As a CFA stakeholder frequently reminds us "a planned burn is only one gust of wind away from a wildfire threatening assets and lives" - describing planned burning as low risk is inviting complacency. Further not all planned burning for agricultural, ecological or cultural purposes is low intensity nor does it always occur where there is minimal variation in fuel or terrain. You may wish to define the type of planned burning (effectively sub-CR1 in Victorian terms) addressed by this unit as being so characterised, but the risk element should probably be described in terms of the degree to which risks can be managed rather than be categoric in stating the risks are low.</p>	<p>Further consultation with industry and fire SME's has refined the unit. Fire prevention industry sector now support its development and design.</p>
Industry (Employee) Vic	<p>Re Licencing</p> <p>Any individual who starts a fire (or allows such) may face serious criminal or civil proceedings if that fire damages infrastructure, assets livelihoods or the wellbeing of any member of the community. Not to make this very clear in the Unit outline could render the training provider and even the accreditation agency vicariously liable in any action against an individual who successfully completes the Unit.</p>	<p>There is no requirement to specify any Criminal or Civil laws that govern units of competency but refer to Licencing, Legislation or Regulations that prohibits the execution on the unit of competency. e.g. WHS is not referenced in units of competency today but has both civil and criminal implications for noncompliance which is implicit in every unit.</p>
Industry (Employee) Vic	<p>Re Performance Evidence:</p> <p>If (as stated on page 1) the unit provides the skill and knowledge to lead on-ground burn operations, would an individual who successfully completes the Unit not consider themselves a "burn supervisor"??? Are we training Burn OICs or not - I am confused!</p>	<p>The unit is for site supervision not Burn Supervisor which is a level 4. A burn site supervisor at level 3 will still have oversight of the burn but will need to defer to the burn supervisor where situations cannot be resolved on site.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
RTO NSW	<p>Nowhere in the doc does it state whether this unit applies to running the burn (Burn OIC) or being a crew member. I think this would be useful, as I was still unsure of this by the end of the doc.</p> <p>Elements and PC's: This section should cover SMEACS. Has this been done sufficiently?</p> <p>I note throughout this section 'burn plan' has been removed and replaced by 'requirements'. Does this mean there will be no burn plan? If no burn plan in place, then replace with 'requirements'. If burn plan in place, then 'burn plan' must be the terminology.</p> <p>PC2.4 Refer previous comment re 'burn plan' or 'requirements' - use correct terminology here.</p> <p>PC2.6 RB Comment: What is involved in this? Agree with Ron.</p> <p>PC2.6 Reinstate 'burn operations'</p> <p>PC3.1 This should have something referring to 'did the burn meet the objectives of burn plan'</p> <p>PC3.2 Continue with agreed upon terminology</p> <p>PE re- Identified conditions: What are these? Weather, burn preparation? Not clear enough terminology</p> <p>KE Fuel hazard assessment: Are we looking at 'fuel assessment' or 'hazard assessment'.</p>	<p>Application statement has been amended.</p> <p>Terminology has been standardised to align better with that used across the burning sector.</p> <p>SMEAC is a planning and supervision tool. This has been addressed in the KE under 'planning' not specifically as a SMEAC as this terminology is often agency based where the target may not be.</p> <p>Elements and Performance Criteria have been amended.</p> <p>'Operational'; has been reinstated in the PC's</p> <p>Performance Evidence and Knowledge evidence components have been amended.</p>
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
AHCLPW2XX Operate a handheld GPS device		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
•	No validation feedback received	
AHCLPW3XX Coordinate and report on data collection		
•	No validation feedback received	
AHCLPW3XX Implement a biodiversity monitoring plan		
Industry (Employer) Vic	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
AHCLPW3XX Operate remotely piloted system for conservation work		
•	No validation feedback received	
AHCMAR3XX Conduct a subtidal marine monitoring operation from a vessel or platform		
RTO Vic	Suggest adding the following to the KE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • drop cameras • baited remote underwater video stations (BRUVS) • remotely piloted system • tethers, attachments, mounts and retrieval systems • seals and o-rings • soft pads • electrical connections/ power supply • lenses and protective covers 	KE dot point 4 - 'marine monitoring equipment including underwater equipment and housings' covers these dot points so unnecessary to replicate PE.
