

Credit Transfer and Equivalence

Russell Docking

June 2023

Background to the project

At the 305th meeting on 8 September 2022, Council endorsed a revised position on the application of credit for superseded equivalent units of competency. The decision supports RTOs granting credit and reduces red tape by removing the requirement to map learning outcomes between a new unit and the immediately superseded equivalent unit.

However, where credit is sought for a unit that has been superseded twice or more, pre-existing arrangements remain i.e. RTOs need to establish the degree of similarity between the two units to ensure skills and knowledge (reflected in elements, performance criteria and assessment requirements) are well aligned.

The Council's decision was based on:

- the nature of training product revisions including the significant changes that can occur over time and the need to ensure confidence in the training system;
- having a high regard for ensuring safe work practices;
- meeting industry requirements without undermining training quality;
- being mindful of the desirability of alignment with ASQA while recognising that the impact in varying past practice was not fully understood; and
- that prior to 2019, the Training Package Products Policy (TPPP) only required developers to determine equivalence of a unit based on occupational outcome and did not apply to implications for training delivery and/or assessment purposes.

Background to the concepts of “credit”, “credit transfer”, “equivalence” and “equivalent competency”.

From the Training Package Products Policy (2015) [Underling added]

Units of competency – mapping

Developers must include an equivalence table within the Companion Volume Implementation Guide in which the equivalence status of each unit of competency is shown according to the following categories:

- **E = Equivalent** - the outcomes of old and new units are equivalent.
- **N = Not Equivalent** - the outcomes of old and new units are not equivalent.

The developer's determination that the outcomes of an old and new unit are equivalent: (i) only applies to workplace contexts and for AQF qualifications purposes, including RPL; and (ii) does not apply to implications for training delivery and/or assessment purposes.

Developers must provide a list of units with any relationships to their predecessors clearly identified in the Companion Volume Implementation Guide. Information must be sufficient for users to see what has changed and to assist them in determining matters such as resourcing, impacts on training for particular competency profiles and any transition arrangements.

From the current Training Package Products Policy (2019)

Units of Competency - mapping (2.4)

1. Training package developers are responsible for mapping units and determining their equivalence status.
2. Unit mapping information must be included in the Companion Volume Implementation Guide. Information must be sufficient for users to identify changes and assist in determining resourcing, impacts on training, and transition arrangements.
3. If developing a cross-sector unit, the Companion Volume Implementation Guide must include detailed information on contextualisation of the unit for different industry sectors.
4. Unit mapping information must include an equivalence table, as well as information on the extent of changes (such as minor text revisions, or addition or removal of elements and/or performance criteria) and any changes to the unit's assessment requirements to assist users to identify how previous training and assessment materials can be adapted.
5. The equivalence table must list the units of competency and clearly identify the status of each unit according to the following categories:
 - Equivalent - the workplace outcomes of the superseded and superseding units are equivalent (refer Section 2.5)
 - Not Equivalent - the workplace outcomes of the superseded and superseding units are not equivalent (refer Section 2.5)
 - Newly created - the unit has been created to address an emerging skill or task required by industry
 - Deleted - the unit is deleted as the skill or task is no longer required by industry (refer Section 5.2).

Units of Competency - determining equivalence (2.5)

1. Where a unit of competency is superseded and the workplace outcome of the unit has changed, the superseding unit must be deemed 'Not Equivalent'.
2. The workplace outcome can be determined to have changed when the skills and knowledge (reflected through the elements, performance criteria and assessment requirements) required to achieve the workplace outcome of the superseded and superseding units cannot be mapped to each other.
3. Determinations of 'Not Equivalent' may also be used to support licensing, regulatory, legislative or certification requirements.
4. Determinations of 'Not Equivalent' must be substantiated in the Case for Endorsement as outlined in Section 12.3 of the Training Package Development and Endorsement Process Policy. The detail of these changes must be included in the unit mapping information located in the Companion Volume Implementation Guide (refer section 2.4).

Notes on the TPPP extracts

The earlier TPPP extract provides for the application of equivalence “for AQF qualifications purposes, including RPL.” In contrast, the new version does not explicitly endorse the use of an equivalent competency for an AQF qualification or for RPL. The earlier TPPP defines equivalence in terms of outcomes, the later version defines equivalence in terms of workplace outcomes. These and other changes mean that the concept of “equivalence” may have shifted along the chain for pre and post 2019 determinations.

