Minning engineering manager of coal mines other than underground certificate of competence
June – August 2018

Written examination

Summary of results and general comments
Examination date: 1 June 2018
Number candidates: 10
Number who passed: 7
Highest overall mark: 76%
Average overall mark: 66%
Lowest overall mark: 53%

OCM1 – Mining legislation

Summary of results and general comments
Exam Date: 1 June 2018
Number of Candidates: 9
Number who passed: 6
Highest mark: 65%
Average mark: 58%
Lowest mark: 42%

Question 1 (total of 20 marks)
Highest mark: 20
Average mark: 14
Lowest mark: 8

Examiner’s comments
Some candidates lacked thoroughness when answering the immediate and foreseeable legislative requirements that are required to be complied with in relation to the incident. This was particularly notable in the areas of notification to IS&HRs, recording of incident and review of control measures.
Question 2 (total of 25 marks)

Highest mark: 18
Average mark: 14
Lowest mark: 6

Examiner’s comments
Part (a) was generally covered adequately by most candidates. Some candidates did not adequately address requirements in part (b) involving consultation; instruction, information and training; and record keeping.

Question 3 (total of 25 marks)

Highest mark: 18
Average mark: 14
Lowest mark: 11

Examiner’s comments
Generally, adequately covered, which may reflect the topical nature and importance of fatigue management as well as the recent focus by mine operators in response to targeted assessments conducted by the NSW Resources Regulator. Some candidates lacked thoroughness in their answer or struggled to provide relevant practical examples of what has been put in place at sites to demonstrate compliance.

Question 4 (total of 30 marks)

Highest mark: 23
Average mark: 16
Lowest mark: 10

Examiner’s comments
This question examines the knowledge of the candidate in relation to notices they may likely need to manage in their role as a mining engineering manager. Although quite comprehensive it appears candidates who prepared well, performed well in this question as compared to candidates who had not previously considered all of the notices that can be issued by various parties in their study/preparation. Some candidates may have struggled due to poor examination technique and/or time management.

OCM2 – Open cut mining practice

Summary of results and general comments
Exam Date: 1 June 2018
Number of Candidates: 6
Number who passed: 5
Highest mark: 79%
Average mark: 68%
Lowest mark: 56%

Question 1 (total 60 marks)
Highest mark: 48
Average mark: 39
Lowest mark: 26

Examiner’s comments
This question examined the candidates’ application of the change management process in order to systematically address a large-scale acquisition of a mine and its assets. Candidates were expected to consider various approvals processes as well as normal mining processes. Generally, most candidates addressed this in a satisfactory manner.

Question 2 (total 60 marks)
Highest mark: 50
Average mark: 37
Lowest mark: 15

Examiner’s comments
This question examined the candidates’ knowledge of hot and reactive ground and the differences in managing the risks. Candidates were also required to respond to an immediate high-risk scenario. Most candidates provided an adequate response. Candidates who lacked fundamental knowledge of hot and reactive ground performed poorly in their responses.

Question 3 (total 60 marks)
Highest mark: 48
Average mark: 44
Lowest mark: 38

Examiner’s comments
This question tested the candidates’ response to a high-risk incident, then progressing to investigative and mitigation/risk control processes after the incident is controlled. The scenario required high level incident investigation to understand causes and implementation of controls to address those causes. Candidates generally supplied above-average standard of responses to this question.
Question 4 (total 60 marks)

Highest mark: 44  
Average mark: 37  
Lowest mark: 28

Examiner's comments

This question tested the candidates’ technical and practical application of auger mining into an open cut environment. Practical and safe extraction methods were prioritised over calculation of recoverable product. Generally, candidates provided a satisfactory response to this question.

Question 5 (total 60 marks)

Highest mark: 56  
Average mark: 45  
Lowest mark: 30

Examiner’s comments

This question tested the candidates’ technical knowledge of earthmoving tyres and their practical application in the open cut environment. The question also posed a situation of a hot tyre and required the candidates to identify the hazard and apply controls as appropriate. Generally, a high-level standard of response was received from most of the candidates.

Oral examination

Date: 30 August 2018  
Number of candidates: 12  
Number deemed competent: 5

General comments

✓ Lack of candidate preparation appears to be an ongoing theme.  
✓ Examiners are seeing some fundamental/safety critical information being omitted from responses.  
✓ The responses by some candidates are not yet demonstrating the level of thinking required as a mining engineering manager.  
✓ Endeavouring to gain greater exposure to mock orals would benefit candidates in an oral examination situation.
More information

NSW Department of Planning and Environment
Resources Regulator
Mining Competence Team
T: 02 4063 6461
Email: minesafety.competence@planning.nsw.gov.au
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