

# Member Update

UPDATE 11 of 16 • 1 August 2016

**TOPIC:** 2016/17 GTA Trading Standards

*DISTRIBUTION:* GTA Members – primary contact list. Please circulate to all appropriate internal parties.

## 1. Issue

Trading Standards to apply for the 2016/17 season as of 1 August 2016 are now available on the GTA website.

## 2. Background

GTA Member Updates No.2 of 16 and No.8 of 16 sought feedback from industry on potential changes to Trading Standards (Standards) for the coming season. Feedback was received from a range of industry sectors on the proposed changes and a range of other issues.

The GTA Standards Committee (Committee) met in 2016 on several occasions and reviewed feedback from industry. The Committee recommended changes to the GTA Board and the Board has adopted recommendations as appropriate.

This document lists:

- Changes to all Standards for implementation in 2016/17;
- Those issues raised by industry where changes were not accepted; and
- Issues potentially to be addressed in the 2017/18 Standards and beyond.

## 3. GTA Standards Communication to Industry

In response to industry concerns requesting additional information on decisions recommended by the Committee, several explanatory documents were developed and placed on the GTA website during development of the 2016/17 Standards. These documents outlined reasons for particular decisions of the Committee as further guidance to industry where specific issues were raised.

These documents, along with the current 2016/17 and prior season Standards, and industry submissions are located on the [GTA website](#)

## 4. Changes Made for Implementation in 2016/17

### 4.1 Agreed Change: Visual Recognition Standards Guides - All Commodities

The existing Visual Recognition Standards Guide (VRSG) produced by GTA for 2015/16 contains the commodities barley, wheat, sorghum, oats, canola, desi chickpeas, maize, Kabuli chickpeas, Angustifolius lupins, red lentils, field peas and faba beans.

The Committee reviewed the existing version and determined that significant changes were not required. Therefore it was decided to not update the version for 2016/17. Industry is to use the existing 2015/16 version when implementing 2016/17 Standards.

In future seasons should major changes be required, an updated version will be created.

To ensure adequate industry advice regarding this decision, the Committee has:

- Changed all references to the VRSG in the 2016/17 Standards Booklets to refer to the latest VRSG version (i.e., 2015/16 production version)

GTA will ensure sufficient numbers of the current version of the VRSG are available for purchase by industry in the 2016/17 season.

For greater transparency, the Committee has agreed that in future, a draft version of the VRSG would be placed on the GTA website for industry review and comment.

#### **4.2 Agreed Change: Minor Wording Changes & Other Issues – All Commodities**

Minor changes to wording in all Standards has occurred to refer to the latest version of reference material available to assist industry implementation of Standards, including:

- Weed Seed Identification booklet.
- Insect Identification booklet.
- Visual Recognition Standards Guide (referring to the 2015/16 version).

The document entitled [“Australian Grains Industry Post Harvest Chemical Usage Recommendations and Outturn Tolerances 2015/16”](#) has been updated based on outcomes of the 2016 National Working Party on Grain Protection meeting.

#### **4.3 Agreed Change: Stored Grain Insect List – All Commodities**

The Grain and Seed Exports Program (GSEP) has reviewed the injurious pests listed in the Plant Export Operation Manual Volume 6A. As a result of this review, the GSEP proposed to Plant Biosecurity for the removal of some of the insects from the list requiring nil tolerance. A comprehensive pest categorisation was done by Plant Biosecurity and approval was granted to remove the following insects from the list of injurious insects requiring nil tolerance:

- Mould beetles (Cryptophagous spp)
- Black fungus beetle (Alphitobius laevigatus)
- Tinied moths (Niditinea fuscipunctella; Tineola bisselliella, Tinea pallescentella, Tinea pellionella)
- Spider beetle (Gibium psylloides).

All Cereal Standards Booklets have been updated as per this change.

#### **4.4 Agreed Change: Varietal Master List – Wheat, Barley, Oats**

As in previous seasons the Varietal Master List for the above commodities has been reviewed following receipt of the changes from the industry sectors responsible for maintenance of those lists. All Standards have been revised based on those changes.

