



Training Product Submission

This form facilitates Step 5.1 Submission of draft training products to the Assurance Body of the Training Package Organising Framework (TPOF) Process Requirements.

Completing this form and submitting the required information, including the attachments, provides the Training Package Assurance (TPA) team with the necessary information to assess your Training Product Submission (the submission) against the TPOF. This is an opportunity to describe how the processes you have applied to develop your products and the products themselves comply with the requirements of the TPOF.

Refer to the Training Package Assurance (TPA) Submission Compliance Guide for detailed information about the evidence required for your submission.

Components of the submission include:

- this form
- completed attachments including the Companion Volume Implementation Guide.

About this form

There are three sections to this submission form:

Section 1: Submission Details

Section 2: Submission Evidence

Section 3: CEO Declaration

Unless otherwise indicated, you must provide a response to each part of each question.



This symbol has been used to indicate where attachments and/or additional information must be uploaded with the submission.

Submission to the Assurance Body

To submit your project for assurance please:

1. Upload this completed submission form and supporting evidence into the relevant project folder in the TPA GovTEAMS Community.
2. Ensure all training package products are entered into Training Product Central (TPC) with the product drafting status set to 'Ready for Submission' and the project status set to 'Assurance Body Consideration'.
3. Publish the submission on your website. This includes:
 - Training Product Submission Form
 - Attachment A – Training Products submitted for assurance
 - Anti-discrimination Assessment
 - Consultation Log
 - Consultation Strategy
 - Technical Committee Details (including Terms of Reference)
 - Training Package Products
 - Companion Volume Implementation Guide (CVIG)
4. Email the TPA team at TrainingPackageAssurance@dewr.gov.au with the Project ID and Title to advise the submission is ready for assurance.

Incomplete submissions, including where there is insufficient or missing detail in the submission form and/or attachments, will be returned to you and the assurance process will be paused until the required information is received.

One form of evidence may satisfy multiple questions. A checklist is provided at the end of this document to assist you to ensure your submission is complete. You can use the column titled 'Evidence Reference' in the checklist to identify the document title of the specific evidence in your submission, alternatively, you may prefer to produce your own cover sheet to accompany the submission.

Assistance completing this form

Please refer to the TPA Submission Compliance Guide TPOF 1 July 2025 for information about how the TPA team will review the submission, noting that the examples of evidence provided are only a guide and not intended to be an exhaustive list.

If you need help completing this form, please contact TrainingPackageAssurance@dewr.gov.au.

Refer to the department's website and the TPA Community in GovTEAMS for further information about the Training Package Assurance process.

Section One: Submission Details

1. Jobs and Skills Council Details

Jobs and Skills Council Name:

Mining and Automotive Skills Alliance

Contact person:

(the person the Training Package Assurance team will liaise with during the assessment process; you can identify more than one person here if required)

Name(s):	Eleanor Yeowell	Position:	Manager, Training Products (Acting)
Phone:	Click here to enter text.	Mobile:	Click here to enter text.
Email(s):	projects@ausmasa.org.au		

2. Project Details

Project ID:	MAS_ANN_2425_006
Project Title:	Critical Control Management for Mine Site Supervisors and Managers

Provide a brief description of the project.

This project responded to reviews of mining fatalities in Western Australia and Queensland, which identified inadequate supervision and gaps in supervisory and management competency.

The training products that underpin risk management, communication and safety and health investigation for mine site supervisors and managers are delivered across mining, drilling, extractive and civil infrastructure operations in nine jurisdictions with materially different legislative frameworks, and are frequently used to evidence competency for statutory and supervisory positions.

Supervisory and management capabilities include identifying controls critical to preventing or mitigating fatal or serious events, then implementing, verifying, and monitoring these controls, and responding when they are not in place or not performing.

To maintain national consistency, this project reviewed and strengthened these training products by leveraging industry best practice (The International Council on Mining and Metals' Critical Control Management: Good Practice Guide) and embedding these capabilities in the national units.

3. Scope of the submission

Provide the total number of Qualifications, Units of Competency, and Skills Sets included in the proposed release of the Training Package. This may include any minor changes that will be made in the proposed release.

While the assurance assessment focuses on products that require endorsement by Skills Ministers (i.e. major changes), understanding the context for the entire release may be helpful to the Assurance Body.

Refer to the Categories of Change tables in the TPOF for the definition of major and minor changes.

	Major	Minor	Total
Qualification(s):	6	2	8
Unit(s) of competency:	5	0	5
Skill Set(s):			2

If applicable, provide an overview of minor change updates that will be included in this release.

Minor changes are outlined below.

Updated superseded general elective units in the following qualifications:

- RII32226 Certificate III in Well Servicing Operations
- RII41326 Certificate IV in Emergency Response Coordination

Two skill sets were updated and transitioned to TPOF 2025 templates:

- RISS00131 Mine Surveying Skill Set
- RISS00132 Site Health and Safety Coordinator Skill Set



Complete and upload *Attachment A – Products submitted for assurance*

4. The Annual Training Product Development Plan

Provide a link to the published plan on your website.

