

Beware of Responsible Service of Alcohol (RSA) training course scams - Complete Hospitality Training

Canonical: <https://cht.edu.au/news/beware-of-responsible-service-of-alcohol-rsa-training-course-scams/>

Details:

RSA training is a target for scams for a structural reason: in some states only an approved provider can produce a valid credential, in others no approval scheme exists at all, and a buyer usually cannot tell the difference until a licensing authority or an employer rejects what they paid for.

That asymmetry cuts both ways, and it produces two distinct frauds. One is the provider that lacks an approval it needs. The other is the provider that claims an approval that does not exist. This page sets out how to verify a provider before you pay, and what the warning signs actually are.

Why RSA specifically

Most training fraud relies on a document that looks official. RSA is unusually exposed because the credential is a legal prerequisite to work, buyers are often new to the country or the industry and under time pressure, and — critically — the rules differ across eight jurisdictions, so confusion is the normal condition rather than a red flag in itself.

A fake RSA is not a harmless waste of money. Non-accredited training produces no Statement of Attainment, does not qualify you to work in licensed premises in any Australian state, and carries no legal standing with any liquor regulator — even where the content taught happens to be accurate. Working in a licensed venue without a valid credential exposes both you and the venue.

Two checks that settle it

Check 1 — Is the provider a Registered Training Organisation, with the unit on its current scope?

Only an RTO can issue the nationally recognised unit SITHFAB021 Provide responsible service of alcohol. Every RTO has a code, and every code is publicly searchable on the National Register at training.gov.au. We are RTO 3722.

The National Register shows three things worth checking, not one:

whether the provider is a genuine RTO at all

its RTO ID

which qualifications and units it is approved to deliver — its scope of registration

An RTO may only deliver and issue what is on its current scope. A published fee for something the RTO cannot legally deliver is a major red flag on its own. So citing the correct unit code proves nothing: SITHFAB021 has to be on that provider's scope.

If a provider will not give you an RTO code, or the code does not resolve on the National Register, stop there.

Check 2 — Does your state also require the liquor regulator's approval?

This is the check people skip, and the answer genuinely differs by jurisdiction. Being an RTO is not sufficient everywhere, and in two states it is all that is required.

| Jurisdiction | Liquor-regulator approval also required? | | --- | --- | | Victoria | LCV-approved provider for the delivery mode; eligible interstate holders use the bridging pathway. | | New South Wales | NSW course providers need L&GNSW; approval. Separate recognition and bridging pathways apply to interstate holders. | | South Australia | Commissioner-approved RTO for training from 1 November 2020; CBS preserves training completed before that date. | | Australian Capital Territory | ACT-approved course/refresher provider, or valid recognised interstate certification. | | Tasmania | Check the Commissioner's requirements for staff versus licence holders. | | Northern Territory | RTO registered to deliver RSA; follow Licensing NT's guidance for the refresher. | | Queensland | An RTO registered to deliver the national RSA unit; no separate state RSA provider-approval list. | | Western Australia | An RTO delivering the nationally accredited RSA course; no separate state RSA provider-approval list. |

Current regulator guidance: NSW , VIC , SA , QLD , WA , NT , ACT , TAS .

One Victorian refinement worth knowing before you buy, because it is a genuine trap rather than a fraud: LCV approves by delivery mode. It publishes two separate lists, one of in-person course providers (who may deliver in person or online using a live meeting platform) and one of online course providers (self-paced). A provider on the in-person list is not approved for self-paced online delivery. So "LCV-approved" is not a single fact — check which list, for the mode you are actually buying.

The fraud most people have never heard of

Queensland and Western Australia operate no approved-provider register for RSA.

In Queensland, the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation directs candidates to the list of RTOs with SITHFAB021 on scope on training.gov.au. There is no state-specific approval beyond ASQA registration. Western Australia likewise has no register and no state top-up module.

So a provider advertising that it is "OLGR-approved" or "DLGSC-approved" for RSA is describing a scheme that does not exist . There is nothing to be approved by, and no list to appear on.

This matters because it is a claim you cannot disprove by looking at the wrong register and finding nothing. The correct conclusion is not "maybe I looked in the wrong place" — it is that a provider inventing a regulatory endorsement to charge for reassurance has already told you what you needed to know about it. In those two states the only check worth making is that the provider is a real RTO with the unit on its current scope.