AHCMAR3XX Identify and collect marine life		
•	No validation feedback received	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AHCMAR3XX Operate mobile underwater vehicles		
•	No validation feedback received	
AHCMAR3XX Conduct intertidal marine monitoring		
•	No validation feedback received	
AHCMAR3XX Coordinate marine conservation activities on small vessels		
RTO Vic	There are some items in the PE list that are not specified in the PCs or KE. For example charts, maps, logs are not in the Pcs or KE.	<p>Items identified in feedback are in the PE refer to Element 1 Planning and preparation e.g. PC 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7. Also, Element 2 PC 2.5 and 2.6 and Element 4 Coordinate marine operations, where maps, charts, logs etc are all required tools. The PC do not need to specify each but as a minimum industry have requested some are included in the PE as assessable.</p> <p>While the unit is not about navigation, the requirement to understand navigation and recording resources is required for planning and coordination. The KE addresses this through dot points 5 weather and sea conditions, 6 logistics, 8 Trip planning, 14 emergency and contingency planning.</p>
AHCMAR3XX Monitor ocean conditions and marine environmental quality		
•	No validation feedback received	
AHCSAW2XX Recognise landforms and soil types		
•	No validation feedback received	

Revised units of competency – Please note all NAR units are now coded ECR.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AHCECR101 Support ecological restoration (Old title AHCNAR101 Support natural area conservation)		
RTO Qld	Unsure at this stage where chemical weed control techniques and their purpose fit into this unit, as this only covers basic manual weed control, if it is covered elsewhere I'm satisfied.	This is an AQF level 1 unit and there is no expectation that at this level chemicals will be used. This is usually reserved for AQF 2 user supervision and above. The weed control units can be imported through the importation rule if it is required.
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been noted.
RTO NT, RTO NT, Gov NT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the Industry Reference Committee is considering making the AHCNAR101 Support natural area conservation a core unit, challenges could be experienced within the desert regions of the Northern Territory in obtaining competency. • Due to the limitations of water and the climate in central Australia, the practice of revegetation work is more around preventing access and fencing off an area. • A suggested solution has been received to amend AHCNAR101 unit removing the wording 'revegetation', 'plant debris', 'planting, seeding' and 'store plants and materials according to instructions'. 	Minor changes as recommended adopted to ensure usability in remote and desert environments. Unit has been retained as a core unit on advise of SMEWG.
Industry (Employer) Vic	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry Assoc Qld	I would like to see cut and paint / cut, scrape and paint added to the basic weed control techniques	SME advised that the use of chemicals at Level 1 was not advisable as the individuals would not have completed the relevant units for safe chemical use which is a minimum level 2. However, a level 2 unit e.g. <i>AHCPMG201 Treat weeds</i> can be imported to address a specific need through the importation rule.
AHCECR102 Support native seed collection Please note all NAR units are now coded ECR		
RTO Qld	Yes - Support this unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
AHCECR202 Maintain wildlife habitat refuges Please note all NAR units are now coded ECR		
RTO Qld	Yes - Support this unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry (Employer) Vic	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry Assoc Nat	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
AHCECR301 Maintain native ecosystem areas (Old title AHCNAR301 Maintain natural areas)		
RTO Qld	Is it Maintain Native Ecosystem Areas (name of draft document) or Maintain Native Areas (name in this validation survey)?	Maintain Native ecosystem areas is the correct title and apologies for the confusion.
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry (Employer) Vic	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
AHCECR302 Collect and preserve biological samples Please note all NAR units are now coded ECR		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry Assoc Nat	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
AHCECR303 Implement biological reintroduction works (Old title AHCNAR303 Implement revegetation works)		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
RTO Vic	Suggest review title. 'Biological reintroduction' is misleading as it could suggest the inclusion of all fauna, however some fauna species would need to meet animal ethics, animal welfare requirements. Perhaps add some wording to the Application that clarifies the biological entities this unit does or doesn't apply to. Could use 'ecological restoration' as for ECR101 and 401.	Application statement amended to exclude animals subject to ethics and welfare requirements: This unit of competency describes the skills and knowledge required to implement biological reintroduction works for ecological restoration areas with plants, other biota and animals not subject to animal ethics and animal welfare requirements.