Note that the Varietal Master List for wheat has been revised following receipt of initial changes from Wheat Quality Australia which is the industry body responsible for maintenance of that list. Any final amendments will be advised to industry by 1 September 2016 following a final review by Wheat Quality Australia.

The Committee is currently exploring development of formal agreements with these industry sectors to clarify arrangements that apply.

#### **4.5 Agreed Change: AUN1 Grade – Wheat**

The minimum 10.5% protein of the AUN1 grade created in 2015/16 has been deleted.

The change was made given that this grade was developed as an “off-grade”. The prior minimum protein requirement meant that grain failing the minimum protein content was graded as Fed1. This was not the intention when the AUN1 grade was initially created.

#### **4.6 Agreed Change: Moisture Reference Method – All Cereals**

Trading Standards methods dealing with “Moisture Assessment of Cereals – Brabender Oven Reference Method”, previously referred to method AACC 44-15a.

That method no longer exists. There is a related standard method AACC 44-15.02 which supersedes the old standard.

All Trading Standards have been updated to refer to the new method.

#### **4.7 Agreed Change: Falling Number Reference Method – Wheat, Barley, Cereal Rye**

In Australia, when assessing wheat, barley and Cereal Rye using the Falling Number, industry has previously agreed that:

- There is no requirement for modification of the method for elevation.
- There is no requirement for modification of the amount of flour used based on the moisture content of the wheat, barley or cereal rye.

As this was not documented in the GTA published Trading Standards for these commodities, it has now been added.

In addition the wording has been clarified to ensure that there are no unwarranted restrictions on the development and implementation of new technology in this method (e.g., if new technology is developed that does not require the Falling Number test to run to completion).

#### **4.8 Agreed Change: Cascade Rules – Wheat**

The 2016/17 cascading rules for the following grade has been altered to reflect the quality of this grade:

- HPS1 to be included before AUW1

#### **4.9 Agreed Change: Vitreous Assessment – Durum**

It is recognised that various methods are used for the assessment of vitreous in Durum, the most common being the Cervitec and Farinator.

The previous reference method referred to the use of the scalpel to assess individual grains. As the scalpel is not used by industry to assess individual grains any reference to the scalpel has been removed.

In addition, to assist identification of vitreous grain, a separate visual chart has been made available on the GTA website. The potential inclusion of this chart in future editions of the VRSG will be reviewed.

#### **4.10 Agreed Change: Weed Seeds – Wheat Grade ANW2**

A request was received from industry for the ANW2 grade to be consistent with AGP1 in relation to weed seeds. Previously the Committee aligned the ANW2 standard with AGP1 for all parameters except for those that impacted on starch quality. Under that process weed seeds were not changed.

It was agreed to align the ANW2 weed seed list with that of AGP1 as that was the original intention of the Committee.

#### **4.11 Agreed Change: Wheat Stained**

In previous standards grains containing <50% White Grain Disorder were classified as Stained. Given the lack of quality concerns with grains containing <50% White Grain Disorder, it was agreed to delete this reference in the Standards. These grains are now to be considered sound.

Industry should note that while the current photographs in the VRSG are adequate, there is a reference to the old definition. This revised stained definition will be altered when next updating the VRSG.

#### **4.12 Agreed Change: Sorghum Frost**

As Frost is rarely if ever seen in sorghum grains, it was agreed to delete all references in sorghum Standards.

#### **4.13 Agreed Change: Adoption of other Commodity Standards**

The Committee agreed to fully adopt the following Standards for 2016/17:

- Oilseeds – developed and updated by the Australian Oilseeds Federation
- Pulses – developed and updated by Pulse Australia

### **5. Issues Considered but not Approved**

The following issues were not approved by the Committee for adoption in the 2016/17 Standards. These issues will not be re-considered by the Committee unless a further submission is received from industry. Industry is free to provide their original submission or further information to support their views should they wish for any of these issues to be considered by the Committee in developing the 2017/18 or future Standards.