There is also a rule that makes this kind of claim a compliance breach rather than mere puffery. An RTO may only represent that completion of a training product will lead to a licensed or regulated outcome where this has been confirmed by the relevant industry regulator . Where no approval scheme exists, no such confirmation can exist — so the claim is not just unverifiable, it is unmakeable.

Be alert to the same pattern elsewhere. Claims of endorsement by a body that does not run an approval scheme, of a "government-accredited" status that is not the same thing as nationally recognised training, or of approval in one state extending automatically to another, all work the same way.

The other side: a genuine certificate that still does not work

The NSW position is the sharpest illustration of the first fraud, and it is not a scam at all in the ordinary sense.

You can hold a genuine, nationally recognised SITHFAB021 Statement of Attainment from a real RTO and still be unable to work in NSW, because the provider was not an Approved Training Provider . Nothing about that document looks wrong. It simply does not do the job. Only the ATP that delivered your course may issue the interim certificate that leads to a competency card , and L&GNSW; fines ATPs that issue an interim certificate to a student who did not complete the course with them.

ATPs also have to comply with L&GNSW's advertising guidelines for approved courses, which is why claims about NSW approval are worth reading carefully rather than skimming.

For South Australia, check the training date and provider approval. Training from 1 November 2020 must be through a Liquor and Gambling Commissioner-approved RTO. CBS states that people who completed RSA before that date do not have to repeat it with an approved provider solely because of that change. An interstate location alone does not decide acceptance. See SA's approved-provider guidance .

Victoria produces a third version of the same problem. LCV states that a course it has not approved yields only a Statement of Attainment, and that "this does not allow you to supply alcohol in Victorian licensed venues or locations" . The training was real. The authorisation never existed.

Check the RTO code, not the brand name

This is the check almost nobody makes, and it cuts in both directions.

One RTO can trade under several names, all of them legitimate. A brand you have never heard of is therefore not a red flag by itself — and a brand you have heard of is not reassurance either. The RTO code is the thing that identifies the provider. The trading name is marketing.

The National Register publishes an RTO's legal name, its ABN and ACN, its registration periods and regulator, and every trading name with its dates . Taking this provider as the worked example, because it is the one we can document without commenting on anyone else's business:

| | | | --- | --- | | RTO code | 3722 | | Legal name | Complete Hospitality Training (Vic) Pty Ltd | | ABN / ACN | 27 006 947 262 / 006 947 262 | | Registered since | 1 June 1994 | | Current registration period | 1 July 2025 to 30 June 2032 , under the National Vocational Education and Training Regulator Act 2011 | | Current regulator | ASQA , the national regulator, since 8 September 2017 | | Previous regulator | The Victorian Registration and Qualifications Authority, 1994 to 2017 | | CRICOS | 04242E |

That 2017 date is an ordinary piece of history rather than anything irregular: the registration was transferred from the Victorian regulator to the national one, which happened to many Victorian RTOs.

And the part that actually helps someone holding a certificate they are unsure about — RTO 3722 has five current trading names :

| Trading name | In use since | | --- | --- | | Victorian Bar School | 1 June 1994 — the original name, same date as the RTO code | | Complete Hospitality Training | 12 December 2011 | | Ready Serve Achieve Melbourne | 6 March 2018 | | Coffee School by CHT | 20 May 2021 | | Alchemy Institute of Australia | 12 September 2024 |

There is also a sixth name that has ended : Complete Healthcare Training , used from 24 October 2023 to 19 April 2025 . If you are holding a certificate issued in that name in that window, you are holding an RTO 3722 credential — the name is retired, the training is not, and the record sits against your USI under RTO 3722 regardless.

There is a second register, and it does not list the same things

Worth knowing, because a name absent from one register is not thereby fake. Business names are registered on the Australian Business Register , searchable by ABN, and they are a different set from an RTO's trading-name history on the National Register.

For ABN 27 006 947 262 , the ABR records the legal entity as COMPLETE HOSPITALITY TRAINING (VIC.) PTY. LTD. , an Australian private company with ACN 006 947 262 , ABN active from 22 May 2000 , GST registered from 1 July 2000 , main business location VIC 3000 . Its current registered business names include Complete Hospitality Training , The Coffee School , Coffee School by CHT ,

Melbourne Barista , Victorian Bar School , Ready Serve Achieve Melbourne and Alchemy Institute of Australia .