Link/URL:

<https://ausmasa.org.au/projects/annual-training-product-development-plan/#:~:text=Critical%20Control%20Management%20for%20Mine%20Site%20Supervisors%20and%20Managers>

If the activity is not listed in the plan, provide an overview of the unforeseen or urgent need addressed by the activity.

Click here to enter text.

4.1 Where the submission contains major changes to a qualification/s, has the Purpose of any of the products changed from what is recorded in the Annual Training Product Development Plan (ATPDP)? Answer 'Yes' where the Purpose of the products is not included in the ATPDP.

☐

Yes

☒

No (go to Q5)

If yes, provide details of the changes OR where the purpose of the qualification/s contained in the project is not included in the ATPDP, please provide details below.

Click here to enter text.

Section 2 – Submission Evidence

Technical Committee

5. Technical Committee Composition



Upload details of the membership of the technical committee and their expertise as per Step 1.2 of the TPOF Process Requirements including the Terms of Reference for the committee

Has the composition of the technical committee changed from that published at the pre-submission stage?

☐ Yes ☒ No (go to Q6)

If yes, provide a reason for the change describing any impact of the change on the development activity.

6. Technical Committee Statement

Provide a statement that the technical committee has reviewed the final draft training package products. Include information about the process for the technical committee review (for example, whether the review was completed during a meeting or out of session).

Confirmation that the Technical Committee reviewed the draft training products has been attached as evidence under Item 18.

The Technical Committee reviewed the draft training products before each round of consultation. Once the training products were finalised, they were shared with the Technical Committee to confirm their review out of session. All members confirmed they had reviewed the final products, with the exception of Damian Long.

Three additional attempts were made to confirm Damian's review; however no response was received.

Consultation Activity

7. Stakeholder Consultation Strategy



Upload a copy of the stakeholder consultation strategy

Did the consultation undertaken deviate from the stakeholder consultation strategy (including changes to identified stakeholders, and any delays or changes to consultation timeframes)?

Refer to pg 24-26 of TPA Submission Compliance Guide.



Yes



No (go to Q8)

If yes, provide a summary of what changed and why.

Stakeholder consultation broadly followed the Consultation Strategy published at the project's commencement. We extended our consultation approach by adding a new mechanism, the Workforce Insight Groups (WIGs), to enable wider participation, and lengthened public consultation timeframes to allow more comprehensive stakeholder input.

The Public and Government Consultation period was brought forward from May 2026 to April–May 2026, as the draft training products were published earlier than scheduled.

Following the feedback received from Public and Government Consultation, further consultation was undertaken to ensure that the training products balanced regulatory requirements with national training standards. Extensive consultation was undertaken between June and August 2026, engaging with state and territory regulators, as well as employers and unions. This period was extended from June–July 2026 to June–September 2026, allowing two additional rounds of engagement.

As a result, the Senior Officials Check was rescheduled from July–August 2026 to September–October 2026.

To gather in-depth, practical input on the work of mine site supervisors and managers, four WIGs were established covering Safety and Health Management Systems, Communications, Hazards, and Investigations. These ran as in-person workshops and online sessions so that practitioners could contribute regardless of location. WIGs were not part of the original strategy; they were introduced on the Technical Committee's advice to ensure the revised units reflected current job-role practice, and supplemented rather than replaced the planned consultation mechanisms.

8. Consultation Timeframes

Provide an overview of when the consultation activities were undertaken.

You can enter more than one set of dates for each consultation phase as required.

Consultation Phase	Dates
Public and government consultation	8 April to 8 May 2026

Consultation Phase	Dates
Incorporating feedback (additional consultation if required)	11 May – 10 September 2026, including additional consultation periods.
Senior Officials Check	11 September – 2 October 2026

9. Vulnerable and Minority Cohorts

Describe how consultation activities have been responsive to the needs of vulnerable or minority cohorts, including women, people with disability, culturally and linguistically diverse communities, and First Nations people.

Information should include how vulnerable or minority stakeholders were identified and how consultation activities were tailored to respond to the needs of those stakeholders.

Refer to pg 26 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

We considered vulnerable and minority cohorts of the mining, drilling, extractive, and civil infrastructure workforces that use the units and the supervisory and managerial roles they support.

These cohorts include women, people with disability, culturally and linguistically diverse communities, and First Nations people, as well as workers in remote and regional operations who may face additional barriers to participation. Cohorts were identified through the Technical Committee, whose tripartite composition included union representation acting on behalf of workers, and through project stakeholder mapping across all states and territories.

Consultation activities were designed to be inclusive and to reduce barriers to participation. A range of mechanisms were offered so that stakeholders with differing capacity, confidence and access could take part through the channel that best suited them. These included online feedback surveys open over multi-week periods, public webinars, in-person workshops in Perth and Mackay, and two online workshops for stakeholders unable to attend in person. One-on-one interviews, online or in person, were also available for stakeholders to participate in.

The activities were distributed through industry, RTO, union, and peak body networks to reach a broad and diverse stakeholder base. Online options supported participation by workers in remote and regional operations and reduced accessibility barriers for those unable to attend in person.

