

# EXAMINER'S REPORT

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

February 2021

### Written examination

Summary of results and general comments

|                       |                |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| Examination date:     | 7 October 2020 |
| Number of candidates: | 8              |
| Number who passed:    | 6              |
| Highest overall mark: | 84.22%         |
| Average overall mark: | 69.9%          |
| Lowest overall mark:  | 53.75%         |

### Paper 1 - Part A – Legislation knowledge

Summary of results and general comments

|                       |                |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| Exam date:            | 7 October 2020 |
| Number of candidates: | 8              |
| Number who passed:    | 6              |
| Highest mark:         | 85.9%          |
| Average mark:         | 68.2%          |

Lowest mark: 52.2%

### Question 1 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark: 8.3

Average mark: 5.5

Lowest mark: 2.8

#### Examiners' comments

The stronger candidates had a good understanding of their duties when managing risk, including those matters that must be considered when assessing what is 'reasonably practicable'. One third of the candidates demonstrated little or no understanding of the matters to be assessed when determining what is 'reasonably practicable'.

### Question 2 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark: 7.8

Average mark: 6.4

Lowest mark: 3.5

#### Examiners' comments

Part (A) of this question, 'when is consultation required', was generally well answered by most candidates. Conversely, many candidates let themselves down in Part (B) with a poor understanding of Health and Safety Representative (HSR) requirements and the establishment process for a WHS committee.

### Question 3 (total of 20 marks)

Highest mark: 20

Average mark: 14.2

Lowest mark: 9

#### Examiners' comments

Most candidates scored well in this question and were able to list the contents of a Safety Management System (SMS), the required Principal Control Plans and the contents of a Principal Hazard Management Plan (PHMP). The poorer performing candidates simply provided a list of documents that may be found

at a quarry rather than the contents (programs) that make up SMS. They were also not able to list the contents of a PHMP.

## Question 4 (total of 20 marks)

Highest mark: 17.8

Average mark: 14.9

Lowest mark: 10.3

### Examiners' comments

Generally candidates were able to list the components of an emergency plan and understood scene preservation and accessing incident scene requirements. Those that scored poorly gave disjointed answers for the emergency plan part and did not understand scene preservation requirements adequately.

## Question 5 (total of 20 marks)

Highest mark: 17.5

Average mark: 13.6

Lowest mark: 7.5

### Examiners' comments

The poorer candidates let themselves down badly in this question by not understanding what the contents of a 'mine record' are and by having little to no understanding of when and why statutory notices are issued and what section of the legislation they are issued under.

# Paper 2 - Part B – Legislation knowledge and application

## Summary of results and general comments

Exam date: 7 October 2020

Number of candidates: 8

Number who passed: 7

Highest mark: 82.5%

Average mark: 71.5%

Lowest mark: 55.3%

### Question 1 (total 20 marks)

Highest mark: 15.3

Average mark: 11.5

Lowest mark: 4.8

#### Examiners' comments

This question had the lowest average score in the exam. Many candidates did not have a good understanding of a mine operator's health monitoring, reporting and record keeping obligations. One candidate misunderstood personal exposure monitoring and health monitoring requirements. In Part (B), most candidates correctly reported the dust exceedances to the regulator, however a number failed to take immediate action to inform the worker and did not immediately implement controls to ensure that no workers were exposed to a contaminated atmosphere.

### Question 2 (total 20 marks)

Highest mark: 18.5

Average mark: 14.4

Lowest mark: 10.5

#### Examiners' comments

Better candidates had a good grasp of the design principles required to construct a multi layered stockpile dump. The poorer candidates focused on lower order administration (system-based) controls and were not able to provide the required technical detail requested by the question and the linkage with the requirements of schedule 1 WHS(MPS)R 2014.

### Question 3 (total 20 marks)

Highest mark: 18.8

Average mark: 16.2

Lowest mark: 11

#### Examiners' comments

This question sought information relating to associated non-technical skills (ANTS) and included technical controls associated with managing blasting and dust exceedances. The question was generally

well answered, however candidates were separated based on the level of technical detail provided in the controls used for each hazard and the detail of the structure used for engaging and managing stakeholders.

### Question 4 (total of 20 marks)

Highest mark: 16.8

Average mark: 15.2

Lowest mark: 11.3

#### Examiners' comments

Generally a well answered question with most candidates providing well thought out answers relating to the management of contractors, their equipment and systems. Some candidates stumbled when confirming written signoff on the contractor's safety management system and also adopted an adhoc system for the management of additional contractors after hours. A small number of candidates failed to adequately identify and address the controls associated with the clearing activities.

## Oral examination

Date: 24-25 November 2020

Number of candidates: 10

Number deemed competent: 6

#### Examiners' comments

The successful 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).

A common theme with the unsuccessful candidates was their failure to demonstrate to the panel that they had sufficient leadership and decision making skills. Candidates often hid behind corporate systems when providing their answers rather than taking control of the situation and demonstrating to the panel that they had the underpinning experience and skills to lead their team through the scenario.

The panel also found several of the unsuccessful candidates 'not yet competent' when dealing with explosive questions and in particular misfire and flyrock scenarios.

We encourage any candidate who was found not yet competent to focus on obtaining as much leadership exposure as possible and to be actively involved in the day to day management of their site.

Most candidates would benefit from further mentoring by a senior member of their management structure.

## More information

Regional NSW

Resources Regulator

Mining Competence Team

T: 02 4063 6461

Email: <mailto: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 Regional NSW 2021. You may copy, distribute, display, download and otherwise freely deal with this publication for any purpose, provided that you attribute Regional NSW as the owner. However, you must obtain permission if you wish to charge others for access to the publication (other than at cost); include the publication in advertising or a product for sale; modify the publication; or republish the publication on a website. You may freely link to the publication on a departmental website.

Disclaimer: The information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing (February 2021) and may not be accurate, current or complete. The State of New South Wales (including Regional NSW), the author and the publisher take no responsibility, and will accept no liability, for the accuracy, currency, reliability or correctness of any information included in the document (including material provided by third parties). Readers should make their own inquiries and rely on their own advice when making decisions related to material contained in this publication.

DOC21/80173