Note that The Coffee School and Melbourne Barista appear as registered business names on the ABR while not appearing in the trading-name table above. That is not a contradiction. The two registers record different things — one records who is authorised to deliver training, the other records who is authorised to trade under a name — and a legitimate organisation can appear differently on each. The practical upshot for verification is that you should check both : the ABR for whether the name belongs to a real entity, and training.gov.au for whether that entity may deliver the unit.

Two general lessons, which apply to any provider and not just this one:

A certificate in an unfamiliar name is not automatically fake. Look up the RTO code printed on it. If the code resolves on the National Register and the trading name appears in that RTO's history for the period when your certificate was issued, the document is what it says it is.

A certificate in a familiar name is not automatically real. Brand names are not protected in the way RTO codes are. If there is no RTO code on the document at all, the brand tells you nothing.

What a real credential looks like

An accredited outcome is a Statement of Attainment naming SITHFAB021 , issued by an RTO, showing the unit code and the RTO number .

The full set of elements is prescribed rather than a matter of house style, and knowing it turns "does this look official?" into a checklist. A VET statement of attainment must carry:

| Element | What to look for | | --- | --- | | The issuing organisation | Its name, registration code and logo | | The unit or units | The full title and national code of each unit or module, as listed on the National Register | | The NRT logo | The Nationally Recognised Training logo, used in accordance with its conditions of use | | A signature | The signature of an authorised individual | | A security mark | The organisation's seal, corporate identifier or unique watermark | | Prescribed wording | A statement that a VET statement of attainment is issued by an NVR registered training organisation when an individual has completed one or more accredited units or modules | | Context, where applicable | Identification of the larger course or qualification the units form part of, and a language notation where relevant |

A qualification carries the parallel set, including the code and title of the AQF qualification and the statement that "The qualification is recognised within the Australian Qualifications Framework" .

And one thing that must be absent. Your USI must not be printed on a qualification or statement of attainment . A provider that puts your Unique Student Identifier on the face of the document has got it wrong, and the RTO's actual obligation is to have the Registrar verify that the identifier belongs to you before using it for any purpose — not to publish it. A document displaying a USI is a warning sign, not a mark of authenticity.

A document titled "Certificate of Achievement" or "Certificate of Completion" with no unit code and no RTO number is not nationally recognised, whatever the content covered and however official the border looks. Two caveats worth knowing so this test does not mislead you:

Victoria's genuine licensing document is called an RSA Certificate of Completion — but it comes from Liquor Control Victoria , after the LCV Learning Hub stage, keyed to a certificate number LCV emails you. It exists alongside a Statement of Attainment, not instead of one.

NSW's genuine interim document is called an interim certificate , valid 90 days , and it comes from the ATP.

In both cases there is still a Statement of Attainment with a unit code and an RTO number underneath. If there is no such document anywhere in the transaction, there was no accredited training.

When the document has to arrive, and how long it is kept

These are the two questions people ask after paying, and both have concrete answers.

An RTO must not issue certification documentation to anyone it has not assessed as meeting the requirements of the training product. There is no legitimate route to a certificate without assessment, which is why "instant certificate" advertising is self-incriminating.

Where you have been assessed as competent, the certification must be issued within 30 calendar days from the completion of the assessment, provided you completed the unit or qualification and paid all agreed fees. A month with nothing arriving is a reason to ask; several months is a reason to complain.

The RTO must retain records of the assessments you submitted for 2 years after you complete the training product.

It must retain records of the certification documentation it issued for 30 years, and maintain a register of what it is authorised to issue and what it has issued.

That 30-year retention is why a lost certificate from a genuine RTO is a records request rather than a re-enrolment — and why an outfit that folds and takes its records with it was never an RTO in the first place.

The marketing rules a real provider has to follow

Most of the warning signs below are not just bad taste. They are breaches of published obligations, which is useful to know because it tells you what to put in a complaint.

All information given to students by an RTO or any third party acting for it must be clear, accurate and current. Where advertising refers to a training product the RTO must include the code and title of the training product as published on the National Register, must accurately represent the training products on its scope of registration, and may only refer to a superseded product while it remains on scope and new enrolments are permitted.

The risks the national regulator names specifically are worth reading as a list of things to watch for:

false or misleading marketing of a course, qualification, or delivery and assessment

marketing unrealistically short courses that compromise the integrity of the training product or lead to extension costs

promoting easier paths to qualifications — inappropriately short duration, inadequate recognition of prior learning

not remaining aware of all marketing material in circulation on the provider's behalf

using images that do not accurately depict the facilities or resources actually used

not clearly distinguishing nationally recognised training from non-accredited training

failing to comply with Australian Consumer Law

Marketing must also identify which services are delivered by third parties, and must not imply a connection with another person or body without consent. So "in partnership with" claims are checkable too.