Industry Assoc Nat	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	I have made a number of suggestions via track changes as in my opinion there needs to be some additional terms incorporated so it reads according to broad industry standards. As it stands, it does not. Yes the teacher and students are implementing biological reintroductions (and this assists it going more broadly across the country and across ecological systems) but it still needs to read using basic terminology.	Developer contacted stakeholder via phone and adopted recommended feedback.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AHCECR304 Undertake direct seeding Please note all NAR units are now coded ECR		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry (Employer) Vic	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
AHCECR305 Collect native seed Please note all NAR units are now coded ECR		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
AHCECR306 Conduct photography for fieldwork Please note all NAR units are now coded ECR		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry Assoc Nat	should include performance evidence about setting up photo points as per plan or industry standard	Adopted recommendation.
Industry Assoc Nat	It is a great unit but it needs another PC to cover establishing a photo point which is common in our industry so that you can take 'before shots' and come back to take 'during' and 'after' shots from precisely the same position. I suggest add (to either 'Prepare' or 'Take' elements) a PC that says 'Prepare and peg out photo points as specified in plan or to enterprise standards '. This is unbelievably important and if more people had learned this at TAFE they would have fantastic records to share now....it is easy but needs to be demystified.	Photo points are a technique rather a specific PC. Photo points has been included in the PE and KE where it can be assessed as a specific photographic technique.
Industry Assoc Qld	This unit needs a little more work (not much) but point appears to be lost as one of the main things photography is used for is to monitor the development of a site via before and after monitoring.	The unit is designed for selection and use of photographic equipment. The purpose for use i.e. monitoring would be part of the selection process in Element 1. This unit is used by other sectors of the AHC Training Package and should not specify the various purposes for use in the PC's but is covered in the PE and KE. E.g. photo points.
AHCECR307 Read and interpret maps Please note all NAR units are now coded ECR		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AHCECR401 Supervise ecological restoration works (Old title AHCNAR401 Supervise natural area restoration works)		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat	needs to have more than 'techniques' in the Knowledge evidence – or the supervisor might know less than the other team member. Simple fix: The Knowledge evidence needs to include 'ecological restoration principles, approaches, strategies, tactics and techniques' not just 'ecological restoration techniques'	Adopted recommendation.
Industry Assoc Nat	There is nothing in the unit to imply that the supervisor needs to know anything about ecological restoration other than techniques. Hence there is a need for a dot point in the Knowledge Evidence to be expanded. I suggest that the current point '•ecological restoration techniques to be used in the works' be expanded to '•ecological restoration principles, strategies, tactics and techniques to be used in the works'	Adopted recommendation.
Industry Assoc Qld	This unit still needs a bit of work as it is impossible to achieve supervision of any ecological restoration project if the supervisor (student) is not able to understand how and when to apply a range of restoration approaches; a range of weed control techniques; a range of other reconstruction techniques etc. More work on the knowledge section in particular would assist. I had (like other units) made some suggestions via track changes but unfortunately, they do not appear to save?	Adopted recommendations.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AHCECR402 Plan the implementation of revegetation works Please note all NAR units are now coded ECR		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat	Should have 'implementation' inserted into the elements to avoid misinterpretation that this is planning revegetation. It is just planning the implementation of it. Simple fix I think.	Adopted recommendation.
Industry Assoc Nat	I believe that the unit is about planning the implementation of planting or direct seeding works , not design of those works. However it could be misconstrued (by students and teachers) as being about designing the works because all the elements are worded as if they are 'planning revegetation' not 'planning the implementation of revegetation'. The elements need to be reworded as follows: 1. Carry out preliminary planning activities for the implementation of revegetation works 2. Prepare a staged plan for the implementation revegetation works	Adopted recommendation.
Industry Assoc Qld	It is good - just needs some further info., minor additions. Need to add in performance criteria for 1 - the goals of the project Need to add in performance criteria for 2 - the design of the project (which is directly influenced by the goal of the project).	Adopted recommendation for goals added into PC1.1 The design of a project is not normally performed at Level 4. A design may be used to formulate a project implementation plan. Design is inferred in 'revegetation works' which may be a formal design or a concept plan depending on the workplace.