Both TPPP versions are silent on the specific issue of credit transfer as is the *Standards for RTOs 2015*. The AQF, however, states that “Credit is the value assigned for the recognition of equivalence in content and learning outcomes between different types of learning and/or qualifications. Credit reduces the amount of learning required to achieve a qualification and may be through credit transfer, articulation, recognition of prior learning or advanced standing.” and “Credit transfer is a process that provides students with agreed and consistent credit outcomes for components of a qualification based on identified equivalence in content and learning outcomes between matched qualifications.” [It should be noted that the AQF is not addressing the equivalence of competencies.]

Both TPPP versions explicitly state that equivalence does not confer any status to the superseded competency with regard to the training or assessment content of the new competency.

Other related documentation including the *Standards for Training Packages* and the *Training Package Development and Endorsement Process Policy* offer no guidance on equivalence or its application.

In the absence of clear instructions with regard to “equivalence”, “equivalent competence”, and “credit” or “credit transfer” it is necessary to revisit the fundamentals of competency and competency-based training and assessment for guidance.

The concept of a VET competency:

1. A VET competency is a statement of the qualities of a person (knowledge and skill) that enables them to deliver workplace outcomes. (*Glossary*)
2. A unit of competency is defined by a specific combination of characteristics (*Standards for Training Packages*) including:
 - a. Elements of competency (skills) and their performance criteria (skill indicators)
 - b. Foundation skills
 - c. Performance Evidence requirements (skills)
 - d. Knowledge Evidence requirements
3. The certification of a competency requires that **all** competency requirements are observed by an RTO assessor. If any requirements are not observed a different competency has been performed. (*This fundamental principle is indicated in the Standards for RTOs in 1.8a and 1.8b the Principles of Assessment of Validity and Reliability and the Rule of Evidence of Validity, and in the formulation of a unit of competency specified in the Standards for Training Packages 2023 which refer to unit requirements that are essential outcomes that are needed to be demonstrated or are essential to performance, or are essential operating conditions, or are assessment requirements including items that a candidate must know or are required or are mandatory.*)

4. Any change in any competency requirement results in a new competency.
5. An old competency may be deemed “equivalent” to a new competency if it has the same workplace outcomes (*TPPP*) ... the workplace outcomes are equivalent, the competency outcomes are not. It can only be said that the old and new competencies are functionally equivalent.
6. An equivalent unit can be used to meet entry requirements for qualifications or skill sets. (*Training Package Companion Volumes*)
7. An equivalent unit cannot be used to meet pre-requisite unit requirements as the destination unit presumes all the required components in the nominated prerequisite unit have been demonstrated.
8. An equivalent unit cannot be used to award the current unit without formal assessment either following supplementary training or RPL. (3.1)
9. An RTO can only deliver a superseded competency for a limited period. (1.26)
10. A competency has no “shelf life” ... once competent, always competent.
11. A competency has a current value determined by:
 - a. Its listing as a current competency by the TGA.
 - b. Its inclusion in a current training package qualification or skill set (1.27);
 - c. Its relevance to current industry practice;
 - d. Its relevance to current niche industry practice;
 - e. Its synergy with other related competencies; and
 - f. Its equivalence to current competencies.
12. A competency will lose some or all of its value if:
 - a. It is superseded by a newer version of the competency;
 - b. It is no longer listed in a training package qualification or skill set;
 - c. Industry practices no longer use the competency;
 - d. No other industry employs that competency;
 - e. It no longer integrates with other related competencies; or
 - f. It has no equivalence to an immediately current competency.

Qualification and Skill Set Rules:

- Specify core and elective competencies for the award of a qualification or skill set.
- May specify different electives for different streams.
- May allow the importation of competencies as electives from other current training packages.
- Do not explicitly allow the substitution of any competency with its superseded equivalent.
- May define entry requirements which can be met through equivalent competencies.
- May allow superseded training products to be used to meet entry requirements.

The concept of Credit Transfer:

- Credit Transfer builds upon the principle that competency is recognised by the constellation of attributes held by a person matching that of an accredited competency.
- If a competency is a component of a qualification and a person has already been certificated by an RTO for that competency or its direct equivalent, they may count it towards that qualification or skill set. (3.5)
- Credit Transfer is an administrative process, not an assessment process.
- Credit Transfer relies upon documented evidence of previous RTO-certificated unit(s) of competency.
- To be admissible evidence the certification document must be relevant, valid, authentic and sufficient.

