

CHIEF EXAMINER'S REPORT

Certificate of Professional Competence

International Passenger Transport (P2– 05678)

December 2012

General Comments

It was encouraging to note that the majority of candidates seemed able to complete this examination without running out of time, as may have happened with the previous new specification papers. Answers were generally laid out logically and clearly, both in the costing question and the scheduling question.

The most common general causes of candidates not gaining full marks were either that they did not answer the question as asked or that they did not use all of the information contained within the case study to formulate an answer. We would again remind candidates that time spent carefully reading the case study and the questions is time well spent.

After every examination, a group of senior examiners and industry sector representatives reviews each paper and sets the pass mark in order to reflect the paper's level of difficulty. In this case, the pass mark was set at 50% (30 marks).

The comments below are intended to help centres and candidates understand how they may best tackle future questions. The answers given are certainly not an exhaustive list, but aim merely to guide.

Question 1

HKM Tours have asked HKM coaches to provide a price for operating the 35 seat Gold standard coach on the proposed 10 day tour to Edinburgh.

This question was well answered with most candidates producing a clearly laid out costing, thereby attracting full marks.

The few candidates who did not gain full marks had generally made one of three errors:

- i Miscalculating the total tour mileage, thereby giving incorrect fuel, maintenance and tyre (running) costs
- ii Unnecessarily using two drivers, thereby doubling the driver wages and accommodation costs. (The tour itinerary includes a period of 25.5 hours when the driver is not on duty, from 1230hrs on day 5 until 1400hrs on day 6, allowing the tour to be completed with one driver.)
- lii Including only 9 days of standing costs, on the basis that the 10 day itinerary included a free day in York.

An example of an answer which would attract full marks is:

Total Tour Mileage - 1725 km

Total Tour Days - 10 days

35 seat coach used

	£
10 days Overheads @ £ 190.00	1900.00
Driver – 10 Days @ £ 100	1000.00
9 Overnight Allowances @ £ 20.00	180.00
Fuel Use 1725km @ 5km/l = 345l @ £1.20	414.00
Maintenance 1725km @ £0.45	776.25
Tyres 1725km @ £0.04	69.00
Sub Total	<u>£4339.25</u>
DIVIDED by 30 pax	£144.64
PLUS 20% Profit	£28.93
TOTAL COST PER PASSENGER	<u>£173.57</u>

Variations in the order and layout of the calculation are accepted and, subject to a correct final answer, full marks are awarded as long as candidates have shown their workings and identified individual costs.

Question 2

In relation to the proposed new day trips and using only the information contained in the case study,

- a) explain why the proposed day trip to St Davids cannot be carried out legally**
- b) for the other proposed day trips, calculate the maximum time at each destination.**

Part a of this question was answered correctly by almost every candidate, with all of those recognising that the total driving time would exceed the legal maximum for one driver.

Part b of the question required the candidate to deduct driving time, other work time and break time from the maximum day of 15 hours to arrive at a time available at each destination.

Most candidates correctly calculated the driving time for each destination and generally took account of the required breaks (both legally required and in line with company policy). However, many did not then allow for the two periods of 30 minutes - at the beginning and end of the day for other work. This period of one hour had to be deducted from the 15 hour maximum day in order to achieve a correct answer.

Some candidates calculated from a 16 hour maximum day. However, the given operation could not be operated under domestic rules and so the maximum day can only be 15 hours.

An example of a typical correct answer is:

YORK	350km @ 70kph (each way)	Total Driving time	10 hrs
	plus	Total Break time	1.5 hrs
	plus	Additional duty time	1 hr
	Total		12.5 hrs
	So,	15hr day minus 12.5 = 2.5 at destination	

TORQUAY	300km @ 75kph (each way)	Total Driving time	8 hours
	Plus	Total Break time	1hr
	Plus	Additional duty time	1hr
	Total		10hrs
	So,	15 hr day minus 10 = 5 hrs at destination	

Question 3.

On 25th June 2012, a driver performed a private hire trip to Devon. By reference to the driver's manual record and his digital tachograph printout,

- a) detail the time and nature of any offences committed**
- b) state when the VU is due to have its next inspection**
- c) state the registration number of the vehicle used**
- d) identify what event happened on this day at 0940 and 1006 hrs.**

Parts b and c of the question were answered correctly by almost all candidates.

Part a required the candidate to determine where the printout did not accurately reflect the driver's actual activities as shown by his manual record and to detail the nature of any offence which may have been committed.

Many candidates did not take into consideration the difference between UTC and BST time and based answers on perceived time differences. Another common mistake was to detail *differences* between the two records which were not *offences*. This did not answer the question as asked.

Examination of the two records shows that at 1021hrs and 1321hrs (UTC), when the driver commenced a break, he did not set the mode switch of the tachograph to break. He changed the mode during the first break at 1115hrs and not at all during the second break. The offence at these times is therefore incorrect use of the mode switch.

