Australian Government
Department of Employment and Workplace Relations

Attachment B - Consultation Log - High-level summary

TLI Rail Fundamentals (Prevocational) Project

Stakeholder type	Number of respondents	What are the key issues	Action taken to address the issue	Does this stakeholder group support the product?
Technical Committee Members	10	A technical committee member asked how new and traditional unit templates would be used in future drafts.	The question was noted for future discussion during draft development.	In principle
State Government Representative	1	A stakeholder offered practical information on the current qualification's delivery structure, including how TLI units and imported units such as First Aid are combined, and offered to present high-level packaging rules, delivered units and the delivery plan.	The email response thanked the stakeholder for the materials.	In draft format
State Government Representative	1	A course flyer described how a Certificate II Rail Fundamentals VET-in-Schools program can be combined with other VET-in-Schools offerings to strengthen career pathways.	The flyer was added to the resource bank to inform development and transition of Victorian materials into national training products.	In draft format
Industry Training Advisory Boards/Other	1	A stakeholder could not yet determine whether the proposed one-qualification, nine-unit structure was appropriate. Questions concerned alignment with the existing nationally accredited rail operations skill set, potential duplication or complementarity, target audiences, and pathways into Commonwealth and state traineeships, apprenticeships and Rail Industry Worker card requirements. The final structure was expected to become clearer as the current Victorian qualification and its possible national transition were evaluated.	The response acknowledged that the initial list was based on supplied material and that the committee would determine what is ultimately used. It also noted that other units could be considered to support the qualification.	In draft format
State Government Representative	1	A stakeholder provided current and previous Certificate II flyers showing qualification structures and electives, together with a training delivery sequence. The documents were offered to support discussion of qualification structure, packaging rules, and the creation or import of elective units.	The supplied documents and delivery information were acknowledged with thanks.	In draft format
Technical Committee Members	1	A technical committee member was concerned that the unit descriptions did not clearly show possible job outcomes or career pathways.	The response noted that endorsed training products can include job titles, but these may become outdated; a companion volume was identified as a more flexible option.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	A technical committee member suggested including work placement or work experience components within the qualification.	The benefit was acknowledged, but members identified a significant operational burden and considered mandatory placements difficult. Excursions were viewed as a more practical option.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	Discussion covered employment preparation, including online interviews, resumes and recruitment processes.	Members agreed these skills are increasingly important, and noted that the existing Victorian program includes mock interviews with rail employers.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	A technical committee member suggested including awareness of psychometric and aptitude testing within employment preparation.	The response noted that these assessments are discussed during delivery but are not formally embedded in the units, and that learners often have limited awareness of them.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	A technical committee member said the qualification should attract students to rail careers beyond train driving.	Members confirmed this was a key design principle, with the qualification intended to highlight operational, customer service, signalling and network management careers.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	2	A technical committee member questioned whether the unit on reporting a factor impacting the rail industry remained appropriate.	The response explained that the unit was originally designed to develop report-writing and research skills, while several members considered two reporting-focused units potentially excessive.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	2	A technical committee member suggested replacing reporting-focused content with more engaging investigation of the rail industry.	An alternative unit focused on industry investigation, particularly future technologies, was considered potentially more engaging and relevant.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	A technical committee member suggested covering emerging technologies, autonomous rail, modern signalling and high-speed rail.	The response indicated these themes may fit within existing units, particularly the new and emerging technologies unit. Unit content would be reviewed to ensure emerging technologies are adequately represented for committee review.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	Clarification was requested about the qualification's target audience because the documentation did not clearly identify intended learners beyond VET-in-Schools students.	The response explained that the qualification originated in a VET-in-Schools context but must be broadened nationally to support school leavers and other entry-level cohorts.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	A concern was raised that young people may disengage from heavily theoretical training and need practical, hands-on experiences.	