The specification of equivalence

- In a unit of competency the “Unit Mapping Information” provides the code and title of the current version, the code and title of the previous version, comments describing the differences between the units, and the equivalence status of the previous unit to the current unit. (Equivalent or Not Equivalent). This information is also tabulated in the *Companion Volume Implementation Guide* for each training package.
- The TGA *Unit of competency details* for a current unit will indicate in the Mapping section that it “Supersedes and is equivalent to [previous unit code and title] and that it “Is superseded by and equivalent to [next unit code and title]. Changes from the superseded unit and to the next unit are provided in Notes.
- It is important to note that the TPPP requirements relate to the determination of equivalence by training package developers ... there is no suggestion in the *Standards for RTOs* that RTOs can independently determine equivalence.

Discussion:

All the above suggests that both TAC and ASQA have been thoughtful in allowing a superseded competency to be automatically used as credit in place of a current competency ... there is no indication in the current TPPP that this is an endorsed process.

ASQA’s position allows unfettered credit along a multi-step equivalence chain. Small changes at each step may accumulate to become significant changes over a series of steps, particularly for pre-2019 units.

There is a contemporaneity about a qualification or skill set ... it is comprised of named competencies that reflect current industry practice. Given that equivalence is based on unchanged workplace outcomes, it is reasonable to allow a recently superseded competency named by the current competency to be used in their place. The next level down does not declare equivalence to the named competency, so it would be unreasonable to uncritically take that extra step.

It is also true that in many cases the competency and its equivalent not only relate to the same workplace outcomes ... they may have the same content. Such “changes” might be editorial or in format rather than in substance. Industry might also change its workplace

practices little over the period of a number of steps in the equivalence chain, so to ban outright second, third or fourth order equivalence would also be unreasonable. For this reason TAC allows an RTO to make an informed and documented judgement about equivalence through the formal process of mapping. ASQA encourages this process but does not mandate it.

The mapping process required by TAC and encouraged by ASQA might reveal that there have been no changes in substance from a second or lower tier equivalence, and with that knowledge the RTO could safely grant credit. It might also reveal that there have been substantial changes, in which case the RTO might offer RPL or an accelerated learning pathway to upgrade the competency to current status.

In its Fact Sheet *Awarding Credit (2023)* TAC advises that auditors will expect to see evidence that an RTO awarding credit has followed TAC's requirements including a mapping where equivalence is considered over more than one step.

The next section looks at example equivalence chains and the risks associated with the presumption of equivalence across more than one link. The paper concludes with a discussion of the mapping process and the impact that this might have on RTO workload and accessibility.

Evidence of the extent of change across an equivalence sequence.

The equivalence of competencies separated by three or more equivalence steps from the current version of a competency in a range of training packages has been reviewed using a mapping process. Examples of equivalence chains of three or more steps have been taken from 6376 current competencies identified in 45 training packages.

Of the 52 training packages, seven did not have equivalence chains longer than a single link (AUM, CHC, FSK, HLT, LMT, PPM, & SIR) Units were examined from the remaining 45 training packages to determine the prevalence of significant gaps between the current version and the version three or four equivalence steps down. Sixty four percent of the units reviewed revealed that there were significant gaps along the equivalence chain, only 36% revealed no gaps. The full record is provided as a table at the end of this document, some examples are provided in the following panels:

RIIMPO318F Conduct civil construction skid steer loader operations is the current version (Release 1: 2021) of a string of equivalent units: RIIMPO318E (2018) – RIIMPO318D (2015) – RIIMPO318B (2013) – RIIMPO318A (2011). Details of the last of this series is not available on TGA. Comparing RIIMPO318F Conduct civil construction skid steer loader operations with RIIMPO318B reveals considerable gaps in the performance criteria, most notably relating to “safe work practices”, emergency procedures, managing and reporting hazards, communication with others, and completing documentation. These gaps are further reflected in the performance evidence and in the knowledge evidence which adds fires, accidents and emergencies, fatigue, PPE, equipment limitations. The increased focus on safety and on thoughtful operation of the equipment means that the assumption that achievement of a past equivalent unit (superseded twice or more) could be used as credit for the current version of the unit would be unsafe.

