

# EXAMINER'S REPORT

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

June to September 2019

### Written examination

Summary of results and general comments

Examination date: 5 June 2019

Number candidates: 15

Number who passed: 9

Highest overall mark: 83%

Average overall mark: 63%

Lowest overall mark: 45%

### OCM1 – Mining legislation

#### Summary of results and general comments

Exam Date: 5 June 2019

Number of Candidates: 15

Number who passed: 10

Highest mark: 82%

Average mark: 58.7%

Lowest mark: 39%

### **Question 1 (total of 20 marks)**

Highest mark: 18

Average mark: 11.8

Lowest mark: 2

#### **Examiner's comments**

Part a) generally covered well by most candidates. Candidates lost marks in b), c) and d) where knowledge of duty holder was lacking. Note: a number of candidates did not include “minimise risk” where H&S risks cannot be eliminated in d).

### **Question 2 (total of 20 marks)**

Highest mark: 18

Average mark: 13

Lowest mark: 6

#### **Examiner's comments**

Some candidates were not assertive in their understanding of what to report under. Knowledge of when and how to inform the regulator and ISHR was lacking in some candidates, while some failed to notify ISHR at all. Candidates lost marks in the notification process, reporting requirements and record keeping.

### **Question 3 (total of 20 marks)**

Highest mark: 13

Average mark: 9.5

Lowest mark: 6

#### **Examiner's comments**

This was generally a question that found candidates lacking in knowledge, particularly in question 3 b) relating to request for a copy of documents.

**Question 4 (total of 20 marks)**

Highest mark: 18

Average mark: 12.5

Lowest mark: 7

**Examiner's comments**

Generally answered well by most candidates, with full marks awarded for 3 key statutory functions (MEM, EE, ME) where accurate. Candidates were awarded marks for additional functions where given.

**Question 5 (total of 20 marks)**

Highest mark: 20

Average mark: 12

Lowest mark: 5

**Examiner's comments**

Generally well covered by most candidates, however a few very low scoring responses brought the average down for this question. This may have been due to either lack of preparation/knowledge or examination technique/running out of time.

**OCM2 – Open cut mining practice****Summary of results and general comments**

Exam Date: 5 June 2019

Number of Candidates: 14

Number who passed: 12

Highest mark: 83.7%

Average mark: 67.7%

Lowest mark: 49.7%

**Question 1 (total of 60 marks)**

Highest mark: 58

Average mark: 48

Lowest mark: 36

**Examiner's comments**

This question tested the candidates' knowledge on high wall failures, investigation requirements, an understanding of conditions that may cause various types of failures and what control methods are available to mitigate the risk. Overall this question was answered well with most candidates having a good understanding of the above. Candidates who scored highly were able to clearly describe the reporting requirements, the types of failures, ground conditions that can increase the risk and controls measures to decrease the risk.

**Question 2 (total of 60 marks)**

Highest mark: 54

Average mark: 35.5

Lowest mark: 5

**Examiner's comments**

Candidates generally identified the change management and risk assessment process to follow, however those that scored poorly generally lacked ability to describe equipment commissioning, ongoing maintenance and defect management.

Most candidates scored poorly on their knowledge of how a floatation cell works.

**Question 3 (total of 60 marks)**

Highest mark: 50

Average mark: 40.5

Lowest mark: 26

**Examiner's comments**

This question tested the candidates' ability to perform a complex road crossing which interacted with public infrastructure. It required knowledge of relevant stakeholders in both the mining operations and regulatory bodies, as well as a practical application of how the task would be undertaken. Overall, the responses were more than adequate.

Some candidates missed out on marks through lack of practical application of the process and what would be required to remediate the impacts to open the public road quickly and safely.

### **Question 4 (total of 60 marks)**

Highest mark: 55

Average mark: 43.5

Lowest mark: 33

#### **Examiner's comments**

This question addresses the challenges faced in dealing with a critical incident, involving a victim suffering fatal injuries. Overall, the responses were of high standards where candidates demonstrated a practical response to the situation. This includes next of kin, employees, operations, escalation and reporting, media management and scene management.

### **Question 5 (total 60 marks)**

Highest mark: 54

Average mark: 36

Lowest mark: 22

#### **Examiner's comments**

Most candidates displayed an understanding of the question and task requirements. Unfortunately, some did not address important components of the 10 Hurdles process resulting in a less than adequate response.

The candidates that scored well displayed thorough knowledge of the change management and introduction to site processes. Importantly the consultation with the majority of the key stakeholders provided a strong platform to identify the hazard and risk management requirements resulting in a thorough and well-structured answer.

## **Oral examination**

### **Summary of results and general comments**

Date: 24 September 2019

Number of candidates: 11

Number deemed competent: 2

## General comments

- Some candidates did not use a risk based and sequential process approach to their responses i.e. used a “scatter gun” approach.
- Candidates must not underestimate the importance of Associated Non-Technical Skills (ANTS). E.g. being able to communicate the process that they need to go through in certain events and demonstrating leadership qualities. Candidates would benefit from going to the Resources Regulators’ website and reviewing [Assessing associated non-technical skills \(ANTS\) in certificates of competence](#).
- A thorough knowledge of notifiable incident reporting requirements was lacking in a number of candidates.
- It is evident that a number of candidates are not thinking at the appropriate level required.
- Successful candidates displayed strong process knowledge and paused to reflect on the next step before articulating their response.
- Examiners recommend that candidates ensure participation in mock orals leading up to the examination to develop skills and confidence in applying knowledge and associated non-technical skills under examination conditions.

## More information

NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Resources Regulator

Mining Competence Team

T: 02 4063 6461

Email: [minesafety.competence@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:minesafety.competence@planning.nsw.gov.au)

## Acknowledgments

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

© State of New South Wales through the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment 2019.

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, Industry and Environment.

Disclaimer: The information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing (December 2019). 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, Industry and Environment or the user's independent advisor.

CM9 reference: DOC19/927029