



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 Assurance Body 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 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

This form and the required attachments must be uploaded to the relevant activity folder in the TPA GovTEAMS Community. Once all documents have been uploaded, email TrainingPackageAssurance@dewr.gov.au with the Activity 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 Training Package Assurance Submission Compliance Guide TPOF 1 July 2025 for information about how the Assurance Body 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):	Annie Barry	Position:	Manager, Training Product Development
Phone:	0423 145 060	Mobile:	0423 145 060
Email(s):	projects@ausmasa.org.au		

2. Activity Details

Activity ID:	MAS_ANN_2425_007
Activity Title:	Review and update AURVTN120 Remove and replace major welded panels on vehicles

Provide a brief description of the activity.

The primary objective of this project was to review the wording of the unit of competency AURVTN120 Remove and replace major welded panels on vehicles. This core unit within the AUR32120 Certificate III in Automotive Body Repair Technology is currently on the scope of 29 RTOs.

The review was initiated after multiple AUSMASA stakeholders raised concerns about the unit's ambiguous wording. The existing Performance Evidence can be interpreted in two conflicting ways: either that learners must complete nine panel replacements across three vehicles, or only three replacements across different vehicle types. This ambiguity has resulted in inconsistent training and assessment practices.

To resolve these inconsistencies and ensure the required number of repetitions is clear and measurable, AUSMASA undertook consultation across the automotive and TAFE sectors. Insights gained from this process informed revisions to AURVTN120 to clarify expectations and better define the required standard of performance.

Given the focused nature of the project — a single amendment to the Performance Evidence of one unit of competency — consultation progressed efficiently and consensus was reached unanimously across all stakeholder groups. As a result, the project was completed in a shorter

timeframe than initially anticipated, with no outstanding issues requiring resolution prior to submission.

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 also 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):	1	0	1
Unit(s) of competency:	1	0	1
Skill Set(s):			2

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

The project scope did not include any minor change requirements. However, minor changes that affected the qualification as a result of work completed on other projects have been included here. The primary reason to absorb these changes at this time is avoid multiple releases and limit the impact on RTOs. Details of minor changes are as follow:

As part of the MAS_ANN_2425_004 Advanced Driver Assistance Systems (ADAS) project, the following units were added to the general electives bank:

- AURETR052 Apply knowledge of Advanced Driver Assistance Systems (ADAS)

Update and replace by non-equivalent unit

- AURETR149 Apply knowledge of ADAS technology in vehicle pre-repair scans replaced by AURETR249 Scan and calibrate advanced driver assistance systems (ADAS)

As part of the MAA_ANN_2324_005 Superseded unit review project, the following units were updated and replaces with their superseded units in the general electives bank:

- MEM24001B Perform basic penetrant testing replaced by MEM18110 Perform basic penetrant testing
- RIIWHS204D Work safely at heights replaced by RIIWHS204E Work safely at heights
- TAEDEL301 Provide work skill instruction replaced by TAEDEL311 Provide work skill instruction



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:

[Annual Training Product Development Plan Activities](#)

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

Click or tap 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?

Yes No (go to Q5)

If yes, provide details of the changes.

Click or tap 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.

Shane Gaghan remained a part of the Technical Committee through the entirety of the project, however on 12/11/2025 after receiving no response from Shane regarding their signing of the TC statement, we were advised Shane no longer held the role as Senior VET Advisor. Attempts were made to leave a message for Shane to contact us, however no response was received.

6. Technical Committee Statement



Upload a statement that the technical committee has reviewed the final draft training package products

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)?

Yes No (go to Q8)

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

The list of stakeholders provided in the consultation strategy was broader to cover a larger number of organisations.

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	September 1 – 19, 2025
Incorporating feedback (additional consultation if required)	October 2025
Senior Officials Check	November 11 – 26, 2025

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.

The review of AURVTN120 Remove and replace major welded panels on vehicles addresses a longstanding implementation issue within the automotive body repair sector, with consultation focused on the existing training and assessment workforce. The consultation process was open to all stakeholders and included mechanisms to enable broad participation. These included online surveys, structured interviews, and email-based engagement, with plain English materials used throughout.

Stakeholders at different stages of their careers and roles within the industry were considered throughout the consultation process. Feedback consistently highlighted that the original Performance Evidence wording was being interpreted inconsistently across RTOs, with some trainers and assessors reading the requirement as mandating up to nine individual panel replacements across three separate vehicles. This created significant resource and access barriers, particularly for smaller RTOs and apprentices in workplaces where opportunities to complete the unit as originally written were limited.