FWPWPP2213 Cut panels was the current version (2020) of a string of superseded equivalent units: FWPPWPP2201 (2016) – FWPWPP2201B (2011) – FWPWPP2201A (2010). Details of the last of this series is not available on TGA. Comparing FWPWPP2213 Cut panels with FWPWPP2201B Cut panels (2016) reveals significant changes over the three steps, notably:

- Missing performance criteria (1.2, 1.3, 1.7, 1.8, 2.1 & 3.6)
- Changes in performance criteria (1.6)
- Changes in performance evidence requirements
- Changes in knowledge evidence requirements
- Changes in assessment conditions

The missing or changed performance criteria related to confirming safety requirements, mitigating risks, PPE, and workplace safety procedures, operational safety, and serviceability and faults. The missing knowledge evidence related to workplace safety requirements and PPE, as did the assessment conditions. If a judgement was made to allow credit for FWPWPP2213 Cut panels on the basis of FWPWPP2201B serious risks could be involved. *[Note: FWPWPP2213 was superseded on 24th January 2023 by FWPCOT2268 Cut timber or engineered wood product to length or dimensions (Not equivalent)]*

ITCWEB513 Build dynamic websites is the current version (2020) of a string of equivalent units: ICTWEB501 (2015) – ICAWEB501A (2011) – ICAA5141C (2010) – ICAA5141B (2010). Details of the last of this series is not available on TGA. Comparing ITCWEB513 Build dynamic websites with ICAA5141C (2010) reveals almost no common content, yet the chain of equivalence is unbroken. It is not surprising that in this industry of rapid change there are major differences in the methodology and terminology of the units of competency.

AURPTA109 Service and repair reciprocating cutting systems is the current version (2020) of a string of equivalent units: AURPTA009 (2016) – AURPTA2009 (2013) – AURP245771B (2011) - AURP245771A (2011). Details of the last of this series is not available on TGA. Comparing AURPTA109 Service and repair reciprocating cutting systems with AURP245771B there is a high level of similarity apart from 1.3 relating to the identification and management of hazards. Ignoring a rogue item of knowledge evidence in the new unit relating to “heavy vehicle compression ignition engines” there are only small gaps. None-the-less, as the gaps include hazard identification and management and PPE their absence constitutes a risk to awarding credit.

CPPUPM3018 Maintain equipment and pesticide storage area in pest management vehicles is the current version (2019) of a string of equivalent units: CPPPMT3018 (2019) - CPPPMT3018B (2015) – CPPPMT3018A (2014). Comparing CPPUPM3018 Maintain equipment and pesticide storage area in pest management vehicles with CPPPMT3018A reveals a change in title (to include vehicles) and gaps between the current and past units. These gaps relate to vehicle capabilities (1.2), chemical containers (2.2), cleaning, safety check and storing vehicle equipment (2.4), and stock control (3.7). There are also significant differences in the detail provided for knowledge evidence. In this high risk area it would be hazardous to accept the past equivalent unit (superseded twice or more) as credit for the current unit.

AVIY0086 Manage abnormal situations and emergencies – helicopter (2022) is the current version of a string of equivalent units: AVIY0064 (2019) – AVIY4018 (2015) – AVIY4018B (2008) – AVIY1808B (2008). Details of the last of this series is not available on TGA. Comparing AVIY0086 Manage abnormal situations and emergencies – helicopter with AVIY4018B reveals a number of gaps at performance criteria 1.4, 1.8, 2.3, 5.2 and 5.3. It is beyond this reviewer’s competence to determine if the gaps are significant as the old unit provided much greater technical detail in the performance criteria than the current unit.

CPCCON3051 Conduct off-form vertical concrete operations (Release 2: 2020) is the current version of a short string of equivalent units: CPCCCO3051 (2019) – CPCCCO3051A (2014). Details of the last of this series is not available on TGA. Comparing CPCCON3051 Conduct off-form vertical concrete operations with CPCCCO3051A reveals a number of gaps that on closer inspection are addressed through the Range Statement of the superseded unit. It is beyond this reviewer’s competence to determine if the coverage through the Range Statement provides sufficient security to award credit based on equivalence. It is noted that the units have pre-requisites that are equivalent.

Risks associated with using superseded units for credit

The evidence from the sample reviewed indicates that it would be unsafe to presume that superseded units of second and lower order equivalence could automatically be used for credit. The evidence demonstrates that requiring RTOs to map equivalent units superseded twice or more against the current unit is justified before credit can be considered.

