

March 2023

Examiners' report

Mining engineering manager of coal mines other than underground coal mines certificate of competence

Examiners' report 2022 – 2023

Written examination

OCM1 – Legislation

Summary of results and general comments

Exam date: 9 June 2022

Number of candidates: 4

Number who passed: 1

Highest mark: 63%

Average mark: 53%

Lowest mark: 41%

**NB The lower number of candidates that sat the OCM1 examination made it challenging at times to determine trends in some questions. Despite this, here are some comments which may be of assistance.*

Question 1 (total of 25 marks) Duty of care

Highest mark: 19

Average mark: 14

Lowest mark: 10

Examiner's comments:

- Basic knowledge of duties in a), b) were covered adequately by most candidates
- Practical application of the legislation in relating to due diligence requirements in C) ii was lacking generally

Question 2 (total of 25 marks) Code of practice

Highest mark: 17

Average mark: 14

Lowest mark: 12

Examiners' comments:

- Generally, knowledge in codes of practice (COP) was lacking in most candidates. Future candidates need to be aware of the significance of COP and are encouraged to visit the Resource Regulator Website for relevant and up to date information.

- MDG 28 knowledge and application was adequate for most candidates

Question 3 (total of 25 marks) WHS

Highest mark: 14

Average mark: 11

Lowest mark: 9

Examiners' comments:

- Knowledge of legislation in relation to Inspectors was lacking in some candidates which was disappointing considering their relevance to an MEM at an open cut mine.
- Knowledge of WHS Act 2011 notices that may be served at an open cut mine was adequate for most candidates. This demonstrated a distinct improvement in candidates' knowledge of notices compared to previous years.

Question 4 (total of 25 marks) Incident management

Highest mark: 17

Average mark: 14

Lowest mark: 12

Examiners' comments:

- Provision of information requirements including knowledge of HPI's and definition of medical treatment was varied amongst the candidates. This knowledge is important for an MEM in determining reporting information to the Regulator.
- The incident management responses were generally adequate in the practical application of legislation required in part c). Candidates are reminded of the obligations in relation to communication between outgoing and incoming shifts, review of control measures and mine record requirements which were omitted by some candidates.

OCM2 – Open cut mining practice

Summary of results and general comments

Exam date: 9 June 2022

Number of candidates: 4

Number who passed: 3

Highest mark: 84%

Average mark: 66%

Lowest mark: 54%

Question 1 (total 50 marks) Incident management and investigation

Highest mark: 52

Average mark: 48

Lowest mark: 46

Examiners' comments:

- Most candidates provided good structure to their responses with thorough emergency response process, site prioritisation of tasks and reporting.

- Slightly lower overall score was a result of insufficient detail and structure to machine recovery and investigation process.

Question 2 (total 50 marks) Risk and change management

Highest mark: 50

Average mark: 42

Lowest mark: 30

Examiners' comments:

- Most candidates provided good structure to their answers that followed the Ten Hurdles process with well thought out responses and supporting arguments.
- The lowest scoring candidate provided a scattered approach that did not have the structure, or the quality of content required.

Question 3 (total 50 marks) Contractor engagement and management

Highest mark: 52

Average mark: 38

Lowest mark: 30

Examiners' comments:

- Most candidates identified appropriate members of their team to include in the selection process however many couldn't adequately describe the criteria for assessment.
- Some candidates could clearly describe the requirements for a contractor before starting work, however, many missed some of the key elements.
- Most candidates identified that a risk assessment was required however many were missing detail of how the contractor would be managed and the key systems they would be following.
- Candidates varied in their responses describing the supervision, monitoring, and auditing arrangements applied to the contractor and the task.

Question 4 (total of 50 marks) Mining practice

Highest mark: 45

Average mark: 39

Lowest mark: 31

Examiners' comments:

- Most candidates answered this question quite well. However, many could not adequately list all the information that was required to be able to conduct a thorough review of the mining process near or through old underground workings.

Question 5 (total of 50 marks) HSEC

Highest mark: 54

Average mark: 32

Lowest mark: 8

Examiners' comments:

- Most candidates identified that some form of Risk Assessment was required, however some did not adequately identify appropriate persons to include in the risk assessment. It is advised to include or consult with the explosive's supplier.

- There was a lack of detail with management of potential impacts to neighbours.
- Candidates demonstrated good awareness by recognition of sentries that needed to be moved to avoid possible fume risk impacts.
- Some candidates did not consider informing neighbours with details on the day of blasting.
- Notification at crew starts was missing with some candidates
- The review of the Explosive Management Plan was correctly considered or actioned by some candidates.
- There was a lack of knowledge relating to possible blast design changes that could be considered as a control measure.
- The use of appropriate “wet hole” products as a control measure was correctly adopted by several candidates.
- Higher marks were awarded where greater thoroughness shown in regard to the investigation and inclusion of a full scope of controls measures across the hierarchy to address hazards.

Oral examination

Date: 9 August 2022

Number of candidates: 2

Number deemed competent: 0

Examiners' comments

The lower number of candidates that sat the oral examination and the variance in questions asked during the examination made it challenging to determine trends. Despite this, here are some general observations which may be of assistance.

- Candidates should take time to understand the question/scenario and ask any clarifying questions or state assumptions early.
- There is no need to rush into an answer. A controlled and structured response is the desired outcome.
- Know the detail in regard to notifications to the Regulator.
- Knowledge of when and how to conduct an investigation was generally lacking in some responses.
- Consider the plan, do check, act management model to base a structured response and to ensure closing of the loop in a thorough response.
- Consider the ANTS as these are a key area being assessed in an oral examination. Refer to Competency information on the Resources Regulator Website.

Post Oral examination

Date: 15 February 2023

Number of candidates: 1

Number deemed competent: 1

More information

Regional NSW

Resources Regulator

Mining Competence Team

T: 1300 814 609 (options 2 and 3)

Email: mca@regional.nsw.gov.au

Acknowledgements

Mining engineering manager of coal mines other than underground coal mines examination panel

© State of New South Wales through Regional NSW 2023. The information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing March 2023. However, because of advances in knowledge, users are reminded of the need to ensure that the information upon which they rely is up to date and to check the currency of the information with the appropriate officer of the Regional NSW or the user's independent adviser.

RDOC23/73664