#### **5.1 Rejected Change: Wheat APW2 in Western Australia**

A request had initially been received from industry to include a protein maximum of 11.0% in APW2 in Western Australia (WA).

In conjunction with ANW1 this grade is largely used for the South Korean and Japanese markets which have a current protein maximum of 11.0%. Note however that the introduction of APW1 in WA caters for the requirements of markets that require higher protein APW, thus this change may not be required if APW1 becomes the main grade segregated.

Industry advised that the proposed change was not required for a number of reasons mainly that the APW2 grade is only introduced in WA as required based on seasonal conditions.

Therefore the Committee agreed that no change was required to APW2 in Western Australia.

#### **5.2 Rejected Change: Wheat ASW1 in Western Australia**

A request had been received from industry to create a separate standard for ASW1 in WA which included a 9.0% protein minimum.

In recent years the zone average protein for ASW1 in the Kwinana and Albany port zones has fallen below 9.0%. Industry had advised there is no international market for ASW1 below 9.0% protein, therefore blending with higher protein grain is required. Low protein ASW1 is generally not received in large tonnages in other States.

Industry comment was received and the proposed change was not supported. The Committee agreed not to change the ASW1 standards for a number of reasons, including:

- Segregation would be an issue if it was introduced.
- It is desirable for a national standard for this grade.
- Introduction of a protein minimum may improve the quality of this grade but negatively impact on AGP1 which is used for blending into many other grades where appropriate.
- Storage providers in WA have a preference for moving away from the APW2 grade being a routine segregation.

#### **5.3 Rejected Change: Mould Definition and Photos – Wheat**

A request was received to review the definition and photos for Mould. As the current definition and photos are considered adequate the Committee agreed that no change was required.

## 5.4 Rejected Change: Weed Seeds – All commodities

Industry had previously been advised of a review of weed seeds in all cereal commodities. Both supporting and negative feedback had been received from industry on various issues during the course of development of the revised weed seed categories and tolerances.

The Committee agreed to withdraw the weed seed implementation proposal. It was agreed that at a future time there was benefit in reviewing the framework for weed seeds and Foreign Material in the Standards, along with any other associated issues. However a date and timeline for that review was not determined.

In choosing to withdraw the recommended changes to weed seeds, a number of factors were considered:

- The original intent of the weed seed review, conducted for various reasons such as simplicity of Standards and the assessment process, remained fully supported by the Committee.
- Revisions had occurred to the recommended changes since inception of the review, based on industry feedback and trial work conducted.
- The revised categories and tolerances were considered to better reflect market quarantine and quality requirements, while not significantly impacting on the production sector.
- There are other mechanisms currently used by industry to determine the presence of weed seeds of quarantine concern in grain (e.g., assessment of harvest running samples).
- Further analysis of the implementation of the revised categories and tolerances by various Members has identified additional concerns in terms of adoption of the previously proposed changes.
- The separate tolerances for individual weed seeds in the initial Categories (generally A-F for most commodities) created significantly more quality tests when revising IT systems to capture data on samples assessed;
  - Assessment and review of these quality parameters will potentially lead to increased classification time in some circumstances.
  - Given the presence of some of these weed seeds in a load, if documented, would not enable existing quality data to be printed on receipt weighbridge tickets.
- The increased classification time may not provide the full benefits of the revised weed seed categories, as initially developed in the scope of the project.
- It was also recognised that changes to the nature of the implementation of the Standards by industry since the commencement of the project have impacted on the outcomes of the weed seed review (i.e., initially the Standards were categorised as Receipt Standards, now they are termed and used also as Trading Standards).
- While the necessary changes to IT systems could generally be done, given the resources required, the impact on the process of assessment of a sample and in some circumstances the potential increased classification time, the benefits of the proposed revised tolerances may not be fully achieved.
- Given the above issues identified as required to be considered in order to fully adopt the changes by industry, it was noted that there is insufficient time for a further review, subsequent staff training and IT system changes, to occur for adoption in the 2016/17 Standards.