Changes in industry practices must also be a consideration. The *Standards for RTOs 2015* require trainers and assessors to maintain current industry skills (1.13b) through engagement with industry (1.6b) to ensure the industry relevance of training and assessment strategies, practices and resources (1.6a). Training and assessment practices would include credit transfer. If credit is to be awarded it would be necessary for an

industry-aware trainer to determine that the “workplace outcomes” of an equivalent unit superseded twice or more remained relevant.

This brings into play the concept of currency, not as a rule of evidence but as an expectation that a person claiming credit for a superseded unit still possessed the qualities of that unit, and that the workplace outcomes of that unit was still a reflection of current industry practice. The decision to award credit carries with it the risk that the applicant’s competence and the workplace outcomes have drifted apart. While this risk could only be quantified by a formal assessment process against the current competency (RPL) if credit is awarded then the trainer would need to be aware of this personal gap and supplement the learning program for that person appropriately.

From a training and assessing perspective, it is a requirement of the TPPP that superseded units are always mapped to the current unit to “assist users to identify how previous training and assessment materials can be adapted”.

Mapping processes to determine credit options

Where the unit claimed is not named in the currently required unit, but where there is a chain of equivalence beyond the named unit, take each required component (element and performance criteria, foundation skills, performance evidence, knowledge evidence, other requirements) of the currently required unit and identify and list any component not found in the unit claimed for credit.

This is a focused process that would require specialist trainer expertise to evaluate the implications of any gaps. The time taken to conduct this mapping would typically be 15 - 20 minutes. Fees could be charged for this service, and for any supplementary training and/or RPL that followed.

Responding to gaps identified by the mapping process

The focus is on addressing any component of the currently required unit that is not addressed in the unit claimed for credit.

A gap may be identified by:

1. Any change in an element of competency, including addition, deletion or alteration of a performance criterion. Any such change means that the elements are not the same.
2. A change in the function of a component ... for example a performance criterion may have previously been a performance evidence requirement, an element may have previously been a knowledge evidence item ... an assessment condition may become a performance evidence requirement ... a foundation skill may become an element. While appearances might suggest that these were editorial changes, they are fundamental changes that would result in gaps.
3. Any component that is in the currently required unit that is not in the unit claimed for credit.
4. A change in the list of pre-requisite requirements, or the non-equivalence of any of the pre-requisite units

** Please note that updated information in relation to gaps is available in the [Awarding Credit Fact Sheet](#)*

A simple mapping process

The mapping process only needs to identify components in the current unit that are not in the superseded equivalent unit.

This can be done by printing the current Unit of Competency and its Assessment requirements from the TGA, then accessing the superseded equivalent unit of competency details through the TGA.

Stepping through the printed copy of the current unit, look in the superseded unit for each element, performance criterion, foundation skill, performance evidence item and knowledge evidence item. For old format units you may need to look for foundation skills and performance evidence items in “required skills” or “critical aspects for assessment”. Also check the range statement for detail relating to performance criteria.

When you find the item in the superseded unit, tick it off on the printed current unit. If you don't find the item in the superseded unit, mark it with a cross ... this is a gap.

Review the gaps to make sure they really have not been covered (using the “find” function [Ctrl+F] can assist with this).

When a gap has been identified a number of options arise. For each gap:

1. Look for evidence elsewhere in the claimed unit that the gap is addressed. For example, a missing item of knowledge might be addressed through a performance evidence requirement, or a missing performance criterion might be addressed through a knowledge item. A decision will have to be made whether the change in function can be accepted as preserving the integrity of the current unit; or
2. Look for evidence of coverage of the gap in other units of competency awarded to the applicant. For example OH&S skill or knowledge required by the current unit might be missing from the unit claimed for credit, but might have been addressed in another unit undertaken. A decision will have to be made whether the coverage in another unit(s) can be accepted as preserving the integrity of the current unit; or
3. Consider whether the gap can be incorporated in the training delivery and assessment of units to be undertaken by the student; or
4. Offer the student RPL for the current unit, drawing upon evidence from the claimed unit, evidence from other units, and any supplementary assessment where prior evidence is not available.

Only (1) would result in true Credit Transfer. (2) – (4) are consistent with the concept of competency but could not be described as Credit Transfer, but rather as forms of RPL, leading to the award of the current unit of competency. (3) is a compensatory training and assessment strategy that may be thought of as supplemented RPL, and (4) is quintessentially RPL.

