The following two Tables provide a summary of the Submissions received in Round 1 (April) and Round 2 (June)

## Submitted #No. Issue/s Details **Discussion / Update** By The original concept of It was noted that SFW1 has 4.1.1 Ridley Proposed change to the the SFW1 grade was to been the long-term grade for Defects allow for a lower test stockfeed starting out as **Specifications** weight and higher 70/10 and then changing to in SFW1 screenings, not to be a the current tighter catch all for all a range specifications. of other defects. The tighter specification adds Preference is not to have cost to storage companies as they need a separate milling SFW1 as a catch-all for a range of defects as this style feed grade. However, the may make the task of tighter specifications remove risk of mould and fungal meeting customer expectations more issues and provide value to challenging. growers. The proposed increases It was agreed a Working Group (WG) should be may impact the formulation of stockfeed established to consider this and will increase the risk further (and 7a/b weed seeds) in storage and and to potentially seek a potentially the risk from balanced compromise an animal health position. A recommendation should be made before 1 perspective. August 2021 in order to advise industry. Committee members that volunteered to be part of the WG included – Simon Tickner, Vince Moroney, Michelle Kerr, Jason Shanley,

## April Committee Meeting

		Kiuley and Ingham S.
Amendments to the Defect Specifications for the SFWR Grade	GrainCorp proposed in 2020/21 the review of SFW1 DEFECTS specifications. This matter and the proposed new limits are currently subject to Submission by industry. If these DEFECTS specifications are approved by the Trading Standards process, then GrainCorp are seeking alignment to the	It was noted this Submission is linked to the outcome of the SFW1 WG and will be considered as part of the WG process.

and Jade Saunders.

Invitations to join the WG are to be extended to Reid's, Ridley and Ingham's

			<ul> <li>recently released</li> <li>(2020/21) SFWR Grade</li> <li>and are therefore calling</li> <li>for the following</li> <li>changes to SFWR.</li> <li>Calling for: <ul> <li>STAN max limit to be</li> <li>changed to 50% per</li> <li>300 grain count</li> </ul> </li> <li>GREE max limit to be</li> <li>changed to No Limit</li> <li>DAMI max limit to be</li> <li>changed to 4% per</li> <li>300 grain count</li> </ul> <li>ARTD max limit to be</li> <li>changed to No Limit</li> <li>FFUN max limit to be</li> <li>changed to 4% per</li> <li>300 grain count</li> ARTD max limit to be <ul> <li>changed to 40 per <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub></li> <li>Litre above the</li> <li>screen</li> </ul> SEVE max limit to be <ul> <li>changed to 5 per <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub></li> <li>Litre above the</li> <li>screen</li> </ul>	
4.1.3	Reid Stockfeeds	Maize – Change to Moisture limit	Seeking a reduction in moisture limits from 14% to 13% to minimise risk associated with the stored product.	The Submission was discussed and there was an agreement that further information was required to better understand the issue and the cause of the problem. It was noted the issue may be a storage issue, grain drying, the Standard or a mix of all three. Given the lack of information it was resolved to go out to the major players in the maize industry to seek input to allow a decision to be made
4.1.4	Emerald Grain	Seeking justification of the GTA Trading Standards parameters for Defects and Contaminants	Emerald is seeking information that supports and justifies the current parameters for Defects and Contaminants to better understand the risk when blending grain to maximise the net value. The recommendation is the provision of information to justify the Trading Standards and limits set for Wheat and Barley.	a decision to be made. It was acknowledged that the Trading Standards have a long history and have come from a regulatory background. The history and justification for the current parameters is not documented. A process to document and justify each parameter will be time consuming and costly. Discussion led to an agreement to review the GTA Trading Standards Explanatory Fact Sheet and consider development of fact

4.1.5	Emerald Grain	Inclusion of a photo and description of Red Wheat in the Visual Recognition Standards Guide	Reference photo required for Red Wheat to reduce the risk of contamination of White Milling Wheat.	sheets that may include information on the major categories within the Trading Standards. The Committee agreed this request is warranted and agreed to action this Submission.
4.1.6	JFMA via AEGIC	Changes to ANW2 Standards - Wheat Dockage	JFMA has requested industry change back to the pre 2010 ANW2 Standards for Screenings. The change as articulated by JFMA is – 'all matter passing through a 2.0mm slotted screen standard from the current 10% to 5%.	It was agreed this Submission is being addressed through the Wheat Dockage Working Group.
4.1.7	СВН	Assessment of Sand & Soil	Proposed change to the GTA Wheat Trading Standards by the application of the DAWE weight-based assessment where (sand and earth are combined) as opposed to the current separate assessment by count for sand and for earth.	This Submission was discussed by the Committee and it was acknowledged there is merit in progressing this Submission as it will make the assessment task easier for the sampler. The current process is complex and requires the sizing of sand and earth particles. It was agreed to ask the Methods Sub-Committee to review the issue across all commodities.

## June Meeting

#No.	Submitted By	Issue/s	Details	Discussion / Update
4.1.1	Inghams Enterprises	Proposed reversal of a change to Millrun Standards for contaminants	GTA Standards for Millrun has no limit on contaminants including straw, chaff, seeds etc. as opposed to prior Standards that required NIL contaminants. The current lack of a limit is leading to practices that	<ul> <li>It was noted the 2015/16 Trading Standards contained a Nil Tolerance for foreign material in Millrun. This was considered and a proposal to remove the Nil Tolerance was put to Industry in 2019. The change was accepted.</li> <li>Discussion amongst the Committee resulted in agreement that further discussion/ information is required from Inghams and other processors. It was noted this discussion should</li> </ul>

		have a material impact on the Stock Feed industry.	<ul> <li>cover all by-product Standards as well.</li> <li>Discussion needs to ascertain if industry requires an absolute Nil Tolerance for foreign material in Millrun or whether there is an acceptable and practicable low-level limit that can be applied.</li> <li>This matter will be progressed through Methods at the next meeting and if required any relevant information will be provided back to the Committee via email. There will be no change to 2021-22 Millrun Standards as part of this process.</li> </ul>
4.1.2 CHS Broadbent	Requesting clearer instructions on Stained Groats testing	Seeking clearer instructions on testing for Stained groats. In particular how many oats are you meant to dehull from the sample that is taken, a portion or all 200 from grain tray.	<ul> <li>The Committee discussed the process for Sained Groats assessment and whether industry requires a standard number of oats to be de-hulled to assess Groat staining.</li> <li>It was noted that the Standards are silent on this matter as past discussion has determined that dehulling is problematic for industry (as no practical equipment in the field is available) and industry participants should consider their risk profile and establish its own procedures to manage the risk of this quality parameter being present in a sample.</li> <li>Discussion resolved that whilst this is a practical approach the Committee should consult with processors and WA participants (CBH) and consider their input. This review will be performed by Methods.</li> <li>In the meantime, a statement will go out to industry to provide information and to discuss the review of this matter.</li> <li>It was noted there was a further issue raised in the Broadbent submission regarding the addition of text to the Field Fungi photo. VRSG reviewed this request and rejected the proposed change as it was agreed there was sufficient information in the VRSG and this should be addressed as part of training for samplers.</li> </ul>