More broadly, the consultation spanned all states and territories, and the inclusion of union representation on the Technical Committee provided a mechanism for the perspectives of workers, including those who may not engage directly with formal consultation processes, to be considered throughout the review.

10. Consultation Log



Upload the consultation log including the high-level summary
(an example consultation log is provided in GovTEAMS)

Include information about all consultation activities undertaken, how feedback has been logged, and how feedback has been addressed. For example, if a workshop was conducted and no individual feedback was gathered, describe how the results of the workshop were considered in the project.

Provide as much detail as possible to support the Assurance Assessor's understanding of the consultation process including the treatment of feedback. This detail may be provided in the high-level summary or below.

Refer to pg 27-32 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

Consultation Approach:

Consultation was staged to build the evidence base first, test the draft training products with industry and government, and then resolve jurisdictional differences before finalisation.

Understanding the workforce:

The Technical Committee (TC) identified a need to look more closely at the current workforce and the needs of mine site supervisors and managers before any drafting began. To ground the training products in practice rather than assumption, Workforce Insight Group workshops were held in Perth, Mackay and online, bringing together 33 managers, superintendents, supervisors and other practitioners from mining, civil construction and infrastructure. Online sessions ensured remote stakeholders could contribute. Targeted interviews with supervisors, superintendents and a regulator then tested and deepened these findings, with a stronger focus on roles and leadership capabilities.

Testing the first drafts:

The first round of public and government consultation tested whether the draft units reflected industry need. It drew input from industry, registered training organisations (RTOs), government, regulators, peak bodies and unions. Feedback confirmed that the original units were largely sound but revealed two weaknesses: unclear role boundaries, particularly in the risk units, and misalignment with AQF levels.

Resolving role boundaries and jurisdictional differences:

Because duties under the same role title vary widely between larger and smaller operations, the units were redrafted around functions rather than role names. Mapping risk assessment activities against roles and jurisdictions then exposed a wider issue: risk management terminology, methods and statutory requirements differ substantially across commodities, sectors and states.

Queensland, for example, mandates formal Critical Control Management (CCM) systems, while adoption elsewhere is voluntary. To keep the units nationally relevant without compromising regulatory fit, the TC agreed to:

- keep unit language neutral so the units apply nationally;
- address jurisdictional variation through a CVIG Addendum, consulted on separately; and

- remove leadership skill sets from scope, embedding leadership capabilities within the units instead.

Confirming fitness for purpose with regulators and industry:

A second, targeted round of consultation tested the redrafted units with those best placed to judge their practical and regulatory fit. Regulators in all mining-driven states were engaged before consultation opened to ensure the right representatives were involved, and feedback was received from regulators in Western Australia, Queensland and New South Wales. Feedback confirmed improved role clarity and closer alignment with workplace practice.

Strengthening the link to the project's purpose:

Feedback continued to highlight jurisdictional variation, so the risk units were mapped against the ICM Critical Control Management: Best Practice and Implementation Guide to confirm they addressed the capabilities needed to prevent fatalities. This allowed the third drafts to reflect good practice without prescribing CCM terminology or requiring assessment within a formal CCM system. Jurisdiction-specific content was placed in the CVIG Addendum, which was tested with Queensland-scope TC members in partnership with the Queensland Resources Council to ensure alignment with Queensland's regulatory environment.

Final validation:

A final round of public and government consultation confirmed that the changes accurately reflected the requirements of the relevant roles across nationally. Feedback confirmed that the units remain fit for purpose nationally, subject to minor additions on risk management language and triggers, and all qualification changes were supported. The CVIG Addendum was then shared with the TC and Build Skills Australia (BSA), and the finalised training products were provided to all regulators.

Across all rounds, every item of feedback was addressed line by line in the consultation log, and the TC was consulted on relevant feedback before each redraft, ensuring decisions were documented.

11. Senior Officials Check



Upload evidence that the Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) check was undertaken

Engagement with SROs must be recorded in the Consultation Log.

Use this space to record any additional information about the SRO check to support the Assurance Assessor's understanding of the submission.

The Senior Officials Check was initiated on 11 September, with the final draft training products and the project Consultation Log provided to the Senior Responsible Officer in the Commonwealth and each state and territory for review. Engagement with each Senior Responsible Officer is recorded in the project Consultation Log. SROs were provided three weeks for their review, concluding 2 October.

Support from all SROs was received, with no implementation issues requiring change to the national units of competency identified.

The Commonwealth noted the extensive consultation undertaken and the consideration given to stakeholder feedback throughout development of the final products.

12. Support from Regulatory and Licensing Bodies

Do any of the products in the submission include occupational licensing, certification or regulation requirements related to **the person** undertaking the work described in the product?

☒ Yes ☐ No (go to Q12.1)

If yes, ensure the requirement is described in the 'Legislative/Licensing/Regulatory' field in TPC and include information about implementation in the Companion Volume Implementation Guide.