AHCECR501 Manage natural areas on a rural property Please note all NAR units are now coded ECR		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry Assoc Nat	Needs more work to make it more consistent with the other ecological restoration units. It should be a really good unit but contains no Performance Criterion, Performance evidence or Knowledge evidence that ensures consideration of appropriate ecological restoration approaches or consideration of potential or limits for natural regeneration. It would not take a lot of editing to fix but I think we need to run through it and make minor edits for consistency.	Minor edits have been made after further consultation with SMEWG. The SMEWG now approves of the final draft unit.
RTO Vic	Economic capacity is only mentioned in the Application. Ecological services provided by natural areas on rural properties can certainly enhance the productivity of the property. Perhaps that aspect could be added to the KE.	Minor edits have been made after further consultation with SMEWG. The SMEWG now approves of the final draft unit.
Industry Assoc Nat	Needs more work to make it more consistent with the other ecological restoration units. It should be a really good unit but contains no Performance Criterion, Performance evidence or Knowledge evidence that ensures consideration of appropriate ecological restoration approaches or consideration of potential or limits for natural regeneration. It would not take a lot of editing to fix but I think we need to run through it and make minor edits for consistency.	Minor edits have been made after further consultation with SMEWG. The SMEWG now approves of the final draft unit.
Industry Assoc Qld	It is on its way to being a good unit but needs more work so it facilitates the development of better plans that are able to encompass a range of issues and solutions. This can only be achieved if students are able to assess a range of issues and understand a broader range of restoration approaches. Needs more in performance evidence and knowledge evidence.	Minor edits have been made after further consultation with SMEWG. The SMEWG now approves of the final draft unit.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry Assoc Nat Industry Assoc Qld RTO Qld, Industry??	Soft copy with changes supplied Minor changes to Elements, PC's and PE to align with current terminology Minor additions to KE	Adopted recommendation.
RTO NSW	I have had a look at the documents and think they are great. I like the synergies with the design and implement units, excellent coupling potential for the Diploma of CLM. Students would do both units and develop a really good skill set to able to design and then implement an ER project.	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat Industry Assoc Qld	Soft copy with minor edits subsequent to above feedback: edits to improve focus on 'implementation' of an ecological restoration program.	Adopted recommendation.
AHCECR502 Conduct biological surveys Please note all NAR units are now coded ECR		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
AHCECR503 Design an ecological restoration project (Old title AHCNAR503 Design a natural area restoration project)		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat Industry Assoc Qld RTO Qld, Industry (Employer) Vic	Soft copy submitted with minor changes recommended for PC1.3 and Assessment Requirement. Addition to KE	Recommendations have been adopted.
RTO NSW	I have had a look at the documents and think they are great. I like the synergies with the design and implement units, excellent coupling potential for the Diploma of CLM. Students would do both units and develop a really good skill set to able to design and then implement an ER project.	Support for the unit has been recorded.
RTO Qld Industry Assoc Nat	In my other role of undertaking vegetation surveys and regeneration plans, I noticed a requirement is increasingly importance in the design brief is cultural considerations. Can we have a place in the design unit NAR503 may be at PC2.5 Suggest adding 'to PC 1.2 Consult with client and key stakeholders to establish purpose, scope and budget of design and including appropriate cultural considerations'	Adopted recommendation.