The decision to award credit on the basis of the above must be fully documented to show how every requirement of the current unit has been evidenced, how the Rules of Evidence have been met, and that the person(s) making the judgement had the necessary credentials and experience to make an informed decision.

Executive summary

This paper explores the awarding of Credit Transfer on the basis of equivalent superseded units of competency.

The paper reviews the three documents of the current *Training Package Organising Framework* (2019), the *AQF* and *Standards for RTOs 2015* to identify the official position on the use of equivalent superseded units for credit transfer. As these documents provide no guidance an exploration of the concepts of VET competency, qualification and skill set rules, credit transfer, and equivalence are outlined, followed by a discussion of the position of accepting of equivalent superseded units for credit transfer. While it is accepted that the equivalent unit to that named in a qualification or skill set could reasonably be used for credit transfer, there could be problems if such use were to follow a chain of equivalent units beyond the first.

The paper then provides evidence of examples from a range of training packages where there are significant gaps in competency requirements between the current version of the competency and superseded versions of the competency linked by a chain of equivalence.

The evidence indicates that automatic acceptance of equivalent superseded units beyond the first is unsafe, and that of acceptance for credit transfer would need to be supported through a mapping process undertaken by a qualified trainer/assessor.

The paper concludes with a discussion of mapping processes that would not be too burdensome for RTOs, and of responses to gaps identified through the mapping process including RPL.

Outcomes of the review of selected units from training packages

The training packages listed below all have units with equivalence chains of three or more units. These equivalence chains reflect **equivalence of workplace outcomes**, and therefore can be used as equivalent in workplace decisions. The analysis conducted was to determine if they had **competency equivalence**. Competency equivalence was recognised when there were no changes in the skills and knowledge requirements of the units (elements, performance criteria, foundation skills, performance evidence or knowledge evidence). Differences in wording or voice were not considered to be changes, nor were re-arrangements of requirements, particularly arising from the change in unit format that occurred between past versions and the current version.

The most common changes were additional performance criteria and additional knowledge evidence items relating to safe work practices, many having profound implications for workplace safety. Other changes reflected new technologies or processes that had developed over the two decade period spanned by the equivalence chains.

Note that a ✖ indicates significant differences exist between the current unit requirements and the unit requirements of a unit down the equivalence chain, and that a ✔ indicates that while the chain was competency equivalent for the specific unit it does not imply that all equivalence chains in that training package are competency equivalent.

Training Package	Unit reviewed	Equivalent competency	Training Package	Unit reviewed	Equivalent competency
ACM	ACMGEN311	✖	MSS	MSS407026	✖
AHC	AHCCHM307	✖	MST	MSTDC2013	✖
AMP	AMPLSK401	✔	NWP	NWPTRT020	✖
AUR	AURPTA109	✖	PMA	PMAOPS341	✖
AVI	AVIY0086	✖	PMB	PMBTECH404E	✔
BSB	BSBINS306	✖	POL	POLAUX030	✖
CPC	CPCCON3051	✖	PSP	PSPPCM029	✖
CPP	CPPUPM3018	✖	PUA	PUASAR027	✔
CSC	CSCINT010	✔	RGR	RGRHBR307	✔
CUA	CUAATS311	✖	RII	RIIMPO318F	✖
DEF	DEFMIL088	✔	SFI	SFIAQU217	✔
FBP	FBPOPR3023	✖	SFL	SFLSOP005	✖
FNS	FNSACC426	✖	SHB	SHBHIND001	✔
FWP	FWPWPP2213	✖	SIF	SIFFFNL006	✔
ICP	ICPPRP2840	✖	SIS	SISXFAC011	✖
ICT	ICTWEB513	✖	SIT	SITTPPD014	✔
LGA	LGAREG002	✔	TAE	TAEDEL511	✖
MAR	MARF042	✖	TLI	TLID0014	✖
MEA	MEAMEC0058	✔	UEE	UEEEC0030	✔
MEM	MEM07006	✔	UEG	UEGNSG051	✖
MSF	MSFFL3092	✔	UEP	UEPOPS017	✖
MSL	MSL974033	✔	UET	UETDREL006	✖
MSM	MSMPMC325	✖			

Note also that where the current unit has prerequisite units the mapping would need to confirm that the same units were required by units down the equivalence chain, and that these units were also competency equivalent.