Identify products that contain regulatory, licensing or legislative implications in *Attachment A – Products submitted for assurance*



Upload evidence of support from all relevant national/state and territory regulatory and/or licensing bodies

12.1 Other regulatory/legislative information

Is there regulatory/legislative information in the products relevant to the workplace/enterprise?

☒ Yes ☐ No (go to Q13)

If yes, **do not** include the requirement in the 'Legislative/Licensing/Regulatory' field in TPC. You may include this information in the 'Description' of the qualification or 'Application' of the unit of competency. You must include information about implementation implications in the Companion Volume Implementation Guide.

13. Engagement with other Jobs and Skills Councils

Are any of the products in this submission imported into training package products managed by other Jobs and Skills Councils?

☒ Yes ☐ No (go to Q14)

If yes, list the Jobs and Skills Council(s) impacted and describe how you have consulted with them. Briefly describe the impact on relevant qualifications.

Refer to pg 29 and 31 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

This submission affects two Jobs and Skills Councils engaged during the project: BuildSkills Australia (BSA) and Powering Skills Organisation (PSO).

BuildSkills Australia (BSA)

The units in scope for this project impact BuildSkills. Refer to the table below for the level of impact and changes required. We have consulted with BuildSkills through meetings, email, and by distributing the units to their technical committee for review.

Evidence: *JSC Consultation evidence_BuildSkills Australia*

Unit	Equivalency	BSA training product	BSA impact
RIICOM301	Equivalent	Elective unit in RII40720 Certificate IV in Civil Construction	No impact
RIIWH301	Not Equivalent	Elective unit in CPC41020 Certificate IV in Demolition	Minor change
RIIRIS402	Not Equivalent	Elective unit in RII30926 Certificate III in Civil Construction	Minor change
RIIRIS501	Not Equivalent	Core unit in RII50420 Diploma of Civil Construction Management	Major change
RIIRIS601	Not Equivalent	Core unit in RII60620 Advanced Diploma of Civil Construction	Major change

Powering Skills Organisation (PSO)

One unit in scope for this project impacts Powering Skills. The table below shows the level of impact and changes required. We consulted with Powering Skills by email and offered a meeting to discuss. PSO advised that a meeting was not necessary since they are currently reviewing all their UEE products, so it's important they know that any imported units are under review.

Evidence: *JSC Consultation evidence_Powering Skills Organisation*

Unit	Equivalency	BSA training product	BSA impact
RIIRIS601	Not Equivalent	Core unit in UEE62325 Advanced Diploma of Electrical Engineering – Coal Mining	Major change



Upload evidence of engagement with all listed Jobs and Skills Councils

Note: where any products in this submission impact other training packages managed by your JSC, describe the impact on those other products at *Q15 Implementation Issues*.

14. Rationale for mandatory workplace requirements

Are any Mandatory Workplace Requirements (MWRs) included in the submitted products?

☐

Yes

☒

No (go to Q15)



Identify products that contain MWRs in *Attachment A – Products submitted for assurance*

If yes, describe the process undertaken to determine the inclusion of MWR. Consider the process set out in the good practice guide on MWR: On the Mark: 5 Good Practice Principles when completing this section.

Click here to enter text.

14.1 Support for mandatory workplace requirements



Upload evidence of support for proposed requirements (including from small to medium sized enterprises), and employer willingness to support learner work placements

Use this space to record any additional information about how employer support for learner work placements was gained.

Note: support is required to be demonstrated for all training package products containing MWRs in the scope of the submission, regardless of whether they have been changed as a result of the development project. Confirmation of ongoing support for MWR including employer support for work placement needs to be gathered through the consultation process.

Refer to pg 29-32 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

Not applicable.

15. Implementation Issues

Use this space to record information about implementation issues raised throughout the development process. Please include:

- What intelligence was gathered from stakeholders about implementation of the training package products
- How any implementation issues raised through the consultation process were addressed
- Whether any other training package products within your responsibility are affected by the project.

Refer to pg 30-31 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

Consultation throughout the project showed that the training products would be implemented in very different regulatory and operational environments. Risk management terminology, forms, documents, methodologies and frameworks vary widely across mining, civil construction and infrastructure. Queensland is the most heavily regulated jurisdiction: the Resources Safety and Health Legislation Amendment Act 2024 requires mine and quarry operators to implement formal Critical Control Management (CCM) systems with defined terms, roles and responsibilities. All other states and territories treat adoption of a formal CCM system as voluntary, and statutory role requirements differ between states, such as Queensland and Western Australia.

To ensure the units could be used nationally, the project mapped the RII risk units against the ICMM Critical Control Management: Best Practice and Implementation Guide, confirming role boundaries, responsibilities, and the capabilities required to address fatalities. The units adopt neutral language and built those capabilities into each level, aligning them with good workplace practice and the ICMM framework without prescribing CCM terminology or requiring assessment within a formal CCM system. The performance and knowledge evidences were developed to enable the units to be applied within national and jurisdictional legislation, safety regulations, standards, and Codes of Practice. To accommodate jurisdiction-specific requirements, an addendum to the units was developed to capture legislation, specific roles, documents, methodologies, frameworks, terminology, and state/territory-specific delivery.