Industry Assoc Nat Industry Assoc Qld	Soft copy with minor edits subsequent to above feedback: edits to improve focus on 'implementation' of an ecological restoration program.	Adopted recommendation.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AHCECR504 Manage ecological restoration programs		(Old title AHCNAR504 Manage natural area restoration programs)
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat	<p>I had not looked at this unit before sorry - and now see it includes planning elements that overlap with 'Design an ecological restoration project' which is also a level 5 unit. Is the difference that this is about 'programs' (i.e. collections of projects) or is the difference that this should be about managing the IMPLEMENTATION plans? I would like to have a much closer look at solutions for this problem. Currently the two elements 1. Inspect and assess site for restoration and 2. Plan ecological restoration program are very inadequate if this is to be about planning and a student could just do this instead of the other unit and come out without the appropriate knowledge and competencies. If it is about 'managing' it needs more work to move it away from planning unless it is about planning large scale programs...which needs to be clearer in the course title and the elements revised to better suit 'programs'. I had to choose between 'yes' and 'no' below and have to choose 'no'. But that doesn't mean it is not salvageable. It just means that the fix is more than changing a couple of words here. I would like to work out what the purpose of this unit is and then how to fix its problems.</p>	<p>After further consultation with SMEWG members during the validation period, work has been done to accommodate all recommendations into this unit, including those in this comment. The SMEWG now approves of the final draft unit.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry Assoc Nat	<p>I have not looked at this unit before sorry - and now see it includes planning elements that overlap with 'Design an ecological restoration project'. Is the difference that this is about 'programs' (i.e. collections of projects) or is the difference that this should be about managing the IMPLMEMENTATION plans? I would like to have a much closer look at solutions for this problem</p> <p>Currently the two elements 1. Inspect and assess site for restoration and 2. Plan ecological restoration program are very inadequate if this is to be about planning, If it is about 'managing' it needs a rewrite . I had to choose between 'yes' and 'no' below and have to choose 'no'. But that doesn't mean it is not salvageable. It just means that the fix is more than changing a couple of words here. I would like to work out what the purpose of this unit is and then how to fix its problems</p>	<p>After further consultation with SMEWG members during the validation period, work has been done to accommodate all recommendations into this unit, including those in this comment. The SMEWG now approves of the final draft unit.</p>
Industry Assoc Qld	<p>This unit is very similar to 'Design an Ecological Restoration Project' I think AABR may need to do some additional work here and work out the difference and then perhaps work more on this unit to ensure it is more about implementing a range of projects rather than designing (AHCECR503)</p>	<p>After further consultation with SMEWG members during the validation period, work has been done to accommodate all recommendations into this unit, including those in this comment. The SMEWG now approves of the final draft unit.</p>
Industry Assoc Nat Industry Assoc Qld RTO Qld, Industry	<p>Soft copy with edits to improve focus on 'implementation' of an ecological restoration program.</p> <p>Minor changes to Application</p> <p>Changes to Elements with the addition of one new element.</p> <p>Performance criteria reviewed and amended</p> <p>Additions to Foundation Skills</p> <p>Changes to PE to align to amended and additional PC's</p> <p>Minor additions to KE and AC</p>	<p>Adopted recommendations.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
RTO NSW	<p>I have had a look at the documents and think they are great.</p> <p>I like the synergies with the design and implement units, excellent coupling potential for the Diploma of CLM. Students would do both units and develop a really good skill set to able to design and then implement an ER project.</p>	Support for the edited documents has been noted.
Industry Assoc Nat Industry Assoc Qld	Soft copy with minor edits subsequent to above feedback: edits to improve focus on 'implementation' of an ecological restoration program.	Adopted recommendations.
AHCECR505 Plan river restoration works Please note all NAR units are now coded ECR		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the edited documents has been noted.
Industry Assoc Nat	Knowledge evidence must include assessment of 'potential and limits of natural regeneration of vegetation' and 'assisted regeneration and reconstruction approaches for revegetation'.	Adopted recommendation.
RTO Vic	<p>Is there overlap between the first and last KE dot points? Suggest the addition of legislation and regulation relating to Cultural Heritage. Waterways are often areas of cultural heritage sensitivity. Pes and Cultural Heritage Management Plans may be required to undertake any high impact activity.</p> <p>Would the selection procedure for earthwork structures or measures be included here (KE dot point 3) or would that be a separate KE?</p>	<p>Adopted recommendations.</p> <p>Added further reference to selection process into KE dot point 3.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry Assoc Nat	Knowledge evidence must include assessment of 'potential and limits of natural regeneration of vegetation' and 'assisted regeneration and reconstruction approaches for revegetation'.	Adopted recommendation.
Industry Assoc Qld	I think this unit is good but could do with more information / points relating to the establishment of native vegetation, maintenance of the site to ensure establishment (i.e. points in performance and knowledge evidence about weed control, site monitoring etc.)	Adopted recommendation.
