



## CHIEF EXAMINER'S REPORT

095

**Subject:** CPC – R2  
**Stage/Scheme:** 05689  
**Series and/or year of examination:** June 2013

Candidates were able to score high marks on all questions in this paper, which was the most accessible that has been set since the open book format was introduced. The standard of explanations and the clarity of answers continues to improve, and this cohort generally related their answers to the case study successfully.

This paper did not require candidates to prepare a driver schedule, nor to produce a detailed costing, with these syllabus areas being addressed in a different way to previous papers.

### Question One

This question required candidates to describe ten breaches of law or company policy in the given schedule. Correct answers included the following breaches, with all correct responses accepted, wherever it was clear that candidates had identified the nature and timing of the breach, even if the response was in a different box.

#### Monday

2015-2030: Insufficient Daily Rest

#### Tuesday

0515-0830: Failed to check vehicle

0900-1030: Exceeded 4.5 hours driving

1030-1045: Insufficient break (or breaks wrong way round)

1045-1115: Illegal other work

1115-1600: Exceeded 4.5 hours driving

1600-1630: Insufficient break

1700-1800: Exceeded 10 hours daily driving

1800: Missed paperwork

#### Wednesday

0230-0245: Insufficient Daily Rest

0715-0915: Exceeded 4.5 hours driving

0915-0930: Insufficient break (or breaks wrong way round)

0930-1800: Exceeded 6 hours duty (or exceeded working time)

1800-1815: Exceeded 15 hours duty (or insufficient Daily Rest)

Some candidates incorrectly claimed a breach on Wednesday (0245-0645) for a legal four hour driving period, but very few candidates identified the two incidents of illegal unloading on Tuesday, possibly because they both followed break periods that were too short.

The majority of candidates were able to describe at least seven correct breaches.

## **Question Two**

This straightforward question about vehicle depreciation again allowed candidates to score heavily, with many achieving maximum marks.

The instruction to give answers to the nearest penny was missed, or ignored by some candidates, with marks lost as a result. Some candidates omitted to deduct the cost of the initial tyre set in one or both parts of the question. In these cases, answers that were otherwise correct earned some marks, but not all.

## **Question Three**

The first part of this question asked candidates to outline five advantages of switching to vehicles supplied by a single manufacturer and was generally well answered, with credible and reasoned responses earning marks.

Candidates who missed that OCR carries out all its vehicle maintenance in-house (case study) and identified advantages of having maintenance done by a single company, did not gain marks for those points. Some candidates also lost marks by giving 'bullet-point' answers and failing to outline a clear advantage.

Part b) was also generally very well answered, with advantages relating to drivers' licences, reduced operator licence requirements, better maneuverability and lower running costs being clearly identified by the majority of candidates. Those who claimed that OCR would not need an operator licence or would not have to maintain the 3.5 tonne vehicles 'to VOSA standards' did not earn a mark for those incorrect responses.

Candidates had more difficulty with part c), which required them to interpret the case study and show an understanding of vehicle margins for operator licences.

Correct answers identified the current number of authorised vehicles (42) and added the additional tractor unit for the German work to reach a new total of 43, preserving the current margin of seven vehicles. Answers that also added the 12 additional vehicles for the Acme contract and produced a total of 55 also earned full marks (it was not completely clear in the case study that these 12 vehicles would be subject to operator licensing). The most common error by candidates was to ignore the existing margin on the operator licence.

## **Question Four**

Part a) of this question was clearly referenced to the operator licensing actions required by OCR in order to carry out the work in Germany. While many candidates successfully identified actions to earn good marks, others gave incorrect answers that related to other aspects of international haulage work or failed to clearly identify the things that OCR would have to do. For example, there were no marks available for 'Traffic Commissioner must publish details of OCR's application in Applications & Decisions', as this is not an OCR action.

In an open book exam, we would expect candidates to be able to correctly identify the appropriate form to be submitted, and many candidates did so. However, a surprising number expected a GV79 application form to be completed for a company that already holds an operator licence.

Part b) was generally well answered. Most candidates identified and explained two personal documents, although some did not provide an explanation and others included the driver's licence and/or tachograph records and/or card, all of which were specifically excluded in the question stem. The European Accident Statement was also not accepted, as not being a personal document.

### **Question Five**

This question was referenced to Regulation EC 1013/2006, which has been amended by other regulations and concerns the international movement of waste. Answers that correctly identified actions that OCR would have to take in regard to the carriage of Acme's waste packaging within the UK were all awarded marks and the majority of candidates scored high marks.

### **Question Six**

Most candidates were able to correctly relate the information provided in the case study to the graph and supply the recommended safety inspection intervals. This relatively easy question again allowed high marks to be achieved.

Candidates who thought that the vans were exempt from the goods vehicle maintenance requirements, did not earn the two marks that they would have earned by applying their knowledge of the table to those vehicles.

### **OVERALL PERFORMANCE**

As commented upon above, this R2 paper was more accessible than its predecessors. The overall standard of written answer was quite high and the use of clear, straightforward answers to explain actions, outline advantages and explain items was good. This clarity, where correct answers were demonstrated, allowed examiners to award marks, even where the exact language of the response differed from mark schemes.

It may help those who did not pass this time to remember that they are always expected to answer the question exactly as it is asked, particularly if they lost marks by not clearly stating 'actions' in questions 4a and 5, or not outlining 'advantages' in question 3.

The open book format allows candidates to use reference materials to confirm details for their answers. While examiners try to set questions that minimise the opportunity to simply copy sections from manuals, candidates who did not pass, should remember that marks for form numbers, time limits and similar details can be quickly confirmed to be sure of earning that mark.

After every examination, a group of senior examiners and industry sector representatives reviews each paper and sets the pass mark. In this case, the pass mark of 37 marks reflects the lower relative difficulty of the paper. The pass mark also took into consideration the potential difficulty for candidates in question 3c and question 5.

Approximately 64% of candidates who sat the exam achieved a pass.