

Public comment response template to Discussion Paper: Maintenance of Competence for Practising Certificates
Please send submissions by email to consult.minesafety@industry.nsw.gov.au Submissions must be received by the due date of Monday 1 February 2016.
Name: Andrew Flynn - Mining Engineering Manager focus
Organisation (if applicable):
Responses to discussion points
1. Is the proposed model for the MOC scheme suitable for application for practising certificate holders in NSW?
The aim of MOC is logical and appreciated however the proposed requirements do seem onerous and unrealistic in the quantity required on a number of points. The required amount of courses and formal training will have a significant effect on personal finances if the employer is not willing to pay for the courses, travel and accomodation. In the current environment where my particular employer is running at a significant loss there is a good chance that much of this training will have to be done at ones own expense. In the same line is personnel that are currently unemployed that wish to retain their certificate of competency to allow them to re-enter the workforce at the previous working level. The other component is employer sponsored leave to undertake any training.
2. Are the areas of competence and their topics suitable and cover the areas adequately?
The areas of competence seem concise and logical, however their will be a challenge showing/conforming to the legislation area of competence. More detail regarding review of this area is required.
3a. Are the types of formal and informal learning with their maximum claimable hours suitable?
The number of hours is excessive for supervisors and our business to contend with as it works out to be at least a week a year per person in which they will be out of/away from work. For persons that are not actively using their certificate of competency, the business would be well within its rights to deny sponsorship of the training and extended learning, making the cost and annual leve requirement to undertake this training exorbitant and preventative.
3b. Is the percentage split between the minimum number of formal hours (66%) against a maximum of 33% for informal hours appropriate?
I believe the split should be more even with the informal being a maximum of 50% of all hours completed and formal being a minimum of 50% of hours. This will assist engineering managers to demonstrate that they are keeping up to date through everyday activities. This also allows Engineering managers to maintain competency when they live in remote areas/operations that have reduced formal opportunities.
4. Are the numbers of learning hours for each practising certificate and areas of competence appropriate to maintain competence a) per year b) over five years?
24 hours per year to be conducted when not all actual hours count is a significant amount of time to be taking out of work. My major concern is that as I am not in the engineering manager statutory role full time, my employer wont recognise it and I shall be unable to complete the requirement due to annual leave restrictions and prohibitive cost of the conferences, seminars etc. regarding mine supervisors, the requirements are also quite onerous and will be quite challenging from a literacy and academic perspective for many of them. Many of the supervisors at my workplace have limited literacy, numeracy and computer skills and would really struggle with the requirements that are being asked.
see above
5. Are the requirements for certificate holders in the MOC scheme reasonable and practical?
The list of requirements are reasonable and practical as a list of overarching requirements/guidelines for attaining the requirements, however as above the actual details of hours required and split between formal and informal are onerous and preventative.
6a. Are the record keeping requirements for certificate holders to satisfy in the MOC scheme reasonable and practical?

yes

6b. Are the governance processes proposed by the department adequate to ensure compliance with the MOC scheme by practising certificate holders?

yes