

## Assessment Material – Explain evaluation and evaluate a risk management programme as required by the Animal Products Act 1999

Assessment is carried out by observation of the candidate through the evaluation process, by review of documents prepared in relation to the evaluation and by questions asked by the assessor. Questions may be presented orally or in writing and may also be answered orally or in writing.

Assessors must be aware of the assessor criteria and moderation requirements for this unit standard.

Elements and Performance Criteria		Assessment Notes	Evidence
<b>1</b>	<b>Discuss procedures for accreditation of evaluators.</b>		
<b>1.1</b>	The reasons for evaluator accreditation are discussed.	<p>To allow MAF to manage risks associated with third party involvement in a government process (registration of RMPs).</p> <p>To provide for contestability.</p> <p>To provide for establishment of clear and transparent requirements for evaluators so that there is a level of consistency as well as competence.</p> <p>To provide for MAF to carry out audits of the evaluators through the Compliance Investigation Group (CIG).</p> <p>To provide a formal system for accreditation to be revoked under certain conditions.</p>	

<p>1.2</p>	<p>The discussion includes the criteria that must be met for evaluator accreditation and the duties that apply to accredited persons under the Act.</p>	<p>All criteria that must be met for accreditation are discussed. There is a clear understanding of the depth of knowledge required in relation to the level of competence required for an evaluator and the scope of that competence.</p> <p>Discussion includes generic and “activity endorsed” evaluators and the conditions that are placed on these evaluators.</p> <p>Candidate to provide documented policies to demonstrate understanding of the administrative requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How confidentiality in relation to information, operations and activities they come in contact with will be managed. The applicant must ensure that proprietary rights are protected.</li> <li>2. The provisions for the storage and traceability of all relevant documentation associated with the evaluation process. Documentation, excluding the evaluation report, must be retained for at least 10 years.</li> <li>3. How independence and conflict of interest will be managed. The evaluator must be free of any commercial, financial, management and other pressures (other than that associated with the evaluation) from those to whom the service is provided, and must have procedures that describe how the results of an evaluation will not be affected by external influences.</li> </ol> <p>The procedures should also ensure that the applicant or any person to whom work is sub-contracted would not evaluate a risk management programme that they have been involved in the design, development or verification of, within any specified time constraints.</p> <p>The candidate should be able to interpret the legislation as it applies to evaluators (Act, Regulations, Specifications and MAF policy statements).</p> <p>Candidates must understand the implications of duties that are placed on their accreditation and be aware of re-accreditation procedures.</p> <p>Refer to clause 4 (1) <b>Interpretation in Animal Products (Accredited Evaluator Specifications) Notice 2000</b> for definitions</p>	<p>Audit/Admin requirements are specific to evaluation, i.e. they do not relate to routine NZQA requirements for unit standards.</p>
------------	---	--	--

1.3	<p>The selection of technical experts is discussed.</p> <p>Range: selection – when are technical experts needed, what criteria are used for their selection</p>	<p>Need for and management of technical experts is clearly understood in relation to evidence that must be provided of competence and experience for activities, where technical experts are used.</p> <p>Ask the candidate to discuss the use of technical experts:</p> <p>How would you determine when to use one? When is your expertise not suitable for aspects of an evaluation?</p> <p>Candidate is able to judge the limits of their own competence.</p> <p>Provide an example of when one would be used.</p> <p>Accurate discussion of the conditions for use of technical experts.</p>	
2	<b>Conduct an evaluation of a RMP.</b>		
2.1	<p>Carry out a desktop review of a RMP to confirm that it meets legislative requirements and is appropriate to the animal material and/or animal product.</p>	<p>Candidate explains the process that they would use to carry out a desktop review and may provide examples of [blank or completed] checklists, reports or other documents.</p> <p>The candidate explains the significance of Reg 11 of the Animal Products (Ancillary and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2000 to the evaluation process</p> <p>The RMP is appropriate to the type of animal material and/or product being processed and produced.</p> <p>The RMP is checked against the legislation to confirm that all legislative requirements have been met.</p> <p>The RMP must contain all components consistent with the MAF Food Assurance Authority Risk Management Programme Manual, and must be capable of achieving outcomes.</p>	

<p><b>2.2</b></p>	<p>Conduct an on-site visit to complete the evaluation of the RMP and the operations to which it applies.</p>	<p>Candidate is observed while making the on-site visit.</p> <p>Questions are asked during the process and the candidate asked to explain the activities being carried out and the reasons for this.</p> <p>Candidate clearly understands all levels of documentation that must be evaluated, including reference material.</p> <p>The candidate is observed during reality check.</p> <p>“Reality check” refers to the comparison of the documented information within the RMP with the actual activities and operations that occur at the premises to which that RMP applies</p> <p>Questions are asked of the candidate during this process to explain the things that they are looking at and doing.</p> <p>Review records and other documentation, related to or referenced by the RMP, not included in the desktop review.</p> <p>Conduct a reality check to ensure that that the RMP is appropriate and will ensure that the animal materials and animal products leaving the RMP are fit for their intended purpose.</p>	
<p><b>2.3</b></p>	<p>Confirm the validation of the RMP conducted by the operator and review the validation protocol where necessary.</p>	<p>Candidate must be aware of the validation requirements.</p> <p>The candidate must confirm that the validation protocol (where necessary) will complete the validation process.</p> <p>(Technical experts may be required by the candidate – process evaluation, statistical sampling procedures, testing methods, interpretation of results, etc.)</p> <p>Role of evaluator during and after initial registration – e.g. reviewing changes made at MAF’s request, follow up on the validation protocol to ensure that the validation of the RMP has been completed successfully.</p>	

2.4	Provide feedback to the operator that does not conflict with the duties of an accredited evaluator.	Feedback to the operator may include identification of legislative requirements or RMP components that are not included.  Feedback may take the form of questions that do not assist the operator but provide a direction for where further work is required on the RMP.	
2.5	Endorsement of the RMP or RMP outline is completed in a manner approved by the D-G.	Describe how both electronic and hard copy endorsement would be achieved.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Write an evaluation report.</b>		
3.1	The report includes all information required by the legislation.	Check against Evaluator specs.	
3.2	The report accurately reflects the evaluation outcome and provides a concise description of the RMP and evaluation process.  Range: outcome – one of, (a) RMP is complete, registration is recommended, with or without conditions; (b) RMP is incomplete, validation protocol is acceptable and registration is recommended with conditions; (c) validation is completed after RMP registration and recommendations are made for change to conditions.	The report is sufficiently detailed to provide a clear indication of the outcome of the evaluation, the way the evaluation was conducted – procedures, use of check lists, questions, etc.  Appropriate conclusions have been made and statements included in the report that summarise the outcome of the evaluation.  Any reporting in cases where the RMP is inadequate must in no way compromise the independence of the evaluator by providing solutions to problems with the RMP.  Additional reporting for incompletely validated RMP to be completed after the validation period.	
3.3	The report is provided in a format acceptable to the D-G, and within a timeframe that is acceptable to the operator.	The report format and presentation allows for clear understanding by the operator and is acceptable to the D-G (candidate responds to requests for changes to the format of their evaluation reports where relevant).  Language should be clear, uncomplicated and unambiguous.	

<b>3.4</b>	The report is endorsed in a manner approved by the D-G.	All pages signed or initialled.	
------------	---	---------------------------------	--