This addendum was reviewed by the Technical Committee at each stage, and was provided to Build Skills Australia (BSA) to ensure it captured the requirements for the civil sector. Because of Queensland's regulatory environment, the Queensland Resources Council held a dedicated session with TC members with Queensland scope to check alignment. As a final assurance, all state responsible officers (SROs) received the CVIG Addendum as a key document supporting implementation.



Include detail about implementation in the *Consultation Log* including information about the stakeholders involved

16. Disputes

Note: This section refers to disputes as described in the Model Dispute Resolution Policy outlined in the TPOF Process Requirements.

Were any disputes recorded during the development activity?



Yes



No (go to Q18)

If yes, describe the dispute/s and how you applied your internal dispute resolution process to resolve the matter.

Two stakeholders disputed aspects of the training products during development: the Queensland Mining and Energy Union (MEU), and the University of Queensland (UQ). Both disputes were resolved through the internal dispute resolution process.

Mining and Energy Union, Queensland District:

The MEU, which is also represented on AUSMASA's Strategic Workforce Advisory Panel (SWAP), provided feedback during public and government consultation and in a one-on-one session during the second targeted round of consultation. Feedback centred on assessor requirements, documentation, and worker participation and consultation. All feedback was addressed, and meeting minutes and a line-by-line summary of responses were provided to the MEU. After both rounds of consultation, two remaining concerns were raised at a SWAP meeting: the draft units did not include triggers that do not require work to stop, and did not use the term "critical controls". All units were circulated to SWAP members for review, and feedback was discussed at a follow-up meeting a week later. Revised wording was then agreed for testing with the Technical Committee and the Western Australian regulator.

Both concerns were resolved through targeted wording changes that kept the units nationally applicable:

- Triggers: RIIRIS402 was updated to include triggers that do not require work to stop, in addition to triggers that require work to stop, which the Western Australian regulator wanted retained.
- Critical controls: The term is tied to the ICMM Good Practice Guide and is defined and applied differently across jurisdictions. The units also serve the drilling, extractive and civil infrastructure industries. The units therefore refer to "controls that are critical to preventing or mitigating a serious event", which captures the capability required for critical control management (CCM) without prescribing terminology.

The revised wording was supported by a mapping document showing how the units deliver CCM capabilities consistent with the ICMM guide. A further round of consultation raised no further issues. Agreement with the outcome was confirmed in a follow-up call with the MEU and is recorded in the Consultation Log.

University of Queensland:

UQ disputed three points: the unit wording, the sufficiency of the national units for Queensland's mandatory training requirements, and the reliance on the non-compulsory CVIG to address jurisdictional variation.

- Unit wording: Explicit reference to "critical controls", CCM and the ICMM guide was sought. The same rationale applied as for the MEU: although Queensland legislates the terminology, the units also serve industries that use neither the terminology nor the ICMM framework. The neutral wording, the mapping document and a further round of consultation, which raised no further issues, confirmed that the units meet the required capability nationally.
- Legislative requirements and the CVIG: Each unit makes compliance with applicable legislation mandatory through its endorsed Licensing, Performance Evidence and Assessment Conditions. Registered training organisations (RTOs) delivering in Queensland are independently bound by the Standards for RTOs 2025 to comply with all applicable Commonwealth, state and territory laws. The units also build critical control behaviours into their performance criteria and assessment requirements. Mutual recognition operates within the VET system and does not override Queensland's statutory requirements for supervising in a Queensland mine.

The remaining concerns related to Queensland training delivery rather than the national units themselves. UQ was therefore referred to the relevant RTOs, and further support and engagement were offered. It was determined that the national training products should remain nationally applicable, with regulatory requirements addressed through the relevant regulatory framework, delivery and supporting guidance. On this basis, the concerns were considered addressed, and the outcome is recorded in the Consultation Log.



Include detail about the dispute/s in the *Consultation Log* including information about the stakeholders involved (See example Attachment B Consultation Log - Dispute Resolution tab)

17. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)

Was an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) practitioner engaged?

☐

Yes

☒

No (go to Q18)

If yes, provide a summary of any disputes that were escalated to ADR. Include the recommendations produced, the final position of the Jobs and Skills Council, and a justification where the ADR practitioner's recommendations were not adopted.

Click here to enter text.



Upload a copy of the ADR practitioner's advice

18. Evidence of broad consensus

Has broad consensus been reached on all products?



Yes (go to 18.1)



No (go to 18.2)



Upload evidence of support (e.g. letters of support)

18.1 Provide a summary of how broad consensus has been determined.

Refer to pg 35-36 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

AUSMASA established broad consensus for the training products through three rounds of consultation with a broad and varied stakeholder group.

Support was expressed across every stakeholder type identified in the consultation strategy: public and private RTOs, employers and employees, WHS regulators, industry associations and peak bodies, unions, and subject matter experts. All feedback is recorded in the Consultation Log and has been considered, addressed, and responded to.