At 1649hrs, the driver commenced a break and set the correct mode on the tachograph. He had, however, driven for 4 hours and 43 minutes without a break, exceeding the legal limit by 13 minutes. The offence at this point is therefore that of exceeding the four and a half hour continuous driving limit.

Part d of the question asked what event happened at 0940 and 1006 hrs. Many candidates simply stated that the driver was driving at these times. It is important, however, that candidates understand the term "event" as applicable to a digital tachograph. Others stated incorrectly that the driver was "speeding". Again, it is important for candidates to understand the difference between the terms "speeding" and "overspeed". At the times given, the tachograph recorded "overspeed".

Question 4

Examine the printed vehicle check sheet and give seven items and/or other requirements that must be added in order to make it compliant with VOSA guidance.

This question was well answered, with candidates demonstrating a very good knowledge of the requirements for a compliant vehicle check sheet.

My only comment would again be to remind candidates to read the case study carefully, as a few candidates failed to gain full marks here because they listed some items which were already on the check sheet.

Question 5

In relation to the four premium quality coaches which you intend to acquire,

- a) give five in-vehicle optional extras you would include in the specification to enhance the passenger experience.**
- b) give two financial implications of operating these premium quality coaches**

Part a of this question was also well answered, with candidates showing a good understanding of the requirements when offering a premium quality service. Answers typically included important options such as a servery, a toilet/washroom, on-board entertainment systems and luxury seats with extra long seat spacing. A number of candidates also listed some vehicle specification details which are not 'in vehicle optional extras', as was asked for. Typical answers in this category, which did not gain any marks, were aerodynamic body styling, road friendly suspension and an automatic gearbox.

In many cases, the answers given for part b were not **financial** implications. For those that were, answers that simply stated a cost, without indicating whether it would be higher, lower or the same (for example "Fuel consumption", "Purchase cost " or "Running costs") did not attract marks. Some of these costs can be higher *or* lower (see below), depending on the reasons given, and to answer a question that requests financial *implications* it was therefore essential that candidates specify.

Marks were awarded where candidates gave implications, for example by saying that running costs could be higher due to the additional equipment on board, or that they could be lower due to having newer, more fuel efficient engines.

Question 6

In relation to the American tour operator's programme, compile a vehicle schedule to cover the proposed four tour programme, for the coach which will depart on the Southern Ireland tour on a Sunday.

This question required the candidate to arrange the tours for one vehicle, so that each departed on its correct day, covered the stated number of days and also allowed for two clear days for maintenance within one four week period.

A typical correct answer could be laid out as follows -:

Sunday	To Southern Ireland
Tuesday (week 2)	Arrive in Windsor
Wednesday	To Wales or Royal Deeside
Monday (week 3)	Arrive Windsor
Tuesday	To London and Kent Weald
Friday	Arrive Windsor
Saturday (week 4)	To Royal Deeside or Wales
Thursday	Arrive Windsor
Friday/Saturday	Maintenance

Variations to the order of tours and to the layout were possible and were given full marks if all requirements were met.

Question 7

With regard to the Thames Valley Council operation which HKM Services will take over,

- a) give two implications for HKM Services' Operator Licence**
- b) explain why Thames Valley Council were able to operate under Section 19 Permits.**
- c) advise Hans whether or not HKM Services could continue to operate these vehicles under Section 19 Permits and give reasons for your answer.**

While most candidates understood the criteria which qualify an organisation for Section 19 operations, many did not then relate this to the situation referred to in the case study and therefore did not correctly answer the three parts of this question.

Part a was generally well answered, with most candidates understanding the need to vary the licence to add more vehicles. Many went on to give further implications such as the need to prove additional financial standing and the need to demonstrate further ability to keep the vehicles in a fit and roadworthy condition. Giving one or other of these attracted an additional mark, up to the 2 mark maximum for part a.

A common mistake in part a was to state that "additional licences would need to be applied for". While we accept that this phrase is often used to mean "apply for a variation in order to increase the number of vehicles authorised on a licence" it is factually incorrect and cannot be rewarded in an examination towards a licence to practise. There is no requirement to have additional licences.

In respect of parts b and c, candidates needed to be aware that the fact that an operation does not make a profit does not in itself qualify that service for Section 19 operation. Many candidates stated that as long as HKM did not make a profit from the service, they could run it under Section 19 Permits.

A full and correct answer to part b would be 'because TV Council are a "not for profit organisation" and because the operation is NOT for hire and reward'.

In other words, the council is not operating with *a view to* making a profit and the service being run is not for hire and reward. It follows, then, for part c of the question, that HKM could NOT run under section 19 permits, as they are a commercial company operating with a view to making a profit. A further reason, and one which attracted a further mark, is that Section 19 permits are not transferable.

It was pleasing to see that the paper, and candidates, seemed to perform well, with a pass rate of 50%, the highest so far under the new specification.