The perspectives of apprentices, trainers, assessors, and employers informed the revision of the Performance Evidence, with the aim of ensuring the unit remains rigorous and industry-relevant while being practically achievable across a diverse range of training contexts. The revised wording — clarifying that three major welded panels may be replaced on the same vehicle — was developed in direct response to this feedback and received broad support across all stakeholder groups consulted.

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 activity.

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

During the Initial Development step of the project, fifteen respondents provided feedback, primarily through a structured survey and targeted interviews. The majority were RTOs (public and private), with representation from employers and one industry association. Feedback focused on ambiguity in the existing Performance Evidence (PE) wording for AURVTN120, which required learners to remove and replace major welded panels on three different vehicles. The primary concern was that this had been interpreted inconsistently; some trainers read the requirement as three panels on three different vehicles (i.e. nine panel replacements in total), creating significant resource burdens for RTOs in sourcing vehicles and for learners in completing assessments.

Key issues raised included difficulty sourcing vehicles with different panels requiring replacement, cost and time constraints in training and assessment delivery, and lack of clarity on whether panel types had to differ across vehicles. Several RTOs and employers also raised the question of whether OEM specifications needed to be referenced, and whether emerging techniques such as bonded and riveted panel replacement should be incorporated into the unit.

One notable issue was raised by the Victorian Skills Authority on behalf of the Victorian SRO, querying whether the change could be fast-tracked as a minor change rather than following the full TPOF process. AUSMASA responded that, as AURVTN120 is a core unit within AUR32120 Certificate III in Automotive Body Repair Technology, any change is classified as a major change and must follow the full development and endorsement process. The VSA also raised questions about the impact on the Victorian Purchasing Guide and whether the updated unit would be deemed equivalent. AUSMASA noted it was not yet in a position to determine equivalency.

AUSMASA's response to Step 1 feedback was to revise the PE to clarify that learners are required to remove and replace three major welded panels, which may be completed on the same vehicle. This addressed the core ambiguity, reduced the vehicle sourcing burden on RTOs, and maintained the integrity of the assessment requirement.

In Step 2 – Public and Government Consultation, 21 respondents provided feedback. The survey asked two specific questions: whether the revised PE provided clear guidance on assessment requirements, and whether respondents agreed with the listed panel types. All 21 respondents answered yes to both questions, indicating broad consensus in support of the revised wording.

Two additional interviews were conducted during this step. A trainer from Murray Mallee Training Company raised a safety concern regarding the risk of carbon monoxide poisoning if panels are not

cut in accordance with OEM specifications. AUSMASA responded that following OEM requirements is specified throughout the unit of competency, and that students are assessed on their ability to comply with OEM, workplace, and regulatory requirements.

A representative from Tesla raised a concern specific to Tesla apprentices, noting that Tesla vehicles have very few welded panels, making it difficult to complete three panel replacements on-site.

AUSMASA acknowledged this concern but noted that, as nationally recognised training products must equip graduates with skills applicable across all employers, the unit cannot be tailored to a single manufacturer. AUSMASA advised that Tesla apprentices could complete the remaining panel assessments at their RTO. The TAG was consulted on this matter and confirmed that bonded and riveted panel techniques are addressed separately in AURVTN123, which is a core unit in the same qualification.

The Industry Skills Advisory Council NT provided a letter of support for the proposed changes, describing the revised PE as clear, well-structured, and removing previous ambiguity.

There was broad consensus in support of the revised wording, with no further revisions required. This enabled the project to progress to the Senior Officials Check, with all states and territories providing responses in support of the proposed changes

Overall

Consultation across all stages demonstrated strong support for the revised Performance Evidence. The core issue: ambiguity in the original wording was identified early and addressed through a targeted amendment. No unresolved disputes were recorded.

All SROs were engaged as part of the process. The two substantive concerns raised during Step 2 (OEM safety and Tesla-specific delivery challenges) were addressed through AUSMASA responses and TAG advice, and neither resulted in further changes to the unit.

Evidence provided: Attachment 10 Consult Log.xlsx

11. Senior Officials Check



Upload evidence that the Senior Responsible Officer check was undertaken

12. Support from Regulatory and Licensing Bodies

Do any of the products in the submission have regulatory, licensing, or legislative implications?