Technical Committee

The TC was established in November 2025 with a broad membership that included mining/civil industry, a state regulator/inspectorate, a union, enterprise and private RTOs, SMEs, an educational expert, and government/observer roles. The TC ran through initial development, both incorporation rounds, and final statements of support.

Its main decisions were the ones that shaped everything downstream – see below.

- Broaden the framing from "critical controls" to a national risk-management framework
- Re-scope RIIRIS402 to task-level/in-field verification
- Update RIWHS301 to initial response and contribution alongside an investigations team
- Withdraw the three leadership skill sets as out of scope

- Raise assessor/industry-expert experience from two to three years
- Add higher-level risk PE to the manager/senior units rather than impose a prerequisite
- Confirm equivalence outcomes
- CVIG Addendum structure

First round public and government consultation

The feedback gathered during Public and Government Consultation provided straightforward support, with substantive feedback from a smaller, engaged set (a few RTOs, a state mining regulator, a union, SMEs).

Recurring issues included:

- AQF level/role mismatch flagged in both directions on almost every unit
- "Critical controls" appearing only in RIIRIS402, criticised as undefined/tokenistic or as not belonging in a national unit
- Objection to dropping assessor experience to two years
- Various scope/boundary concerns (RIIRIS402 vs. RIIRIS501 drift, RIIRIS601 sitting below AQF 6, RIIWHS301 audience unclear).

Following this review, it was agreed to describe roles by function, not job title; move CCM detail to the CVIG; uplift both RIIRIS501 and RIIRIS601; and re-scope RIIRIS402 and RIIWHS301. Because of these changes, further targeted consultation was sought to develop the training products.

Second round targeted consultation

A further round of targeted consultation was published to collect additional feedback on the proposed structural changes. Feedback was more concentrated and more detailed, and the structural changes were broadly welcomed and strongly endorsed as appropriate. Feedback centred on the following issues:

- RIIRIS402 stakeholders sought stronger stop-work provisions that identify triggers before work starts, the addition of normalised deviance and escalation authority, and clearer reflection of likelihood and severity in the assessment.
- RIIWHS301 the title was still seen as potentially misleading.
- Prerequisite request: stakeholders asked for RIIRIS402 to be made a prerequisite for RIIRIS501 and RIIRIS601.

The Technical Committee considered these issues and agreed to increase the assessor experience requirement to three years and to include triggers and normalised deviance. The prerequisite request was declined in favour of strengthened performance evidence and progression through the application statement.

Third round public and government consultation

A further round of consultation was published to seek additional feedback on the final units and to open the CVIG Addendum for comment. Feedback centred on two issues, both now resolved:

MEU sought explicit use of the words “critical control management” and non-stop triggers in the units. This was resolved by adding trigger/stop-work performance and knowledge evidence that expresses the CCM capabilities without naming CCM in the national text.

UQ raised Queensland mutual-recognition/ALARA and critical-control obligations. This was addressed by pointing to the mandatory legislation hooks already binding in each unit, supported by CVIG guidance.

The consultation closed with no unresolved concerns, and broad consensus was maintained.

Consultation with stakeholders

As part of the consultation described above, below is a breakdown of broad consensus by stakeholder group.

- **Regulatory bodies:** CMSHAC provided a written letter of support dated 23 July 2026. The WorkSafe Mines Safety Directorate (WA) engaged directly on unit wording and confirmed its position on control terminology before the wording was settled. State and territory WHS regulators were contacted directly and invited to comment at the second and final rounds.
- **Industry:** Mining employers across surface and underground, coal and metalliferous operations, expressed support along with industry associations and peak bodies. The Queensland Resources Council convened an out-of-session meeting of Queensland Technical Committee members to verify the accuracy of the CVIG Addendum content.
- **RTOs:** Private and public RTOs supported the revised units, several describing them as more realistic and fit for purpose than the endorsed versions at the intended AQF levels.
- **Employee representatives:** The Mining and Energy Union engaged across both rounds and confirmed its agreement following a summary of the feedback received, discussion with SWAP and the actions taken.

18.2 Where broad consensus is not reached, provide a justification for why the product has been submitted for endorsement, including how you attempted to gain consensus.

Click here to enter text.

Compliance with Requirements

19. Anti-Discrimination Assessment

Provide an assessment that demonstrates that the products meet anti-discrimination legislation, and associated standards and regulations, including the Disability Standards for Education 2005.

Refer to pg 38–40 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.



[Upload a copy of the Anti-Discrimination Assessment](#)

20. Pathways

Describe the process undertaken to ensure the training package products have pathways that facilitate movement between education sectors and employment.

Refer to pg 41–42 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

Note: Pathways advice must be included in the Companion Volume Implementation Guide.

Pathways were considered at three points: entry to the training products, movement between the training products, and movement from the training products into employment and further training.

Entry requirements:

None of the training products carry prerequisites. During the second round of targeted consultation, stakeholders recommended RIIRIS402 as a prerequisite for RIIRIS501 and RIIRIS601, on the basis that entrants to these units, usually from university, have not always worked in a workplace and may not have completed a risk assessment. The recommendation was not adopted because a prerequisite would create an access barrier that the content does not justify. The Technical Committee instead agreed to:

- show the progression in the application statements of RIIRIS501 and RIIRIS601;
- and

- strengthen the performance evidence of RIIRIS501 and RIIRIS601 to include risk assessment.

