



## CHIEF EXAMINER'S REPORT

**Subject:** CPC – P2  
**Stage/Scheme:** 05678  
**Series and/or year of examination:** September 2013

### General Comments

This paper saw well-prepared candidates scoring very high marks. Candidates who read the Case Study carefully and took the time to assimilate the detailed plan for the service to Copenhagen were rewarded by earning significant marks in questions 1, 2 and 4.

Candidates who were less prepared, lost valuable marks in the high-scoring questions and therefore failed to reach the required standard to pass the exam.

### **Question One** (8 marks were available)

This question required candidates to prepare the timetable for an outward journey to Copenhagen. Many candidates achieved full marks for this straightforward exercise. Some candidates gave answers in UK time, or gave arrival times at stops rather than departure times. The departure time from London was given on the answer sheet, and driving times to each subsequent destination were tabulated in order in the case study.

### **Question Two** (12 marks were available)

The drivers' schedule for the same journey to Copenhagen was not well answered with many candidates earning less than half the marks available. Common mistakes were the omission of the start of work and the initial drive to Victoria; showing UK times for the European legs of the journey; omitting the destination of a driving leg; and calculation mistakes. An example of a correct schedule is shown below.

<b>Start Time (local time)</b>	<b>Finish Time (local time)</b>	<b>Driver 1 Activity</b>	<b>Driver 2 Activity</b>
1315	1330	Daily walkaround check	Other work
1330	1350	Drive to Victoria	Other work
1350	1400	Boarding	Other work
1400	1545	Drive to Folkestone	Other work
1545	1620 or 1720	Train, break	Train, break

1720	2105	Other work	Drive to Eindhoven
2105	2135	Eindhoven, break	Eindhoven, break
2135	0035	Drive to Munster	Other work
0035	0105	Munster, break	Munster, break
0105	0450	Other work	Drive to Hamburg
0450	0520	Hamburg, break	Hamburg, break
0520	0720	Drive to Puttgarden	Other work
0720	0805	Ferry to Rodby, break	Ferry to Rodby, break
0805	1005	Other work	Drive to Copenhagen

The second driver could have joined the vehicle at any point before the departure from London, Victoria and any activity was acceptable for this period. On the road journey, the second driver's activity was accepted as any except 'Rest', which cannot be taken in a moving vehicle. Marks were awarded for either driver carrying out the required activities, provided that timings were correct and the schedule remained legal.

**Question 3** (9 marks were available)

This question concerned the application process for the Copenhagen route, and the documents to be carried on the vehicle. Part a) was extremely well answered, with the vast majority of candidates correctly identifying the Regular Service.

Answers to part b) were available in reference materials and most candidates managed to differentiate between the items mentioned in the Case Study and those that earned marks.

Almost all candidates correctly identified five years as the normal validity period in part c).

Part d) asked for two documents that must be carried on the vehicle and the majority of candidates answered well. The question stated that answers must not include documents that were personal to a member of the crew, or an individual passenger and some candidates seemed to miss this requirement.

**Question 4** (12 marks were available)

The costing question also related to the Copenhagen service. An example of an acceptable answer is set out below.

	£	£
<b>STANDING COSTS</b>		
Purchase price	260,000	
less: Residual value	<u>140,000</u>	
Amount to depreciate	<u>120,000</u>	
Divide by 4 years	30,000	
Divide by 260 days		115.38
Two Drivers per day		160.00
Other standing costs per day		<u>110.00</u>
Total standing costs per day		<u>385.38</u>
Times 4 days		1,541.52
<b>RUNNING COSTS</b>		
Tyres	0.06	
Fuel	0.31	
Maintenance	<u>0.23</u>	

Total per km	<u>0.60</u>	
Times (2 x 1,203 km)	1,443.60	
Overseas allowances 2 x €150 x 0.85 x	765.00	
Train (£315 x 2)	630.00	
Ferry (€190 + €220) x 0.85	<u>348.50</u>	
Total running costs		<u>3,187.10</u>
Total costs		4,728.62
15% mark up		<u>709.29</u>
		5,437.91
		or
Income required		<u>5,437.92</u>

Correct answers that used alternative calculation methods earned full marks. Correct answers that used 4, 5 or 6 days for 'Depreciation' and 'Other Standing Costs' earned marks.

A number of candidates did not include the mileage from the Camberwell base to the starting point for the service to Copenhagen in their calculations. We would expect all costings to include such 'dead mileage'. The majority of candidates earned less than half the available marks.

#### **Question 5** (7 marks were available)

This question about the five-yearly checks that must be carried out on all operators was exceptionally well answered by most candidates. Again, correct answers were available from reference materials, but candidates still had to identify the criteria and the evidences required and express their answers as explanations.

#### **Question 6** (9 marks were available)

Part a) of this question asked for nine checks to be carried out, in addition to those mentioned in the Case Study. Although most candidates achieved some marks, some simply listed the vehicle items that should be checked by drivers.

Answers that were accepted included:

Supervise drivers carrying out walkaround checks; allow more time for checks; provide training for drivers; change wiper blades etc. more often; reduce intervals between safety inspections. Many credible answers were given that had not been included in the marking scheme and these were awarded marks.

Part b) of the question asked for three methods of monitoring the effectiveness of the measures identified in part a). Those candidates who were able to understand the difference between the demands of the two parts earned good marks.

### **Overall Performance**

The overall standard of written answer has improved over recent sessions, as has the use of clear, straightforward answers to explain actions and explain items. This improvement 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 using **local** times in questions 1 and 2, or by not clearly stating **measures** in question 6.

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 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 29 marks reflects the relative difficulty of the paper.

Approximately 33% of candidates achieved a pass.