

## Public comment response template to Discussion Paper: Maintenance of Competence for Practising Certificates

Please send submissions by email to [consult.minesafety@industry.nsw.gov.au](mailto:consult.minesafety@industry.nsw.gov.au)  
Submissions must be received by the due date of Monday 1 February 2016.

**Name:** Justin Woodward

**Organisation (if applicable):**

### Responses to discussion points

1. Is the proposed model for the MOC scheme suitable for application for practising certificate holders in NSW?

Response: No. The scheme makes no allowance for prior learning or the overall experience of an individual. The ability of an individual to pay for, attend and pass a series of hurdles should not outweigh the experience of an individual who may not wish to jump through those hurdles. The positions in question are onerous and time consuming. The responsibilities of the positions come with significant legislated penalties. This should be sufficient to encourage an individual to maintain competence.

2. Are the areas of competence and their topics suitable and cover the areas adequately?

Response: The areas and topics are adequate. Having to split your learnings between all four is not reasonable. An operation will have many and varied needs. The individual should be able to choose what learnings they focus on, and should not have to do so with a view to passing a set of criteria in each category. Keep the list as appropriate areas of competence, but remove the need to reach a set target in each area.

3a. Are the types of formal and informal learning with their maximum claimable hours suitable?

Response: Absolutely not. The maximum claimable hours has been set to ensure an individual covers a range of topics within a given time period. This should not be a requirement. An individual should be able to choose what would best add value to their operation, or to their own professional development.

3b. Is the percentage split between the minimum number of formal hours (66%) against a maximum of 33% for informal hours appropriate?

Response: No. There should be no split between informal or formal. The individual actively using their ticket, or working in the industry, should be able to get full credit for doing their job.

4. Are the numbers of learning hours for each practising certificate and areas of competence appropriate to maintain competence a) per year b) over five years?

a) per year - The number of hours is irrelevant, given the small number of hours allowed to be used per activity. The actual number of hours required to achieve the learning hours is a great deal more.

b) over five years? This is a superfluous target given the per year requirements. This target cannot be missed if the per year target is met.

5. Are the requirements for certificate holders in the MOC scheme reasonable and practical?

Response: No. In my view the requirements are the opposite of reasonable and practical.

6a. Are the record keeping requirements for certificate holders to satisfy in the MOC scheme

Response: No. The record keeping requirements are similar to those required by a tax return, but there is no money involved. The individuals concerned have already demonstrated competence by earning the ticket. Did the department consider online GAP training as an alternative?

6b. Are the governance processes proposed by the department adequate to ensure compliance with the MOC scheme by practising certificate holders?

Response: