



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

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 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:

Industry Skills Australia

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):	Tricia Fidock Klausch Schmidt	Position:	Project Specialist Director Project Operations
Phone:	0409872933 0417568967	Mobile:	0409872933 0417568967
Email(s):	Tricia.fidock@isajsc.org.au; Klausch.schmidt@isajsc.org.au		

2. Project Details

Project ID:	TAL_ANN_2324_014
Project Title:	RePL Alignment

Provide a brief description of the project.

The purpose of this Training Product Development project was to align the AVI30419 Certificate III in Aviation (Remote Pilot) and the Civil Aviation Safety Authority's (CASA) Remote Pilot Licence (RePL) requirements.

The project involved updates made to one qualification, 22 units of Competency and one Skill Set. Many existing units did not directly align with the CASA requirements, necessitating significant changes. This included merging, replacing, deleting and creating units where there was no alignment with existing products. Overall, the changes resulted in a net reduction of four units, and is aligned to the CASA requirements.

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):	1	0	1
Unit(s) of competency:	18	0	18
Skill Set(s):			1

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

Originally, this project identified a second qualification requiring update (maintenance). However, changes could not be implemented because the relevant unit is located in the core. The Aviation Strategic Workforce Planning Committee (SWPC) will be advised that qualification AVI59922 contains a superseded core unit AVIH0007 and will require review in the future.

One of the Skill Sets identified for this project was also not reviewed, as the unit it contained was outside the project scope. The skill set – AVISS00080 Remotely Piloted Aircraft Operations in Excluded Category Sub 2 kg Skill Set relates to drone operations; however, the included unit serves a different purpose. It is intended for individuals who do not want to obtain the licence but want to complete a reduced version of the training.



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://admin.industrykillsaustralia.org.au/sites/default/files/2026-03/Annual Training Product Development Plan - March 2026.pdf
------------------	---

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

It is contained in the plan.

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 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.

Rachel Emery (State Govt) was a late application and was added to the project as an Observer to ensure the TPOF process was followed.

Paul Hardy changed companies from Lifesaving NSW to AAUS. He later resigned due to work load.

James Bassam applied to replace Paul Hardy but then determined he didn't have the available time to commit to the project.

Rebecca Ludgate left Charles Darwin University and they did not have a replacement.

Luke Evans changed organisations from UVAIR to Public Safety Training and Response Group.

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, was the review completed during a meeting or out of session).

The review process for this project involved conducting meetings with two to four Technical Committee members with the requires subject matter knowledge to review each unit individually. Draft versions were then made available to the full TC, allowing members to provide feedback within specified timerames. The process concluded with a formal “Sign Off” meeting.

As recorded in the “Sign Off Meeting Minutes” held on 3 March 2026, the members in attendance were asked to confirm the following statement:

“I have been involved in the reviewing of the draft training package products and believe they should be progressed through to endorsement”.

The following members responded YES:

- Renee Bartolo
- Gary Dixon
- David Baker
- Andrew Trease
- Luke Evans
- Ryan McMahon

During the meeting, Tricia (ISA) asked Fillippa Ross (proxy for Rachel Emery):

- “Was the TPOF process followed during the Technical Committee meetings held for the remote pilot project”?

Filippa Ross responded via the Teams Chat:

- “I have to go to another meeting.....happy with everything so far.....great meeting”

Tricia advised that she would follow up with those Technical Committee members who were unable to attend. She subsequently contacted the remaining members by email and received written confirmation of their support as follows:

- Lesley Condon – YES
- Mitch Deam – YES
- Rachel Emery – YES
- Ross Brown (proxy for Joseph McMahon) - YES

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.

Because most units of competency were rewritten from scratch to align with the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) Remote Pilots Licence (RePL) requirements, the Technical Committee required additional time to review and refine the content. As a result, Public Consultations 1 & 2 were deferred.

Public consultation 1, originally scheduled for June 2025 but was conducted from 7 October to 7 November 2025.

Public consultation 2, originally scheduled for August 2025, but was conducted from 22 January to 27 February 2026.

The submission to the Assurance Body was also rescheduled, moving from January 2026 to May 2026.

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	7 October to 7 November 2025 Additional consultation: 22 January to 27 February 2026.
Incorporating feedback (additional consultation if required)	Incorporating feedback took place between the two consultation periods. 8 November 2025 to 21 January 2026.
Senior Officials Check	15 April to 30 April 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.

The selection of the Technical Committee was carefully planned to ensure strong representation from all relevant stakeholder groups, including those working in remote areas. One member, in particular, worked closely with Indigenous and isolated communities, making her feedback critical to ensuring the training products were clear, accessible, and easy to follow. ISA made available 1 on 1 meetings for any cohort that requested to ensure ISA are inclusive and responsive to the needs of all stakeholders.

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 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.

ISA ensured direct consultation with a wide range of stakeholders, particularly the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA), the regulator, both prior to and throughout the project. CASA initially had a representative on the Technical Committee; however that representative was later redeployed. Despite multiple requests for a replacement, CASA was unable to provide another representative. Nevertheless, CASA was kept informed of progress through to project completion and was provided with final draft products.

Through the project ISA's Industry engagement manager was working with industry to get various SME's to provide input. There were two stakeholder consultations with a total of seven weeks available for providing feedback.

State Training Authorities were notified by email at the commencement of the project, ahead of each of the two consultation periods, and again for a final review of the drafts after they had undergone internal edits and external quality assurance.

Senior Responsible Officers were emailed at the start of the project and again when the final drafts were prepared for submission to the Assurance Body.

Skills Insight and Powering Skills (other JSC's) were advised in July 2024 that the relevant remote pilot units were scheduled for review.

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 state and territory SRO's were provided with the the revised Training products and CVIG to provide feedback between the 5th of April to the 30th of April. A teams meeting was offered to answer any questions but was not required. We have received SRO support letters from all States and Territories.

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

Note: Where products contain regulatory, licensing or legislative implications there is mandatory information that must be included 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.

Skills Insight and Powering Skills both have qualifications that contain units of competency that were reviewed as part of this project. They were informed via email of the relevant remote pilot units to be reviewed in July 2024.



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 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.

Click here to enter text.

15. Implementation Issues

What intelligence did you gather from stakeholders about implementation of the training package products? How were any implementation issues raised through the consultation process addressed? Provide detail below to support the Assurance Assessor's understanding of the submission.

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

No issues regarding implementation were raised during the project. The CVIG had details added to enable trainers to have clear guidance on implementing.



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.

Click 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 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.

Limited feedback was received during the two consultation periods, due to this being a very niche industry, however several organisations provided written confirmation that they supported the Units of Competency aligning with CASA requirements. There were no stakeholders that did not support the revisions. Most importantly CASA were supportive.

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.

Pathway advice has been included in the AVI CVIG. This qualification provides foundational knowledge for Drone or Remote pilot operations. This qualification is suitable for Australian apprenticeships and VET in Schools.

From here they can move to the **AVI40422** Certificate IV in Aviation (Remote Pilot-Beyond Visual Line of Sight) to further their career and use drones that operate beyond the visual line of sight. Then from here they can complete the **AVI59922** Diploma of Aviation (Chief Remote Pilot) allowing them to perform operational management duties in support of Remote Pilot Aircraft System (RPAS) operations.

Further pathway information is contained in the AVI, CVIG.

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.

We started the review with 22 units of competency. Two sets of two units were merged due to duplication. So 4 units became 2. Six existing units were deemed no longer required so will be deleted. Four units were created as new as they had no crossover with the units being deleted and it wasn't suitable to have them act as replacements.

The final outcome 22 units were reduced to 18 units of competency.

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 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.

One unit of competency AVIY0100 Conduct aerial application operations using remotely piloted aircraft systems has had two pre-requisite units added. The TC deemed this as essential due to handling chemicals being a safety issue.

Three units have had a pre-requisite unit removed due to duplication within the units.

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 here to enter text.

25. Foundation skills

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

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

Our Foundation Skills expert assessed every unit within the project for foundation skills, including to the Australian Core Skills Framework (ACSF) and to DigComp 3.0 to determine the digital skills demands of each task. This assessment also covered imported units included in the core selection for both the qualification and the skill sets. The initial mapping resulted in ACSF ratings ranging from level 3 to level 4.

These outcomes were presented to the Technical Committee, which advised that, in practice, the units should not exceed ACSF level 3. In response, we worked closely with the Technical Committee to review the units that initially contained core skills rated at level 4. The relevant elements and performance criteria were reworded to ensure the language accurately reflected an ACSF level 3 requirement.

The final ACSF ratings for the qualification and skill sets were included in the training products released for public consultation, and no feedback was received regarding these ratings. Following Technical Committee approval of the final unit ratings, the qualification was assessed using the eight core units and three operational units (with one operational unit required depending on the type of remotely piloted aircraft system). The skill set was assessed using all three of its units.

Detailed information on the ACSF mapping and DigComp performance levels has been documented in the Aviation Foundation Skills Companion Volume V1.0.

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 p 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*:	Vanda Fortunato	Date:	4/05/2026
Full Name:	Vanda Fortunato		

* 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 have been briefed by the GM of Operations (acting). He explained that this Aviation project has followed the TPOF process to ensure that ISA are compliant with development and review of the Aviation training package product. Industry and the regulator CASA were engaged throughout the project and we also gave stakeholders two opportunities to review and provide feedback.

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. Step 5.1 of the TPOF requires JSCs to publish the submission on their website at the time of submission to the TPA.	☒		https://www.industryskillsaustralia.org.au/aviation-training-package-remote-pilot-licence-project?tab=finalisation-project-tabs-1924
3	Attachment A – Products submitted for assurance, including (where applicable): - Regulatory, licensing, or legislative implications (see item 12) - Mandatory Workplace Requirements (see item 14) - Requested transition period details (see item 22)	☒		No change to requested transition No Regulatory or licensing No Mandatory Workplace Requirements
5	Technical committee membership details	☒		Folder 5: Technical Committee Composition.
7	A copy of the stakeholder consultation strategy	☒		Folder 07: Stakeholder Consultation Strategy
10	The consultation log including: - Detail about implementation (see item 15) - Detail about disputes and the stakeholders involved where applicable (see item 16)	☒		Folder 10: Consultation Log No Disputes
11	Evidence that the SRO check was undertaken	☒		Folder 11: Senior Officials Check
12	Evidence of support from all relevant national/state and territory regulatory and/or licensing bodies	☐	☒	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
13	Evidence of engagement with other relevant JSCs	☒	☐	Folder 13: Engagement with other relevant Jobs and Skills Councils
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.

Q.	Submission Requirement	Uploaded	N/A	 Evidence Reference
16	Dispute details - describe the how you applied your internal dispute resolution process to resolve any disputes.	☐	☒	Nil disputes
17	The Alternative Dispute Resolution practitioner's advice	☐	☒	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
18	Evidence to support broad consensus	☒		Folder 18: Evidence of Broad Consensus
19	The Anti-Discrimination Assessment	☒		Folder 19: Anti Discrimination Assessment
23	The Companion Volume Implementation Guide	☒		Folder 23: CVIG
26.1	Evidence of identified industry need and support for a stand-alone unit	☐	☒	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.