AHCECR506 Develop and implement sustainable land use strategies Please note all NAR units are now coded ECR		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Nat	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Support the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
AHCEXP301 Handle and store explosives		
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCEXP302 Identify and select explosive products		
•	No validation feedback has been received	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AHCEXP303 Prepare and use explosives		
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCFAU201 Recognise fauna		
Industry (Employer) Vic	In general, yes but there would be an expectation that the person would be able to identify a range of fauna and the unit doesn't specify this e.g. mammals, birds, insects. Needs to be have requirements as in ACHFAUXXX	Modified the PE to include options and range for recognition.
RTO Vic	Reference to 20 fauna in the PE. Same comments as in draft feedback. Volume is problematic. May see 20 + kangaroos in one sighting.	Modified the PE to include options and range for recognition.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
AHCFAU301 Respond to wildlife emergencies		
Industry (Employer) Vic	3.1 Inform general public and media of the nature of the incident and agency decisions (maybe this does not apply to every situation and so could have "if appropriate" added)	Reworded PC 3.1 to reflect workplace procedures.
RTO Vic	Questioned code in mapping table. Suggested 301 Ref PE Dot Point 6: Assuming there are animal carcasses to remove (element 6)	Corrected Code in mapping table. As an assessment task this can be simulated and should be assessed for competency to be demonstrated.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AHCFAU501 Manage fauna populations		
Industry (Employer) Vic	Yes- Supports the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
AHCFIR201 Assist with planned burning (Old title AHCFIR201 Assist with prescribed burning)		
Industry (Employer) Vic	Yes - Supports this unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry/RTO Vic	Presented minor change to title and content to remove reference to 'prescribed' in the unit and replacement to 'planned' burning	Adopted recommendations.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
AHCFIR501 Manage wildfire hazard reduction programs		
Industry (Employer) Vic	Yes - Supports this unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.
AHCFIR502 Plan and evaluate burning for fuel, ecological and cultural resource management (Old title AHCFIR502 Plan prescribed burning for fuel, ecological and cultural resource management)		
Industry/RTO Vic	Presented minor change to title and content to remove reference to 'prescribed' in the unit and replacement to 'planned' burning	Adopted recommendations.
Industry/RTO Vic	Presented further minor changes to content	Adopted recommendations.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Gov Vic	Supported changes to unit posed by stakeholder	Feedback noted.
RTO WA	Supported changes to unit posed by stakeholder	Feedback noted.
Industry (Employee) Vic	<p>Re application</p> <p>The concept of "recovery" at a site, rather than across a region, leads to expectations that at some point in the future the site will return to the same state as prior to the fire in question; this is rarely if ever the case. Maybe response of flora and fauna would be more helpful.</p> <p>Is there some confusion between the terms wildfire and planned burning here?</p>	Adopted recommendations.
Industry (Employee) Vic	<p>Ref Element 3</p> <p>Meaningful monitoring requires a baseline that must be recorded prior to burning and associated preparatory works. Labelling the process post-burn is misleading as well as grammatically unnecessary.</p> <p>Dot point in KE Is biodiversity not covered by the 3 points above?</p>	<p>Recommendation has been adopted.</p> <p>The SMEWG advised to add additional element to resolve the plan monitoring baseline.</p> <p>Unit has been modified.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
RTO NSW	<p>Terminology in Application response to above stakeholder comments: Application - 'Response' preferred</p> <p>'Bushfire' has been the term since 2009 Royal Commission The concept is using planned burning to assist in managing areas of bushfire risk</p> <p>KE re Climate change: Clarification needed please - are we wanting them to research climate change and show evidence of knowledge? Or are we referring to weather changes during a burn?</p>	Unit was subsequently reviewed and amendments reflect respondents recommendations.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Gov NT	<p>RE: Validation - AHC IRC Conservation and Land Management qualifications</p> <p>Please accept below input obtained when seeking input on the fire related units of competencies and specifically for AHCFIR502 Plan prescribed burning for fuel, ecological and cultural resource management:</p> <p>Different terminologies are used when talking about cultural heritage within a Northern Territory workforce to that of a southern parks of Australia. The conditions are different, and the PPE equipment is different due to the changes of the environment and these differences expand across the Northern Territory. Managing cultural heritage assets are vastly different across the country.</p> <p>A significant amount of contextualisation will be needed for 'AHCFIR502 Plan prescribed burning for fuel, ecological and cultural resource management'. There needs to be flexibility in the assessment condition. Knowledge evidence should include pe and talking with land owners. When determining a proscribed area to burn, this is done in consultation with the landowner.</p> <p>A paper received expanding on the conversation: https://insidestory.org.au/what-are-whitefellas-talking-about-when-we-talk-about-cultural-burning/</p>	<p>Unit has been reviewed and the SMEWG advise that the unit is broad enough to capture the concerns expressed by respondent.</p> <p>Further consultation with Indigenous burners, CLM burners and PUA burners were conducted during validation after this piece of feedback was received and all parties, including the SMEWG, are confident the new unit meets the requirements of all invested stakeholders.</p>