And a useful pre-enrolment right: before you enrol, or before fees become payable, you are entitled to a full and accurate schedule of fees including prepaid fees, the training product code and title, duration, modes of delivery, location, dates and scheduling, whether licensing or occupational licence requirements apply, any third-party arrangements, support services, and all obligations to acquire materials or equipment. You must also be told how to lodge an enquiry and how long to expect to wait.

A provider that will not put that in writing before payment is telling you something.

Warning signs

No RTO code , or a code that does not resolve on training.gov.au

The unit not on the provider's current scope , even where the code is quoted correctly

"Instant" or "same-day certificate" with no assessment. SITHFAB021 requires you to demonstrate, among other things, asking two intoxicated customers to leave — one compliant and one refusing to leave. That cannot be assessed by a multiple-choice form, and an RTO may not issue certification to anyone it has not assessed

Check USI arrangements. For nationally recognised training, a USI is generally required before a qualification or Statement of Attainment can be issued, unless an applicable exemption applies. See the official USI exemption guidance . It is free; recover an existing USI rather than creating another. A missing USI request alone does not prove that a credential is invalid; check the RTO registration and unit codes.

A USI printed on the certificate. The opposite error, and also wrong: it must not appear there

No NRT logo , no registration code, no seal or watermark, or no prescribed statement on the document

A price far below the market , particularly with a guaranteed pass

Approval claimed for a scheme that does not exist — "OLGR-approved", "DLGSC-approved" for RSA

Approval claimed but not verifiable. A logo is not evidence. A logo can be copied onto any website; a register cannot

"LCV-approved" without saying which list. Victoria approves by delivery mode, so an in-person approval does not cover self-paced online delivery

A brand name with no RTO code behind it. Trading names are not the credential

Photographs of facilities that do not match what you are actually enrolling in. Using images that do not accurately depict the facilities or resources used is a named regulatory risk

Nationally recognised and non-accredited offerings blurred together on the same page without distinction

Vagueness about which state the certificate is valid in. A legitimate provider will ask where you intend to work, because the answer changes what you need

Payment by transfer to a personal account , or pressure to enrol immediately

No written fee schedule before payment, and no answer to how long an enquiry takes

The USI point is the most reliable single tell, because it is statutory and universal. Create yours free at usi.gov.au . If you have studied anything accredited in Australia since 2015 you already have one — recover it rather than creating a second, because duplicates split your training history across two records.

Verify it yourself, in about two minutes

Ask for the RTO code and look it up on training.gov.au .

Confirm SITHFAB021 is on that RTO's current scope of registration .

If the trading name is unfamiliar, check it against the trading names listed on that RTO's record for the period concerned, and against the registered business names on the Australian Business Register.

Work out whether your jurisdiction runs an approved-provider register, using the table above.

If it does, confirm the provider on the regulator's own published list — LCV for Victoria, and check which of LCV's two lists ; L&GNSW; for NSW; the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner for SA; Access Canberra for the ACT; the Commissioner for Licensing for Tasmanian licence holders.

If it does not — Queensland, Western Australia — treat any claim of state approval as a warning sign rather than a reassurance.

Check the provider asks you for a USI , and gives you a written fee schedule with the training product code and title before you pay.

Every step is free, and every step uses the regulator's records rather than the provider's own claims.

Tasmania's register, for the licence-holder tier, is published by the Liquor and Gaming Branch at treasury.tas.gov.au/liquor-and-gaming/liquor/responsible-service-of-alcohol/training-organisations .

If you think you have been scammed

Stop using the certificate. Presenting an invalid credential to an employer creates its own problem.

Check the provider against your regulator's list , so you know which of the two situations you are in.

Use the provider's own complaints process first if it is a genuine RTO. RTOs must have a complaints system with procedural fairness , publicly available procedures , reasonable timeframes the RTO sets, and escalation avenues . Note that the old fixed 60-day complaints rule has been deleted : an RTO now sets and must justify its own timeframe, so ask what theirs is and get it in writing. For appeals you must be told your right to appeal and all avenues for independent review , and the system must offer independent review at no or low cost .