## 6. Issues for further Industry & Committee Consideration

Industry agreed with the direction of the Committee for all future issues as advised during 2016. For clarity, those issues to be addressed by the Committee in future are repeated below. Note that no changes related to these issues have occurred in the 2016/17 Standards.

Given the potential resource implications of the following, on behalf of industry, GTA has prioritised these issues for addressing as outlined below. An assessment will be made on the issues around each topic, timelines for review and resources required. More details on each topic is included below.

#### Priority 1

- Screen size (including Test Weight method and equipment verification mechanisms)

#### Priority 2

- Foreign Material, including the definition and sample size for assessment
- This topic may consider weed seeds, as noted above under 5.4

#### Priority 3

- Sample size for the remainder of defects

#### Priority 4

- Nil tolerance parameters

#### Priority 5

- Barley FN, germination, in conjunction with GIWA

### **6.1 Proposed Review: Falling Number/Germination – Malt Barley**

Industry was previously advised the Committee was reviewing the relationship in the Malt barley Standards between Falling Number (FN), Rapid Visco Analyser (RVA), Shot, Sprouted and Germination (Capacity and Energy) and that based on the data analysed further consideration of the RVA limits may be warranted.

Industry was encouraged to supply the Committee with information related to the RVA, including:

- Industry use of and reliance on the RVA when applying GTA Standards;
- The applicability of the RVA limits in the Standards; and
- Data to assist comparison of RVA data with FN data.

On behalf of the Committee GTA has written to the Grain Industry Association of Western Australia (GIWA) requesting that they consider:

- The potential impact on Malt barley quality of not assessing Shot and FN on Malt barley upon receipt; and
- The potential for inclusion of a tolerance for Shot and FN in Malt barley Standards.

Industry will be advised in due course of the feedback from GIWA. Based on that feedback from GIWA and any further feedback from industry, the Committee will consider:

- If any changes are proposed and the nature of those changes; or
- If the Standards for these quality parameters do not require any further consideration.

### **6.2 Proposed Review: Foreign Material Category – All Commodities**

As previously advised to industry the Committee is undertaking a review of a range of issues related to this subject including:

- Foreign Material – seeking a common definition across all commodities and consideration of applicable tolerances to apply;
- Nil Tolerance – to determine if a low level tolerance is warranted in Standards for any parameter where a nil tolerance currently exists.
- Sticks – to review the current definition and tolerance for acceptability and consistency across commodities.
- Sample size for assessment of defects and contaminants – to determine if the accuracy and speed of assessment may be increased through a reduced sample size.

### **6.3 Proposed Review: Reference Screen Specifications – All Commodities**

The Committee is currently compiling information gathered from industry on screens used for the assessment of various commodities where reference specifications do not currently exist in Standards.

Once all relevant information has been received and reviewed, the Committee will consider the development of reference screen specifications or an alternative method for assessment of screen specifications.

Industry will then be invited to provide comment on the appropriateness of those proposals before introduction into the Standards.

### **6.4 Proposed Review: Standards Specifications – Oats**

The Committee was previously advised that some sectors of the oat industry routinely implement variations to the current GTA Oat Milling grade Standards when trading oats.

The Committee has formed a working group to review both the milling and feed grade oat Standards. Once the committee has deliberated on the potential revisions, industry will be consulted. It is expected that if major changes are proposed the revisions would be considered for implementation in 2017/18 standards.

Initial topics being reviewed include:

1. Given varietal purity specifications, how to tell the variety declared
2. Development of a more formal process with relevant organisations regarding Varietal Master List development and approved varieties
3. Suitability of all three GTA grades and the specifications
4. Screen size for screenings assessment
5. Terminology used in industry for the range of defects
6. Suitability of the VRSG photos and definitions of defects - notably for Weather Damaged Groats

Industry will be notified of the deliberations of the working group in due course.