

EXAMINER'S REPORT

Quarry manager of mines other than underground mines or coal mines certificate of competence

November 2019

Written examination

Summary of results and general comments

| | |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| Examination date: | 4 September 2019 |
| Number candidates: | 13 |
| Number who passed: | 9 |
| Highest overall mark: | 82.4% |
| Average overall mark: | 66.2% |
| Lowest overall mark: | 39% |

Paper 1 - Part A – Legislation knowledge

Summary of results and general comments

| | |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| Exam date: | 4 September 2019 |
| Number of candidates: | 12 |
| Number who passed: | 9 |
| Highest mark: | 81.6% |
| Average mark: | 67.2% |

Lowest mark: 56.1%

Question 1 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark: 9.6

Average mark: 6.6

Lowest mark: 3.4

Examiners' comments - This question was well answered by eight of the candidates, while the other four performed poorly. Deficiencies included the failure to identify all statutory positions required on a quarry site and a poor understanding the general duties defined in s19 Work Health and Safety Act 2011.

Question 2 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark: 8.5

Average mark: 7.4

Lowest mark: 4.3

Examiners' comments – The poorer performing candidates failed to identify specific controls required to manage work associated with confined spaces (cl 65-77 Work Health and Safety Regulation 2017). They relied on softer controls, focusing on administration, personal protective equipment, training and procedures.

Question 3 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark: 10

Average mark: 8.1

Lowest mark: 5.6

Examiners' comments – Generally well answered, however several candidates did not include reference to considerations in schedule 1 WHS (MPS) R 2014.

Question 4 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark: 8.9

Average mark: 7.6

Lowest mark: 4.4

Examiners' comments – The stronger candidates were able to detail extensive technical criteria for the design and control of risks associated with mobile plant. The poorer candidates relied on training, communication and procedures and failed to reference higher order controls.

Question 5 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark: 7.4

Average mark: 6

Lowest mark: 3.9

Examiners' comments – Overall, this question was not well answered due to candidates not knowing what was required to be recorded on a 'mine survey' plan cl 122 (6) WHS(MPS)R 2014. Most candidates managed the hazards associated with mining in and around 'old workings' well, with the better candidates adopting higher order engineering controls.

Question 6 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark: 7.4

Average mark: 5.2

Lowest mark: 3.5

Examiners' comments – Many candidates did not outline the requirements of cl14 (1)(f) WHS(MPS)R 2014 sufficiently and missed the requirement to have a process to assess contractors health and safety policies and procedures. There was also little mention of the arrangements to monitor and evaluate compliance by the contractor and information on how the contractor plan would be integrated with the safety management system of the mine.

Question 7 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark: 9

Average mark: 6.2

Lowest mark: 4.1

Examiners' comments – Better candidates obtained high scores in this question, while the poorer candidates simply did not know the requirements of the legislation that relate to the contents of a 'mine record' or matters relating to notices.

Paper 2 - Part B – Legislation knowledge and application

Summary of results and general comments

Exam date: 4 September 2019

Number of candidates: 12

Number who passed: 10

Highest mark: 83.75

Average mark: 69.7

Lowest mark: 39

Question 1 (total 10 marks)

Highest mark: 9.8

Average mark: 7.3

Lowest mark: 4.5

Examiners' comments – The higher performing candidates were able to express a clear understanding of the process used to determine the size, shape and extent of an exclusion zone. This included good consultation with subject matter experts and consideration for surrounding infrastructure, community and hazards. The poorer candidates gave very general answers that lacked specific detail and often failed to include any technical information relating to decisions.

A number of candidates did not know who to report lost explosives to, which was quite disappointing.

Question 2 (total 15 marks)

Highest mark: 14.5

Average mark: 9.7

Lowest mark: 5.3

Examiners' comments - Of most concern to examiners was the inability of candidates to quote the correct atmospheric concentrations for dust (inhalable and respirable) and silica that workers must not be exposed to in the workplace. Given the industry's recent focus on this hazard, quarry managers would be expected to understand these limits. In the scenario, some candidates failed to advise the

Regulator of exceedances and did not take immediate steps to inform and ensure workers were not exposed to dust concentrations above the national limits.

Question 3 (total 15 marks)

Highest mark: 12.6

Average mark: 10.8

Lowest mark: 5.8

Examiners' comments – This question was generally answered satisfactorily, however the level of detail supplied separated the candidates scores. Some candidates also lost marks for their lack of knowledge surrounding the reporting requirements pursuant to s14 WHS (MPS) A 2013 and others did not fully understand the WHS (MPS) A 2013 scene preservation requirements.

Oral examination

Date: 7 November 2019

Number of candidates: 10

Number deemed competent: 5

Examiners' comments

Overall, the 2019 candidates can be categorised into three (3) distinct groups.

- 1) The first group of candidates answered the oral questions extremely well and were able to clearly and confidentially articulate their decision-making process for all scenarios. Each candidate had good technical knowledge, which was supported by sound associated non-technical skills (ANTS).
- 2) The second category was a smaller group of candidates that were found to be not yet competent, however are clearly going to make good leaders in the future. These candidates are encouraged to talk to their immediate supervisors and mine operators about being exposed to additional front-line leadership positions, where they are exposed to this type of work environment daily.
- 3) The final group of candidates were deemed not yet competent and were not able to demonstrate to the examiners their ability to manage all scenarios. Some did not have the technical skills to deal with each situation, while others did not demonstrate the ability to lead a team. Examiners were looking for confidence and timeliness in the delivery of answers and the ability of the candidate to lead others. These candidates will have to focus on improving their

technical knowledge, but more importantly their decision-making skills and their confidence in the way they perform in real life situations.

More information

NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Resources Regulator

T: 02 4063 6461

Email: mca@planning.nsw.gov.au

Acknowledgments

Quarry manager of mines other than underground mines or coal mines examination panel

© State of New South Wales through the NSW Department of Planning Industry and Environment 2019.

This publication is copyright. You may download, display, print and reproduce this material in an unaltered form only (retaining this notice) for your personal use or for non-commercial use within your organisation. To copy, adapt, publish, distribute or commercialise any of this publication you will need to seek permission from the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.

Disclaimer: The information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing (December 2019). However, because of advances in knowledge, users are reminded of the need to ensure that information upon which they rely is up to date and to check currency of the information with the appropriate officer of the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment or the user's independent advisor.

DOC19/990440