Yes

No (go to Q13)



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

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:

Click or tap here to enter text.



Upload evidence of engagement with all listed Jobs and Skills Councils

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 or tap 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

15. Implementation Issues

Were any implementation issues raised through the consultation process?

- Yes No (go to Q16)

If yes, provide a summary of the implementation issues raised and the proposed management strategy.

For example:

- how the downstream impacts of the changes will be managed (for example, where the submission proposes deletion of units/qualifications)
- implications for other products in the training system

Click or tap here to enter text.

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.

Click or tap here to enter text.



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 or tap 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.

The revised Performance Evidence for AURVTN120 was developed in direct response to stakeholder feedback gathered through consultation and considered with the assistance of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG).

Feedback was reviewed, actions agreed, and refinements made to ensure the updated unit reflected industry needs and remained practically achievable for RTOs and learners across all jurisdictions.

Broad consensus for the revised AURVTN120 is evidenced by:

- the consultation log documenting stakeholder engagement and feedback across all stages of the project, including responses from RTOs, employers, government bodies, and industry associations across seven jurisdictions (see Attachment 10 Consult Log)
- respondents to the Step 2 public and government consultation survey confirming that the revised Performance Evidence provides clear assessment guidance and that the listed panel types are appropriate
- Technical Advisory Group meeting minutes documenting TAG advice on key issues raised during consultation, including the treatment of bonded and riveted panel techniques and manufacturer-specific delivery considerations (see Attachment 6a TC Minutes)
- the Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) check, which identified no outstanding implementation issues (see Attachment 11 Senior Officials Check)

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 or tap 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](#).



Upload a copy of the Anti-Discrimination Assessment

20. Pathways



Upload evidence that pathways into and through the products have been **considered and agreed**

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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

21.1 Has the analysis identified any overlap with existing units?

Yes

No (go to Q22)

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

Click or tap 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 or tap 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.



[Upload a copy the Companion Volume Implementation Guide](#)

24. Pre-requisites

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

Yes No (go to Q23)

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

Click or tap 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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

25. 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 Q26)

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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

25.1 Support for Stand-alone Unit/s




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

Section 3 - CEO Declaration

26. 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:	21/04/2026
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. This includes adherence to the Qualification Development Quality Principles, Product Requirements, and Process Requirements.


Key assurances include:


- Comprehensive stakeholder consultation, with feedback incorporated or justified
- Reviewed by the technical advisory group
- Compliance with anti-discrimination legislation and inclusivity standards
- Detailed mapping and implementation information provided in the Companion Volume Implementation Guide.

All supporting evidence has been uploaded to GovTEAMS for assessment. For further information, please contact Annie Barry at projects@ausmasa.org.au

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
3	Attachment A – Products submitted for assurance, including (where applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulatory, licensing, or legislative implications (see item 12) Mandatory Workplace Requirements (see item 14) Requested transition period details (see item 22) 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		MAS_ANN_2425_007_Attachment A
5	Technical committee membership details	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Attachment 5 TC Composition Attachment 5a TC Terms of Reference
6	A statement that the technical committee has reviewed the final draft training package products	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Attachment 6 TC Statement Attachment 6a TC Meeting Minutes
7	A copy of the stakeholder consultation strategy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Attachment 7 Consult. Strategy
10	The consultation log including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detail about disputes and the stakeholders involved where applicable (see item 16) 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Attachment 10 Consult Log
11	Evidence that the SRO check was undertaken	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Attachment 11 Senior Officials Check
12	Evidence of support from all relevant national/state and territory regulatory and/or licensing bodies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
13	Evidence of engagement with other relevant JSCs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
14.1	Evidence of support for proposed MWRs including employer willingness to support placements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.

Q.	Submission Requirement	Uploaded	N/A	 Evidence Reference
17	The Alternative Dispute Resolution practitioner's advice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
18	Evidence to support broad consensus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Attachment 6a TC Meeting Minutes Attachment 10 Consult Log Attachment 11 Senior Officials Check
19	The Anti-Discrimination Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Attachment 19 Anti-discrimination assessment
20	Evidence that pathways into and through the products have been considered and agreed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Attachment 20 Pathways
23	The Companion Volume Implementation Guide	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Attachment 23 AUR Release 9 Companion Volume Attachment 23a Training Package Products
25.1	Evidence of identified industry need and support for a stand-alone unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.