Movement between products:

The review refined the role boundaries between the risk units and included a communication unit and a safety and health investigations unit to support them. These units are also used across mining, drilling, extractive and civil infrastructure. Engagement with Build Skills Australia (BSA) on the units of mutual interest ensured that the products continue to support movement across the resources and civil infrastructure sectors. The units form a progression:

- RIIRIS301: a risk unit for workers and operators carrying out risk assessments.
- RIIRIS402: a step up from RIIRIS301, for those responsible for a work area or crew, facilitating job- or task-level risk assessment. RIIRIS401 was also considered, although out of scope, to keep movement between products possible and avoid gaps.
- RIIRIS501: a step up from RIIRIS402, for those responsible for an operational area, ensuring that systems, processes and resources are in place for risk management, including formal risk assessment.
- RIIRIS601: a step up from RIIRIS501, for those responsible for the site- or organisation-wide risk management system, which they establish or maintain.
- RIIWHS301: a supporting unit, adjusted so that candidates support, rather than lead, an initial safety and health investigation and gain exposure that informs their risk management practice. The unit is open to operators and supervisors and sits in other qualifications.
- RIICOM301: a supporting unit, reviewed to ensure that communication during risk assessment and management is clear and understood. It includes elements of communicating in challenging or sensitive workplace situations. The unit is open to operators and supervisors and sits in other qualifications.

Into employment and further training:

The supervisory and management qualifications lead to recognised employment and statutory outcomes in the sector, including supervisor and Site Senior Executive roles and, where relevant, the statutory certificates of competency issued by the relevant Board of Examiners.

21. Rationalising and Streamlining

Describe the process undertaken to rationalise and streamline the training package products.

Include information about any units and/or qualifications to be deleted and the results of any analysis of cross sector units and/or other existing units.

Refer to pg 43-44 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

Development for the training products began with a workforce functional analysis and a review of state regulatory requirements. This analysis established that the gap lay in the specification of existing units, so revision was the appropriate response rather than new development. The Technical Committee confirmed this finding, as did three rounds of consultation. No new units were developed as a part of this project.

Review of the five existing units found that four were Not Equivalent to their predecessors and one was Equivalent. Revision of the four focused on function-based descriptions rather than job titles, which clarifies role boundaries between the units.

RIIWH301: re-scoped from independently conducting investigations to initial response and contribution. The unit now covers establishment of the investigation, preservation of the scene and statutory notification, and no longer requires full root cause analysis.

RIIRIS402: re-scoped to facilitating task-level risk assessment and verifying control effectiveness in the field, including recognising stop-work triggers and escalating beyond the supervisor's authority. The unit progresses clearly from RIIRIS301.

RIIRIS501: re-anchored at management level, with the system-updating function removed and verification and capability evaluation added. The unit progresses clearly from RIIRIS402.

RIIRIS601: lifted to framework-level accountability, governance, audit and capability evaluation.

RIICOM301: determined Equivalent.

21.1 Has the analysis identified any overlap with existing units?

☐ Yes (go to 21.1) ☒ No (go to Q22)

21.2 Provide a justification for why existing products are not suitable.

Click here to enter text.

22. Request to change transition period

Is a change to the standard transition period (12 months) proposed for any products in this submission?

☐ Yes ☒ No (go to Q23)



Identify products where a change to the transition period is proposed in
Attachment A – Products submitted for assurance

Provide a rationale for the proposed transition period. Include information about the consultation undertaken to identify the need for a changed transition period.

Click here to enter text.

Training Product Content

23. Training Package Products

The Training Package Assurance team will review qualifications, units of competency and Skill Sets through Training Product Central.

Note: The drafting status of each training product must be set to 'Ready for Submission' and the project status must be set to 'Assurance Body Consideration'.



Upload a copy of the Companion Volume Implementation Guide

24. Pre-requisites

Does the submission include any units of competency that contain pre-requisites?

☐

Yes

☒

No (go to Q25)

If yes, describe the process undertaken to ensure the use of pre-requisites is minimised.

Click here to enter text.

Were there any issues raised about pre-requisites through the consultation process?



Yes



No (go to Q25)

If yes, provide a summary of the issue/s raised and how the issue/s have been resolved.

Stakeholders in the second round of targeted consultation recommended RIIRIS402 as a prerequisite for RIIRIS501 and RIIRIS601 on the basis that entrants to these units, usually from university, have not always worked in a workplace and may not have completed a risk assessment.

The recommendation was not adopted because a prerequisite would create an access barrier that the content does not justify. Instead, the Technical Committee (TC) agreed to show the progression in the application statements of RIIRIS501 and RIIRIS601, and to strengthen the performance evidence of both units to include risk assessment.

25. Foundation skills

How did you determine the required level of performance for each of the ACSF core skills areas?