Lodge a complaint with both the state liquor regulator and your consumer protection authority. In Victoria that is Liquor Control Victoria on 1300 182 457 and Consumer Affairs Victoria on 1300 558 181 .

Report it to ASQA if a provider is misrepresenting itself as an RTO, issuing outside its scope, or breaching the marketing obligations above. ASQA published 18 final practice guides on 17 June 2025 supporting the current Standards, which is a useful reference for what a compliant provider is meant to be doing.

Complete accredited RSA training again with a provider on the regulator's approved list.

Step 6 is unwelcome but it is the only thing that produces a usable credential. See how to get an RSA certificate and how much an RSA course costs .

A note on this page

We are RTO 3722 , verifiable on the National Register, and hold SITSS00071 Responsible service of alcohol on our scope of registration.

Where a state operates an approved-provider scheme, verify our status on that regulator's own list rather than taking any provider's word for it, including this page's. That is exactly the check this page is asking you to make of everyone else, and it would be incoherent to exempt ourselves from it.

Three things we can state plainly, because they are on the regulators' own records rather than ours. We appear on Liquor Control Victoria's approved RSA course provider list , under in-person providers, and are not on LCV's separate online provider list — so we may deliver in person or by live meeting platform in Victoria, but not as a self-paced online course. We are not on the Tasmanian Commissioner for Licensing's register , so our Statement of Attainment is not acceptable for the Tasmanian licence-holder tier. And we were not on the ACT Access Canberra approved list as at 1 September

2026, and are not an approved provider with Liquor & Gaming NSW.

See the RSA page for the position in each jurisdiction, who needs an RSA course , and the difference between a good and a bad course provider .

About us

We are Complete Hospitality Training , RTO 3722, CRICOS 04242E. Level 3, 28 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne VIC 3000, and 410 Elizabeth Street, Surry Hills NSW 2010. Contact melbourne@cht.edu.au or +61 3 9654 1554 . The legal entity is COMPLETE HOSPITALITY TRAINING (VIC.) PTY. LTD. , ABN 27 006 947 262, ACN 006 947 262.

We link to the relevant course and regulatory sources in this guide. Check those sources for current requirements, and confirm course availability, delivery, fees and entry requirements with us before enrolling.

Is a cheap RSA course automatically a scam?

No. RSA is a single unit of competency, so it sits at the low end of vocational pricing everywhere. An unusually low price combined with no assessment, no USI and no verifiable approval is the problem, not the price by itself.

I did an online RSA. Is it valid?

It depends on the state and on the provider's approval status. Online delivery is not the issue. Victoria expressly permits both in-person and online delivery, and the NSW bridging course is online and self-paced. Approval is what matters — and in Victoria, approval for the mode, because LCV keeps separate in-person and online provider lists.

My certificate looks official.

Appearance proves nothing. Check the prescribed elements: the RTO's name, registration code and logo; the full title and national code of each unit; the NRT logo; an authorised signature; a seal, corporate identifier or watermark; and the prescribed statement about VET statements of attainment. Then check the RTO code on the National Register and the provider on the liquor regulator's list.

My USI is printed on my certificate. Is that normal?

No. A USI must not be printed on a qualification or a statement of attainment. The RTO's obligation is to have the Registrar verify the identifier belongs to you before using it, not to display it on the document.

My certificate has a trading name I do not recognise. Is it fake?

Not necessarily, and this is a common false alarm. One RTO can hold several trading names at once, and can hold registered business names on the Australian Business Register that do not appear in its trading-name history. Look up the RTO code on the certificate: if it resolves on the National Register, and the trading name appears in that RTO's published history for the period your certificate was issued, the document is genuine. A certificate with no RTO code is the real problem.

My certificate says "Complete Healthcare Training". Does it still count?

Yes. That was a registered trading name of RTO 3722 from 24 October 2023 to 19 April 2025. The name has been retired but the training was delivered by that RTO, and the record sits against your USI under RTO 3722. The same applies to certificates issued under Victorian Bar School, Ready Serve Achieve Melbourne, Coffee School by CHT or Alchemy Institute of Australia, all of which are current trading names of the same RTO.

A provider says it is "OLGR-approved". Is that good?

It is a warning sign. Queensland runs no approved-provider register for RSA, so there is nothing to be approved by. The same applies to claims of "DLGSC approval" in Western Australia. There is also a rule against it: an RTO may only represent that a course leads to a licensed or regulated outcome where the relevant industry regulator has confirmed it.