Members agreed practical engagement is critical, citing site visits, excursions and practical activities in the existing Victorian program. The meeting reached consensus that practical engagement must be retained.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	2	A question was raised about whether the units align with higher-level qualifications, including Certificate III pathways and apprenticeships.	The response confirmed this alignment was deliberate: the units were designed as foundation units to support progression into higher qualifications and rail careers.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	3	A question was raised about how the qualification could operate in regional areas with limited access to rail facilities.	The response explained that the qualification was designed to be primarily theoretical while retaining practical activities, allowing delivery where rail access is limited. Excursions could supplement delivery where possible.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	The balance between VET-in-Schools delivery and broader employment pathway outcomes was identified as needing clearer definition.	The response agreed that this required further consideration and should be revisited at a future meeting.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	A technical committee member suggested including "Safely Access the Rail Corridor" within the qualification as an elective component.	The response noted constraints related to under-18 learners and assessment requirements, while confirming the training exists as a Victorian elective. Its inclusion as an elective option was supported for further investigation.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	A technical committee member suggested including communication, radio and communications-equipment units for consideration within the qualification.	Members agreed that communication skills are relevant and that additional communication-related electives should be considered.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	A technical committee member suggested including Construction Induction, commonly referred to as a White Card, as an elective.	Several members supported the suggestion and clarified the current terminology as Construction Induction Card. It was seen as valuable for infrastructure pathways, with feasibility as an elective pathway to be assessed.	In principle

Technical Committee Members	1	A technical committee member suggested including safe-working evolution and history, together with background on rail safety systems.	The response noted that some content may fit within safety awareness and emerging technology units, while broader safety-systems context could be incorporated for committee review.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	2	A technical committee member said students need greater visibility of rail career pathways and job opportunities.	The feedback received broad support. Members noted that the existing Victorian program exposes students to multiple rail operational areas and career options rather than focusing only on train driving.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	The discussion identified skill shortages in signalling, signalling engineering, network control and related technical occupations.	Members confirmed that national shortages exist in signalling, signalling engineering and network control roles.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	3	A concern was raised that terms such as “urban” and “intercity”, along with other Victorian-specific language, may not apply nationally.	The committee agreed that terminology should be reviewed and nationalised across all units for consistency.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	A technical committee member raised concern that some wording may be too complex for Year 11 students.	The response clarified that units are written for registered training organisations rather than directly for students, but agreed that wording should remain accessible.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	2	A technical committee member suggested creating a glossary of rail terms.	Members strongly supported considering a glossary in the companion volume, with a follow-up to source rail glossary examples for future discussion.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	The discussion covered Safe Access to Rail Corridor training.	A committee member advised that acceptance varies across rail networks and jurisdictions; it may be useful as foundational knowledge but should not be presented as universally accepted network access.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	5	A technical committee member emphasised the need for national consistency while retaining flexibility for local implementation.	This principle was repeatedly acknowledged, with electives and companion volumes identified as mechanisms for supporting local flexibility.	In principle
Industry Training Advisory Boards/Other	1	A stakeholder requested responses to questions about the proposed national pre-vocational rail qualification. The feedback called for a review of rail-related school programs and qualifications across all states and territories, comparison with the current Victorian course, and consultation with heavy-haul operators and existing school pathway programs. It stated that broader national input could strengthen the qualification, cautioned against unintentionally replacing successful pathways without adequate consultation, and highlighted the need to articulate with existing rail qualifications including Certificate II in Shunting and Certificate II in Rail Infrastructure.	The feedback was added to the consultation log. Investigations were to be undertaken, with outcomes to be reported at the next technical committee meeting scheduled for 24 July 2026.	
Technical Committee Members	11	Feedback questioned whether the listed functional areas of rail operations are consistent across states and territories and identified possible omissions, including terminal and yard operations, infrastructure management, rolling stock management, timetabling and network planning, customer service and logistics, network control and safeworking, and train operations and driving.	The wording was strengthened in version 3 and submitted for validation at the second technical committee meeting.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	A stakeholder considered a performance criterion for identifying rail network infrastructure too demanding when compared with an existing unit that uses basic track and structures infrastructure terminology.	The element and performance-criterion wording was revised in response to the feedback and applied to version 3 for committee review.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	A stakeholder questioned the use of “dog spike” terminology and suggested using “rail fastening systems” instead.	The terminology was replaced in response to the feedback and applied to version 3 for committee review.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	A stakeholder reviewed the materials and added comments in the relevant sections across the reviewed material.	Wording was revised and responses to the comments were added to version 3 for committee review.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	2	A stakeholder asked whether other rail network types, including heavy haul, freight and high-speed rail, should also be explored.	The response agreed that this detail can be incorporated into the training materials. A sentence was added to define “rail” and “light rail”, and two elements direct learners to explore the network types further. The feedback was reworked into version 3 for committee review on 4 August 2026.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	Suggested adding a performance criterion covering learning about the impacts of drugs and alcohol.	The response considers the information useful and suggests capturing it in Performance Evidence and/or Knowledge Evidence.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	Suggested using an excursion or similar activity to give learners an opportunity to wear the required PPE.	The committee regarded this as worthwhile despite the need for training providers to maintain PPE kits. It proposed considering a performance criterion requiring demonstration of correct PPE fitting in line with rail-operator requirements.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	A training provider advised that it delivers Certificate II rail infrastructure training to VETDSS students, may be able to provide relevant information, and offered further assistance.	The response requested more detail about the qualification structure and the units delivered or available to VETDSS students.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	Reported, with some uncertainty, that a regularly used training provider may work with school-based apprentices or trainees, possibly through a mining initiative, and offered to obtain more information.	The response records that the information would be followed up and added to the review and analysis matrix.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	3	Proposed refocusing the unit on foundational identification of rail and light-rail network components, contexts, governance and operations, including automation, for entry-level or further-study pathways without implying rail-safety or operating competence.	The feedback was reviewed and reworked into version 3 for committee review.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	7	Proposed a structured first element covering comparison of network types and components, system interactions, geographic reach and major interfaces, and Grades of Automation with changing responsibility between people and automated systems.	The feedback was reworked into version 3. The proposed first element covers network purpose and characteristics, rolling stock, infrastructure and operational systems, geographic coverage and key locations, and supporting roles and responsibilities.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	Recommended combining the first two elements to avoid repetition while allowing common components and differences in network purpose, operating environment, infrastructure, rolling stock and operating models to be compared.	The response states that Elements 1 and 2 were combined in the version 3 draft for committee review.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	Proposed replacing the second element with coverage of rail governance and regulatory arrangements, including entity roles, the Rail Safety National Law, accreditation and registration information, and distinctions among regulatory, infrastructure-management and operational responsibilities.	The response directs that the current Elements 1 and 2 be retained, with the suggestion potentially addressed as a third element and supporting detail included in Performance Evidence and Knowledge Evidence.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	10	Recommended revising the third element to distinguish regulatory, governance, infrastructure-management and operational responsibilities rather than combining public-transport administration with railway-operation and rail-safety functions.	The third element was rewritten to incorporate the feedback, with additional detail to be included in Performance Evidence and Knowledge Evidence.	In principle

Technical Committee Members	11	Proposed an application-focused element requiring learners to research selected Australian rail and light-rail networks, compare their purpose, context, reach, nodes, components and governance, and present findings using appropriate terminology and authoritative sources.	The third element was rewritten to incorporate the feedback, with additional detail to be included in Performance Evidence and Knowledge Evidence.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	2	Noted that the content appeared to cover journey planning, timetable interpretation, passenger experience, service connections and customer-service observations. It also identified possible accessibility barriers for regional, remote, freight-only or jurisdictions without accessible passenger or light-rail services, suggesting reconsideration in the assessment conditions.	Element 4 and its performance criteria were reworded in version 3, with some detail to be incorporated into the assessment conditions.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	2	Proposed evidence requiring research, comparison and presentation of selected Australian networks collectively covering passenger or metro, freight or heavy haul, and light rail. The evidence would address purpose, context, reach, nodes, components, governance, operating models including a GoA4 example, rail terminology and source acknowledgement.	The Performance Evidence was rewritten in response to the feedback and applied to version 3 for committee review.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	Proposed adding comparison of at least one driver-operated and one automated passenger network, including an unattended train operation (GoA4) example.	The Performance Evidence was rewritten in response to the feedback and applied to version 3 for committee review.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	8	Proposed Knowledge Evidence covering rail terminology; network types and operating contexts; system components and relationships; geographic reach and interfaces; Grades of Automation; regulatory, governance, infrastructure-management and operational roles; the Rail Safety National Law; and authoritative current information sources. It noted that highly specific rolling-stock and infrastructure detail may be more suitable for specialist units. Detailed examples were suggested for companion-volume guidance or specialist units.	The Knowledge Evidence was rewritten in response to the feedback and applied to version 3 for committee review.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	Proposed defining Grades of Automation from GoA0 through GoA4 and explaining how responsibility for basic train-operation functions is allocated between personnel and automated systems at each grade.	The Knowledge Evidence was rewritten in response to the feedback and applied to version 3 for committee review.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	2	Proposed revising the legislation coverage to address the purpose and high-level operation of the Rail Safety National Law and its application through relevant state and territory legislation.	The Knowledge Evidence was rewritten in response to the feedback and applied to version 3 for committee review.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	Questioned the inclusion of passenger-group types sharing a carriage because the requirement may be subjective and difficult to benchmark consistently.	The Knowledge Evidence response was rewritten and applied to version 3 for committee review.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	2	Requested a documented comparison with AUMAFA001, FSKLRG007, FSKLRG010 and BSBPEF101 because the proposed employment unit appeared to overlap career exploration, pathway planning, application preparation and interview performance. It also requested a clear rail-specific point of difference if the unit were retained.	An analysis and comparison matrix was completed and presented to the committee, which agreed to continue developing the unit.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	2	Suggested considering the Application of Skills and Knowledge template because the draft prepares learners for employment or further training rather than a defined rail workplace function, and the template may express the career, planning and employability outcomes without artificial workplace elements or operational assessment conditions.	The template suggestion was discussed. Feedback was being sought on whether some units could be approved and endorsed using the Application of Skills and Knowledge template.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	4	Asked whether the main outcome should be career-pathway planning, immediate application and interview readiness, or both, and suggested a title encompassing employment, apprenticeships, traineeships and further study.	The response says a title change may be considered and notes that the unit is pre-vocational and may be included in pathway qualifications, skill sets and school-based apprenticeship or traineeship qualifications.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	Suggested clarifying the boundary with core units on network fundamentals and rail functions by applying existing foundational knowledge to career decisions rather than reassessing it. It also proposed broadening the rail ecosystem to include infrastructure, rolling stock, construction, engineering, regulation, assurance, digital systems and supply-chain roles.	Elements and performance criteria were reworded in version 3 to strengthen the rail context and broaden the focus from obtaining a job to career exploration and employment readiness.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	Proposed replacing the subjective assessment of personal eligibility and suitability with comparison of current skills, knowledge, interests and experience against selected role requirements, identification of development needs and supports, and next steps. It cautioned that completion must not imply satisfaction of medical, age, licensing, security, authorisation or employer-selection requirements.	Elements and performance criteria were reworded in version 3 to strengthen the rail context and broaden the focus from obtaining a job to career exploration and employment readiness.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	Suggested broadening the element to cover worker and employer rights and responsibilities, including safe and respectful behaviour, WHS/OHS, privacy, workplace protections, fitness for work, reporting concerns and assistance sources. It also proposed requiring clarification or raising a safety concern when an instruction is unclear or unsafe.	Elements and performance criteria were reworded in version 3 to strengthen the rail context and broaden the focus from obtaining a job to career exploration and employment readiness.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	Proposed reframing the outcome around preparing application materials for a selected rail-industry opportunity, allowing for different recruitment requirements. It recommended interpreting instructions, checking materials, obtaining feedback and revising them; using a nominated reviewer rather than only a supervisor; and avoiding real applications or unnecessary personal information.	Elements and performance criteria were reworded in version 3 to strengthen the rail context and broaden the focus from obtaining a job to career exploration and employment readiness.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	Questioned the requirement to be suitably attired because it is subjective and may produce inconsistent or inequitable judgements. It suggested assessing preparation, respectful behaviour and communication appropriate to the interview mode and role requirements instead.	Elements and performance criteria were reworded in version 3 to strengthen the rail context and broaden the focus from obtaining a job to career exploration and employment readiness.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	11	Proposed integrated Performance Evidence covering a career action plan, comparison of capabilities with role requirements, workplace expectations and feedback. The suggested model involved investigating two roles or pathways from different functional areas, developing one plan, preparing one tailored application, and completing a simulated interview followed by feedback and reflection.	The feedback informed the version 3 Performance Evidence, with wording clarified and strengthened to support assessment of the elements and performance criteria.	In principle

Technical Committee Members	3	Proposed reorganising Knowledge Evidence around assessable categories rather than fixed occupation lists and prescribed activities, covering occupational areas and pathways, authoritative sources, entry requirements, training, career planning, recruitment, ethical applications, interviews, workplace rights and responsibilities, and technological change. It suggested placing updateable role examples in the Companion Volume.	The response records that the knowledge evidence would be streamlined in consultation with the committee.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	5	Suggested removing named tools and activities from endorsed Knowledge Evidence because they may be proprietary, change over time or be inaccessible, and instead specifying the purpose, features and appropriate use of career self-assessment resources.	The Knowledge Evidence response was rewritten in response to the feedback and applied to version 3 for committee review.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	2	Suggested reframing the conditions around career planning and recruitment because no operational rail activity is assessed. It proposed career information, representative position descriptions, application instructions, digital tools and a simulated interview as resources, with rail personnel, facilities, site visits and real applications optional rather than mandatory, and replacing ‘students’ with ‘candidates’.	The recorded response states that Knowledge Evidence was rewritten for version 3 committee review; it does not separately confirm the proposed assessment-condition changes.	In principle
State Government Representative	2	Asked whether PPE fitting should be included in Performance Evidence if the related performance criterion is changed.	The response agrees and notes that the Performance Evidence section could be strengthened and clarified in a future version of the unit.	In draft format
State Government Representative	2	Suggested explicitly covering customer-service responsibilities for maintaining a safe station or train environment, including identifying risks and reporting or mitigating hazards in line with rail-operator processes, potentially as a separate focus or alongside the relevant element.	The feedback was incorporated into version 3 of the unit for committee review.	In draft format
State Government Representative	2	Asked whether the customer-service unit should be elective or core, noting its importance to network functioning and its transferable employability value across operational roles and other entry-level industries.	No response recorded.	In draft format
State Government Representative	3	Suggested that newer signalling systems, currently addressed in the proposed emerging-technology unit, could also be covered as formal learning in the rail-network-infrastructure unit.	The response was rewritten and applied to version 3 for committee review.	In draft format
State Government Representative	1	Asked whether ‘turnout’ is the terminology used across Australia or whether ‘switch’ is also used.	The response cites the Australian industry standard RISSB AS 7642:2022, ‘Turnouts and other special trackwork’, and ARTC ETA-02-01 as references.	In draft format
State Government Representative	5	Suggested considering units from complementary VET qualifications, such as electrotechnology, hand tools or construction safety, where they align with rail study and potential electrical, rolling-stock or other apprenticeships.	A committee member supported considering baseline units used in other courses and stated that rail-corridor-access training is mandatory for rail employees in one jurisdiction; training and assessment can occur in a simulated environment.	In draft format
Technical Committee Members	1	A training provider supplied a 16-unit rail program delivered over three school terms, one day per week.	The information was noted for further discussion and referenced in analysis of other state-based programs.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	10	Committee feedback recommended updating the title and terminology to remove a rail-versus-light-rail distinction wherever possible.	The committee agreed that the unit should address rail networks generally.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	9	Committee feedback recommended allowing performance evidence through journeys, simulations, virtual tours, industry visits or case studies, rather than relying on a single delivery format.	The committee agreed this flexibility would support regional and remote learners.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	9	Committee feedback recommended allowing performance evidence through journeys, simulations, virtual tours, industry visits or case studies.	The committee agreed this flexibility would support regional and remote learners.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	9	Committee feedback recommended reviewing employment-application language, including the terminology used for resumes and cover letters.	The committee agreed to broaden the terminology to help future-proof the unit.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	9	Committee members suggested considering terminology such as “professional profile” instead of “resume”.	The committee agreed to review the terminology again in the next version released for review.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	9	Committee feedback called for review of the emerging-technologies unit structure and performance criteria.	The committee agreed that the unit would be revised following further discussion.	In principle
State Government Representative	1	Feedback recommended describing different types of rolling stock used on rail and light-rail networks, rather than attempting to list all rolling stock in Australia, with the coverage potentially limited to representative types.	The performance evidence was rewritten in response and incorporated into version 3 for committee review.	In draft format
State Government Representative	1	Feedback questioned the geographic scope of rail and light-rail networks and suggested referring to network coverage in the relevant state or territory where appropriate.	The performance evidence was rewritten in response and incorporated into version 3 for committee review.	In draft format
State Government Representative	1	Feedback noted that connecting two rail networks may not be feasible for every learner. It suggested setting a minimum time or distance, or requiring one change, so that the journey remains sufficiently complex to report.	The performance evidence was rewritten in response and incorporated into version 3 for committee review.	In draft format
Technical Committee Members	2	Committee feedback proposed combining Elements 1 and 2 of Unit 1.	The committee agreed to the combination following its feedback.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	9	The committee discussed whether the First Aid unit should be included in the qualification.	The First Aid unit was removed from the elective group. It may be included as an imported unit where required under the qualification packaging rules.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	10	The committee discussed whether TLIB0012 Maintain and Use Hand Tools should be included as a qualification elective.	The committee agreed to include TLIB0012 as an elective in the qualification.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	10	The committee discussed whether TLID0020 Shift Materials Safely Using Manual Handling Methods should be included as a qualification elective.	The committee agreed to include TLID0020 as an elective in the qualification.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	10	The committee discussed whether the SARC unit should be included in the qualification.	The SARC unit was removed from the elective group. It may be included as an imported unit where required under the qualification packaging rules.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	10	The committee discussed whether TLIL0004 Apply Conflict and Grievance Resolution Strategies should be included as a qualification elective.	The committee agreed to include TLIL0004 as an elective in the qualification.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	10	Committee feedback was provided on the unit title and an associated update, but no further detail was recorded.	No response recorded.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	10	Committee feedback proposed focusing a glossary on approximately 10-13 priority rail-industry terms and materials.	Committee members were asked to provide and confirm further feedback.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	A committee member raised concern that the content could begin to extend beyond AQF Level 2.	Additional context and feedback from comparable programs was provided. The member agreed to review the units again and indicated they had no current doubts about the approach.	In principle

Employers	1	Feedback covered three matters in the customer-service unit: review language relating to people requiring support, clarify whether customer incidents specifically mean emergencies, and align the conflict criterion with contemporary “behaviour of concern” terminology.	The wording was updated to use more appropriate contemporary language, while retaining “specific needs” because it includes people needing support for varied reasons. “Customer incident” was retained for lower-level matters that a new entrant may address, with emergencies escalated. “Customer conflict” was replaced with “behaviour of concern” across the relevant requirements.	In draft format
State and Territory Training Authorities (STAs)	1	Feedback identified eight priorities: make the qualification reflect the full rail ecosystem and career pathways; strengthen hands-on, site-based and simulated learning; embed employability and workplace behaviours throughout; make rail safety central while distinguishing awareness from authorised work; support metropolitan, regional and remote contexts; strengthen school-to-industry pathways; cover emerging technologies without becoming technology-specific; and use accessible, age-appropriate learning and assessment for young people with varied capabilities.	ISA described broad career exploration, practical learning where feasible, employability integration in learning resources, and a unit-level statement that completion does not provide competence for rail safety work or rail-system operation. The response addressed regional delivery, school-to-work pathways and technology awareness. Accessibility was linked to the school-to-work resource approach, without a separate detailed response.	In draft format
Union	1	Feedback supported a national pre-vocational qualification and introductory coverage of signalling, traction power, rolling-stock electrical systems and related careers, while stressing that it must remain awareness and career exploration rather than electrical, traction-power or signalling competency. Career information should clearly distinguish roles, apprenticeships, licences, signalling qualifications and specialisations, with a consistent limitation statement.	The qualification description was tightened to present the product as prevocational orientation for informed entry-level employment or further study. The committee did not adopt a long trade-specific limitation list, and the description and licensing information were clarified without implying that the qualification itself provides regulated work authority.	In draft format
Union	1	Feedback requested stronger treatment of electrical hazards, including overhead and third-rail systems, exclusion zones, approach distances, return currents, multiple supplies and induced voltage, with traction infrastructure treated as energised. It also requested replacement of an outdated jurisdiction-specific reference with current jurisdictional and infrastructure-manager requirements.	A general application statement was added confirming that completion does not provide competency for regulated, licensed, accredited, safety-critical or role-specific rail work. References were checked and updated against current rail legislation, regulations and guidelines.	In draft format
Union	1	Feedback noted that occupational titles for overhead/high-voltage and signalling roles may obscure the underlying trade, qualification and licensing requirements, and recommended more accurate terminology.	A general limitation statement was added to confirm the unit is preparatory and does not provide regulated or role-specific work competency. “Such as” was added to role descriptions so they provide an indicative, non-exhaustive view of occupations; the source does not record a specific trade/licensing terminology revision.	In draft format
Union	1	Feedback requested clearer distinctions among rail traineeships, electrical apprenticeships, qualified trades, signalling specialisations, post-trade qualifications, technical roles and engineering pathways. It also requested an explicit statement that the Certificate II does not replace or shorten an apprenticeship, trade qualification, licence or signalling qualification.	A general application statement was added to confirm the unit is preparatory and does not provide regulated or role-specific competency. Performance evidence requires research on at least three occupations, including duties, employment pathways, qualification or training requirements, and relevant attributes and employability skills; the source does not record the requested explicit non-replacement wording.	In draft format
Union	1	Feedback requested explicit limits on work involving signalling, traction-power and associated electrical infrastructure, including installation, maintenance, testing, fault-finding and isolation. It also requested that any observation occur from an authorised safe location without equipment interaction.	A general application statement was added to confirm that the unit does not provide regulated, licensed, accredited, safety-critical or role-specific work competency. Assessment resources were checked and updated to use a suitable learning environment, rail safety resources, PPE and a simulated rail hazard-and-risk environment; the source does not record a specific authorised-location/no-interaction requirement.	In draft format
Union	1	Feedback identified that the unit’s reference to “major mechanical systems” was inaccurate because the listed rolling-stock equipment includes electrical and electronic systems. It recommended broader terminology and clarification that inspection, testing, maintenance and repair must be performed by appropriately qualified and, where applicable, licensed workers.	A general application statement was added to confirm the unit is preparatory and does not provide regulated or role-specific work competency. References to “major mechanical systems” were replaced with “rolling stock systems” throughout the relevant requirements; the source does not record the requested explicit qualified/licensed-worker clarification.	In draft format
Industry Training Advisory Boards/Other	1	A request was made to submit feedback during the second consultation stage because further stakeholder input was still being gathered and no feedback had yet been received for the first stage.	Submission during the second consultation stage was approved.	In draft format
Technical Committee Members	1	A delayed glossary contribution was provided as an initial set of key terms, with an indication that a more comprehensive version might still be located. Further assistance was offered if required.	A follow-up sought the glossary examples and terminology resources requested at the previous committee meeting, emphasising a focused set of key rail-industry items rather than large reference documents.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	9	Feedback requested review of the units and qualification packaging rules.	The confirmed packaging is six core and three elective units, nine in total, with two units able to be imported from the General Elective List or elsewhere. Two proposed general-elective units were identified for removal as peripheral, while retaining the option to import them where a rail context requires them.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	4	Feedback was provided on TLIPC0007 Identify Elements of Rail Networks, TLIPC0010 Identify Rail Network Infrastructure, TLIPC0008 Prepare for Employment in the Rail Industry and TLIF0035 Develop Safety Awareness for a Rail Environment.	The feedback was addressed within the individual units through wording changes and clarification of performance evidence and knowledge evidence.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	Review of three units identified possible duplication between rail-network elements and rail-network infrastructure, especially around signalling, track, traction power, depots, control centres, bridges and tunnels. It also questioned whether report templates, spell-checking and online research were rail knowledge or generic foundation skills. The feedback recommended distinguishing recognition of where systems fit from deeper infrastructure knowledge, and clarifying the intended depth rather than removing all overlap.	Comments on TLIPC0008 were addressed through performance- and knowledge-evidence wording changes. For TLIPC0007, the overlap was reviewed and requirements were strengthened to recognition or awareness level. For TLIPC0010, a misnamed assessment area was corrected, reporting activities were positioned within the unit, and overly prescriptive report-writing evidence was revised. All units will be revisited for consistent depth; some may be delivered as a unit, skill set or imported unit.	In principle
Technical Committee Members	1	Comments were provided on the three identified units, but the feedback content was not further detailed.	The feedback was addressed in the individual units through wording changes and clarification of performance evidence and knowledge evidence.	In principle