Refer pg 51-52 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

The required level of performance for each ACSF core skill was determined for each qualification against the Australian Core Skills Framework, at the qualification level, to describe the foundation skills a competent person is expected to have on completion. Consistent with ACSF guidance, AQF level and ACSF level were not treated as directly equivalent.

Each of the following five core skills was set to the level of demand evident in the qualifications, so the levels may differ across skills within a single qualification:

- Learning
- Reading
- Writing
- Oral communication
- Numeracy

For each qualification, the determination considered the:

- AQF level.
- Occupation(s) to which the qualification leads, identified using the Occupation Standard Classification for Australia.
- Demands of the full unit set, with the core units carrying the mandatory requirement and the elective banks reviewed for the skills a valid selection adds.
- ACSF performance indicators for each core skill, taking account of the variables that affect performance, including the work context, the level of autonomy, and the complexity of the texts and tasks involved.

26. Stand-alone Units

Does the submission include any stand-alone units of competency?

Note: stand-alone units refer to units of competency that are not packaged into a qualification.

☐

Yes

☒

No (go to Q27)

If yes, provide justification for the use of a stand-alone unit. Explain why it cannot be immediately packaged into a qualification and the proposed plan for embedding it in a qualification in future updates to the training package.

Refer pg 52 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

Click here to enter text.

26.1 Support for Stand-alone Unit/s



Upload evidence of industry need and support for each stand-alone unit

Section 3 – CEO Declaration

27. Submission declaration

- ☒ This submission and proposed training package products were developed in accordance with all components of the Training Package Organising Framework (TPOF).
- ☒ I confirm the training package product/s align with their intended purpose and are structured to meet the needs of industry, employers and learners.
- ☒ I confirm all required attachments are included with this submission.
- ☒ I confirm the final draft products are accurately entered into Training Product Central and are ready for assurance assessment.

Jobs and Skills Council Chief Executive Officer			
Signature*:		Date:	13/10/2026
Full Name:	Dr Gavin Lind		

* Options for capturing the CEO signature include: copy and paste an electronic signature above; upload a separate signed document which includes the required declarations to GovTEAMS; send an email from the CEOs email address to TrainingPackageAssurance@dewr.gov.au which includes the required declarations.

27. CEO summary statement

Include a summary from the CEO describing how they have ensured that the submission has been developed in accordance with the requirements set out in the TPOF.

I, Dr Gavin Lind, as Chief Executive Officer of AUSMASA, confirm that the submitted training package products comply with the Training Package Organising Framework (TPOF) requirements, including adherence to the Qualification Development Quality Principles, Product Requirements, and Process Requirements.

Key assurances include:

- comprehensive stakeholder consultation, with feedback incorporated or, where not incorporated, addressed with justification;
- review by the technical committee;
- completion of the Senior Officials' check;
- compliance with anti-discrimination legislation and inclusivity standards; and

provision of detailed mapping and implementation information in the Companion Volume Implementation Guide and accompanying Addendum.

Submission Checklist

To avoid a delay in the processing of your submission, please ensure that your submission is complete. Submissions that are not accompanied by the required attachments will be returned for completion. Confirm the following documents have been uploaded where applicable.

Q.	Submission Requirement	Uploaded	N/A	 Evidence Reference
Other	Publish submission to JSC website as per Step 5.1 of the TPOF. Refer to page 2 for minimum required documents.	☐		Click here to enter the URL/link to the published submission.
3	Attachment A – Products submitted for assurance	☒		MAS_ANN_2425_006_Attachment A
5	Technical committee membership details	☒		Attachment 05a_Technical Committee Composition Attachment 05b_Technical Committee Terms of Reference
7	A copy of the stakeholder consultation strategy	☒		Attachment 07_Consultation Strategy
10	The consultation log	☒		Attachment 10_Consultation Log
11	Evidence that the SRO check was undertaken	☒		Attachment 11_SRO Check
12	Evidence of support from all relevant national/state and territory regulatory and/or licensing bodies	☒	☐	Attachment 12a_Regulator Support_QLD Attachment 12b_Regulator Support_NSW Attachment 12c_Regulator Support_WA
13	Evidence of engagement with other relevant JSCs	☒	☐	Attachment 13a_JSC Engagement_BSA Attachment 13b_JSC Engagement_PSO
14.1	Evidence of support for proposed MWRs including employer willingness to support placements	☐	☒	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
17	The Alternative Dispute Resolution practitioner's advice	☐	☒	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.

Q.	Submission Requirement	Uploaded	N/A	 Evidence Reference
18	Evidence to support broad consensus	☒		Attachment 6_Technical Committee Statement Attachment 10_Consultation Log Attachment 11_SRO Check Attachments 12_Regulator Support Attachment 18_Technical Committee Meeting Minutes
19	The Anti-Discrimination Assessment	☒		Attachment 19_Anti-Discrimination Assessment
23	Training Package products submitted in Training Product Central	☒		
	The Companion Volume Implementation Guide	☒		Attachment 23a_RII Release 12 CVIG Attachment 23b_Risk Management and Safety CVIG Addendum
26.1	Evidence of identified industry need and support for stand-alone units	☐	☒	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.