The provider says its certificate is valid Australia-wide. Is it?

An RSA Statement of Attainment is a national training record, but permission to serve alcohol depends on the destination's rules. NSW permits eligible temporary interstate workers; permanent movers and security or RSA marshal roles must meet NSW training and competency-card requirements, using bridging where eligible. Victoria offers bridging to eligible interstate holders. SA applies approved-provider rules to training from 1 November 2020, with earlier training not required to be repeated solely for that change. QLD and WA require suitable national RSA evidence. Tasmania distinguishes staff from licence holders; the ACT and NT have local currency and refresher requirements. Check the regulator before your first shift. See RSA recognition by jurisdiction ([/rsa/](#)), NSW's rules (<https://www.nsw.gov.au/business-and-economy/liquor-and-gaming/training/rsa-bridging>) and SA's rules (<https://www.cbs.sa.gov.au/sections/LGL/RSA-approved-providers>).

I was never asked for a USI. What does that mean?

A missing USI request alone does not prove that training is unrecognised: exemptions can apply. Check the RTO registration and the unit codes, and ask the provider about its USI arrangements.

The course took twenty minutes and I passed automatically.

That is not an assessment of SITHFAB021. The unit requires demonstrated performance, including refusing service to three specified categories of intoxicated customer and managing a customer who refuses to leave. An RTO must not issue certification documentation to a person it has not assessed as meeting the requirements.

It has been two months and no certificate has arrived.

That is outside the rule. Where you have been assessed as competent, completed the training product and paid all agreed fees, certification must be issued within 30 calendar days from the completion of the assessment. Raise it through the provider's complaints process, ask what timeframe they have set for handling it, and escalate if needed.

The provider has shut down. Is my record gone?

Not if it was a genuine RTO. Records of certification documentation issued must be retained for 30 years, and your completion also sits against your USI on your national transcript. That is one of the practical differences between an RTO and an unaccredited operator.

Can I get my money back?

That is a consumer protection question rather than a liquor licensing one, which is why the complaint goes to both bodies — and note that failing to comply with Australian Consumer Law is itself among the marketing risks the regulator names. Do not delay retraining while you pursue it.

Does ASQA handle liquor complaints?

No. ASQA regulates registered training organisations. The liquor regulator handles the licensing side. If a provider has misrepresented both, complain to both.

The photos on the website did not match the training room. Does that matter?

It is a named regulatory risk in its own right: using images that do not accurately depict the facilities or resources actually used. On its own it may be sloppiness, but it belongs in a complaint alongside anything else you find.

My employer accepted it. Am I fine?

Not necessarily. In Victoria the licensee is required to keep RSA certificates on the premises and produce them on request by a police officer or liquor inspector, under sections 108AD and 108AE of the Liquor Control Reform Act 1998, and under ss 108AB and 108AC to ensure staff have completed an approved program and refresh it every three years. An invalid certificate on file is a problem waiting for an inspection, for the venue and for you.

Is a "Certificate of Completion" always fake?

No, and this is where the simple tests need care. Victoria's genuine licensing document is called an RSA Certificate of Completion — but it is issued by Liquor Control Victoria after the Learning Hub stage, and it sits alongside a Statement of Attainment from an RTO. The question is not the title on the document. It is whether a unit code and an RTO number exist somewhere in what you were given.

How do I know an RTO has been around a while?

The National Register publishes registration periods and the regulator that granted each one. It will show you when the RTO code started, every period since, and which regulator holds it now. The Australian Business Register separately shows the entity, its ACN, when the ABN became active and its registered business names. Both are matters of public record rather than something you have to take on trust from a website.

What about Responsible Service of Gaming courses?

Victorian RSG is free approved training: online modules through RSG Online and venue-arranged sessions with venue support workers. National SITHGAM training does not replace it. See the official training requirements

(<https://www.justice.vic.gov.au/safer-communities/gambling/responsible-service-of-gaming-training>) and our RSG guide (/courses/responsible-service-of-gambling-rsg-melbourne/).

Where does food safety training sit in all this?

Differently, and it is worth not carrying assumptions across. Food handler training under Standard 3.2.2A does not have to be accredited at all, so a free non-accredited course genuinely satisfies that law. The Food Safety Supervisor certificate is a separate matter with its own approval rules, and in New South Wales the RTO must be approved by the NSW Food Authority. We are not on that list. See what food safety certificate do I need (/news/what-food-safety-certificate-do-i-need/).