

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

Examiners' report November 2018

Written examination

Summary of results and general comments

Examination date:	5 July 2018
Number candidates:	5
Number who passed:	3
Highest overall mark:	65%
Average overall mark:	60%
Lowest overall mark:	52.7%

Part A – Legislation knowledge

Summary of results and general comments

Exam date:	5 July 2018
Number of candidates:	4
Number who passed:	3
Highest mark:	65.0%
Average mark:	60.1%
Lowest mark:	45.7%

Question 1 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark:	6.2
Average mark:	5.2
Lowest mark:	4.2

Examiners' comments - The question was in three parts and three of the four candidates completely missed answering at least one part of the question.

Question 2 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark:	8.3
Average mark:	7.3

Lowest mark: 5.2

Examiners' comments - Generally answered quite well. One candidate however just listed overall mobile equipment hazards, which was not relevant to the question of working at heights hazards.

Question 3 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark: 7.3

Average mark: 5.8

Lowest mark: 4.2

Examiners' comments - All candidates missed setting up emergency procedures. Other items generally missed were disposal of explosives and registers. Communication could have been dealt with better.

Question 4 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark: 7.3

Average mark: 6.3

Lowest mark: 4.8

Examiners' comments - Generally, the use of fire specialists was missed. Legislation items listed but not explained makes it difficult for an examiner to judge whether the candidate understands them.

Question 5 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark: 8.3

Average mark: 6.6

Lowest mark: 5.0

Examiners' comments - Two good answers and one quite poor for this important topic. Communication and training were missed by some candidates.

Question 6 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark: 6.5

Average mark: 5.7

Lowest mark: 5.0

Examiners' comments - One candidate presented just a list of legislation with no presentation on how this answered the question on managing fatigue. This was generally the worst answered question by all candidates. Candidates did not seem to understand the concept of situational awareness.

Question 7 (total of 10 marks)

Highest mark: 6.8

Average mark: 5.2

Lowest mark: 1.7

Examiners' comments - This question was answered poorly. Candidates are reminded that good exam technique includes time calculations to answer each question. One candidate only wrote eight words in the answer.

Part B – Legislation knowledge and application

Summary of results and general comments

Exam date:	5 July 2018
Number of candidates:	2
Number who passed:	1
Highest mark:	68.9
Average mark:	62.6
Lowest mark:	56.7

Question 8 (total 15 marks)

Highest mark:	10.3
Average mark:	9.8
Lowest mark:	9.3

Examiners' comments - One candidate understood the concept of hierarchy of control and gave some good examples but failed to identify sufficient potential hazards to make the job safe.

The other candidate showed good knowledge of the potential hazards but did not deal with the hazards in a logical way using the concept of hierarchy of control. Hazards were not prioritised in how they were dealt with.

Question 9 (total 15 marks)

Highest mark:	11.3
Average mark:	9.0
Lowest mark:	6.7

Examiners' comments - One candidate showed a good understanding of the situation and the dangers that needed to be addressed and accordingly scored highly.

Another candidate approached some areas well but showed no understanding or consideration of rock and surface conditions, geology and the need for geotechnical advice. This then meant that no comments were made about required bench designs, blasting orientation or how the steep site could be cleared.

Oral examination

Date:	11 September 2018
Number of candidates:	2 (resitting)
Number deemed competent:	0

Examiners' comments

Strengths:

- Candidates had a solid understanding of risk-based safety systems, including supporting control documents/plans that would be typically used in industry.
- They also exhibited a mature and logical approach to managing the risks associated with change management and demonstrated a satisfactory level of leadership and discipline.

Weaknesses:

- Candidates did not demonstrate a satisfactory understanding of the controls required to manage the risks associated with blasting hazards. While having some knowledge of the fundamental principles underpinning blasting, when confronted with scenarios involving known failures in blasting practices (misfire/flyrock), candidates could not demonstrate an adequate level of technical capability to ensure the hazard would be managed.
- Despite guidance (that included blasting techniques) being distributed after the 2017 examination by the panel, the candidates had not sufficiently upskilled their knowledge in blasting techniques.

More information

NSW Department of Planning and Environment

Resources Regulator

Mining Competence Team

T: 02 4063 6461

Email: minesafety.competence@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 and Environment 2017.

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 and Environment.

Disclaimer: The information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing (November 2018). 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 and Environment or the user's independent advisor.

DOC18/526155