Industry Assoc Qld	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for the unit has been recorded.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry (Employer) NT Gov NT Industry (Employer) NT	AHC FIR502 Plan prescribed burning for fuel, ecological and cultural resource management. Different terminologies are used when talking about cultural heritage within a Northern Territory workforce to that of a southern parks of Australia. When considering conditions described within AHC FIR502 Plan prescribed burning for fuel, ecological and cultural resource management the PPE equipment is different due to the changes of the environment and these differences expand across the Northern Territory. Managing cultural heritage assets are vastly different across the country. A significant amount of contextualisation will be needed. There needs to be flexibility in the assessment condition. The knowledge evidence should include permits and talk with land owners. When determining a proscribed area to burn, this is done in consultation with the landowner.	Unit has been reviewed and SME's advise that the unit is broad enough to capture the concerns expressed by respondent. Further consultation with Indigenous burners, CLM burners and PUA burners were conducted during validation after this piece of feedback was received and all parties, including the SMEWG, are confident the new unit meets the requirements of all invested stakeholders.
AHCLPW301 Supervise park visitor activities		
•	No Validation feedback has been received	
AHCLPW303 Construct access tracks		
•	No Validation feedback has been received	
AHCLPW304 Carry out inspection of designated area		
•	No Validation feedback has been received	
AHCLPW305 Perform restricted diving for scientific purposes (Old title AHCLPW305 Perform diving for scientific purposes)		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Gov RTO WA	Just one comment from me – I would like to see the use of defib in water based environment left in, using a defib in a water based environment has its challenges, it's a great exercise to work through. We do exercises with over 80 scuba divers across WA for this specific purpose. We need our divers to be prepared. When they are prepared they are safe. It s a great element to have in the program.	Adopted recommendation.
RTO Nat	Phone conversation. Possible remove the reference to Difib from PE but retain in KE as it is important just not a requirement	Adopted recommendation.
RTO Vic	<p>Cannot find any stats indicating that this unit or AHCLPW305A has ever been delivered and so question the need for a diving unit in AHC. An existing diving unit from another TP could be imported and contextualised.</p> <p>Issue with including an Australian standard in the Application. The unit of competency is the industry standard. ASQA regulates the unit, not the Australian Standard. UoC can reflect standards but not repeat them or refer to them as the industry standard. Remove from Application. Suggest adding the standard to the KE. Also AS/NZS2299.2-2002 Occupational diving operations - Scientific diving (referred to in release 1) is still listed as current. Should that also be in the KE?</p> <p>These four pre-requisites are additional to the previous version that had none. If this unit was selected for the Cert III it would exhaust the importation of other units under the rules; or delivery of other units in the cert III that have prerequisites not in the elective list.</p> <p>This PE is overly prescriptive. There are 46 PC items that have to be evidenced and then all 35 dot points with about 80 dot sub-points. Numerous variations of dives needed.</p>	<p>This is a very small and specialist sector of CLM industry with accreditation for delivery very restricted.</p> <p>This sector have reviewed and amended the unit to align with the Australian Standard.</p> <p>Industry has advised that this unit has been used for training vocational employees, and that the requirement to comply with Australian Standards is imperative due to the high risks involved.</p> <p>All PE relates directly to the AS for scientific diving. Industry require this to be stated in detail to prevent noncompliance with the standard.</p> <p>This is a redesigned unit and the inclusion of prerequisites has been required by industry to ensure safe training and performance and that foundation skills and knowledge is in place prior to its delivery and assessment.</p> <p>Scientific diving practice as specified in the PE reflects the Australian Standard and aligns with Element 3 Conducting a dive, where individuals must perform activities to achieve dive objectives PC3.4.</p> <p>Minor change to Element 3 and PC 3.4 to highlight that it is for scientific diving.</p> <p>Removed reference to specific Australian Standard in the Application and AC.</p>

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	<p>There is nothing in the elements or performance criteria that specifically relates to this unit being about diving for scientific purposes other than obtaining a pe (PC 1.8). This unit is really just about diving, which could be for a whole range of purposes. Suggest import and existing dive unit from another TP and delete this unit.</p> <p>Alternatively could rewrite the unit about undertaking scientific survey work where diving is required with an existing diving unit as pre-requisite.</p> <p>How is this different to diving for other purposes?</p> <p>The following are not in PCs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • performed at least 2 of the following search techniques during the dive: • performed at least 2 of the following survey techniques during the dive: 	
AHCLPW306 Undertake sampling and testing of water		
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCLPW401 Process applications for changes in land use		
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCLPW402 Implement land and sea management practices		
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCLPW403 Inspect and monitor culturally significant places		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCLPW404 Produce maps for land management purposes		
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCLPW405 Supervise the monitoring of biodiversity (Old title AHCLPW405 Monitor biodiversity)		
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCLPW501 Develop a management plan for a designated area		
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCLPW503 Assess land use applications for legislative compliance		(Old title AHCLPW503 Access applications for legislative compliance)
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCLPW505 Implement natural and cultural resource management plans		
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCLPW601 Coordinate the preparation of a regional resource management plan		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCNRM301 Establish an Australian native stingless bee colony		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
RTO Vic	Questioned accuracy of equivalency	Corrected equivalency in mapping table.
AHCNRM501 Develop a coastal rehabilitation strategy		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
AHCNRM502 Develop a water quality monitoring program		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
AHCNRM503 Support the implementation of waterways strategies		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
AHCNRM504 Interpret and report on catchment hydrology		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AHCNRM505 Provide technical advice on sustainable catchment management		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
AHCNRM506 Plan and monitor works projects in catchments and waterways		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
AHCNRM508 Investigate suspected breaches of natural resource management legislation		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
AHCNRM601 Review ecological management plans and strategies (Old title AHCNRM601 Review land management plans and strategies)		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
AHCNRM602 Develop a monitoring, evaluation and reporting program		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
RTO Vic	Mapping table code incorrect	Corrected mapping table error.
AHCNRM603 Implement a monitoring, evaluation and reporting program		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AHCPMG410 Implement the pest monitoring and evaluation plan		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
AHCPMG411 Ensure compliance with pest legislation		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
RTO Vic	Correct typo in Mapping Table	Mapping table corrected.
AHCPMG414 Apply predator trapping techniques		
Industry (Employer) SA	There are two element 4's listed. Should be re-numbered	Corrected errors in Numbering of the PC's.
AHCPMG506 Manage the implementation of legislation		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
AHCPMG507 Develop a regional pest management plan		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
AHCPMG508 Develop a system to monitor and evaluate the pest management plan		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
AHCPMG509 Investigate a pest control failure		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
AHCPMG510 Develop a pest survey strategy		
Industry (Employer) SA	Yes - Supports the unit	Support for unit has been recorded.
AHCSAW201 Conduct erosion and sediment control activities		
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCSAW301 Construct conservation earthworks		
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCSAW302 Implement erosion and sediment control measures		
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCSAW401 Set out conservation earthworks		
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCSAW403 Supervise implementation of conservation earthworks plans		
•	No validation feedback has been received	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AHCSAW501 Design control measures and structures		
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCSAW502 Plan erosion and sediment control measures		
•	No validation feedback has been received	
AHCSAW503 Plan conservation earthworks		
•	No validation feedback has been received	

Proposed units of competency for deletion

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AHCNAR201 Carry out natural area restoration works		
•	Replaced with AHCECR2xx Perform basic ecological restoration works	No validation feedback has been received.
AHCNRM507 Manipulate and analyse data within geographic information systems		
•	Replaced with CPPSIS5064 Coordinate GIS data manipulation and analysis	No validation feedback has been received.
AHCNRM401 Plan and implement a biosecurity program		
•	Replaced with AHCBIO401 Plan and implement a biosecurity program	No validation feedback has been received.