

Vocational Qualifications (QCF, NVQ, NQF)

CPC (Certificate of Professional Competence)

Level 3 CPC (Certificate of Professional Competence) for Transport Managers (Road Haulage) - **05669**

Unit R2: Certificate of Professional Competence for Transport Managers (Road Haulage) - **05689**

OCR Report to Centres December 2016

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2016

CONTENTS

Vocational Qualifications (QCF, NVQ, NQF)

Level 3 CPC (Certificate of Professional Competence) for Transport Managers
(Road Haulage) - **05669**

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
Level 3 CPC (Certificate of Professional Competence) for Transport Managers (Road Haulage) - 05669	4

Level 3 CPC (Certificate of Professional Competence) for Transport Managers (Road Haulage) - 05669

General Comments

Recent R2 case study papers have been well answered by many candidates, with particularly noticeable improved candidate performance on driver schedule and costing questions. This trend continued this session, with average marks for those questions being high. However, the general standard of presentation of answers for December 2016 was not as high as in recent exams and some candidates should have related their answers more to the circumstances described in the case study.

As previous Principal Examiners' reports have explained, there will always be marks available to candidates who take advantage of the open book exam to research their answers, but marks will very rarely be available for answers copied from teaching materials, unless these answers are clearly related to the case study. Candidates are reminded to read the case study and the exact requirements of each question carefully and to give answers that directly respond to the questions set.

Question 1

This question addressed the 'most serious infringements' and required candidates to identify five different legal areas and match these to descriptions of possible infringements. Most candidates scored well on this question, and a significant number scored full marks.

Common mistakes included repeating offences in a legal area, identifying offences that are not regarded as 'most serious' and/or not identifying the appropriate legal area for an infringement.

Examiners gave marks for clear and relevant identification of the legal area. For example, the legal area for the infringement of "Carrying goods exceeding the maximum permissible laden mass by 20% for vehicles the permissible laden weight of which exceeds 12 tonnes" was accepted as 'overloading', 'vehicle loading', 'loading', 'safe carriage of goods', 'weights & dimensions', 'construction & use' or reference to relevant law.

Candidates were expected to research their answers and many did so successfully, with clear and accurate descriptions of relevant infringements.

Question 2

Generally, candidates completed the driver schedule to Stuttgart well, with approximately 66% achieving at least half of the available marks and a significant number scoring full marks. Those who did not schedule sufficient rest periods, and produced an illegal schedule, earned a maximum of 7 marks.

An example of a correct schedule is given below.

Start Time	Finish time	Activity
14.30	17.00	Yard Duties
17.00	17.20	Check vehicle [or] other work
17.20	17.30	Paperwork [or] other work
17.30	20.30	Drive Harwich
20.30	23.30	Rest
23.30	23.45	Embark
23.45	04.45 OR 05.45	Rest
04.45 OR 05.45	06.00	Disembark
06.00	09.00	Rest
09.00	09.15	Checks
09.15	13.45	Drive Stuttgart
13.45	14.30	Break
14.30	18.30	Drive Stuttgart

Marks were awarded for correct start and finish times for each line, with an appropriate activity description, including a correct destination for each driving period. Unnecessary activities resulted in no mark being awarded for the following line. Marking stopped when an offered schedule was illegal or the ferry at 23.45hrs was not taken, but following lines were adjusted for other errors.

Common mistakes included scheduling break periods instead of rest periods, not changing to local time on arrival in France, giving unnecessary, or too long, breaks and/or rests, and/or scheduling a drive to Dover (instead of Harwich).

Question 3

Part a) of this question required candidates to describe how the two trailers shown in the graphic had been appropriately secured to the carrying vehicle.

Although generally quite well answered, some candidates did not relate their answers to Fig.1 in the case study and/or outlined checks that the driver might carry out. Some answers were obviously copied from learning materials, without reference to the requirements set out in the question or to the vehicle load in question.

The same issues arose to some extent in part b), with some candidates outlining checks that were not appropriate to this load.

Question 4

In part a) some candidates gave answers that related to notifications to be made to Traffic Commissioners, or outlined actions to set up a new limited company. The importance of reading questions carefully is highlighted by these simple mistakes.

Most candidates who gave appropriate answers correctly identified that the removal of a company director, the addition of a company director and the change of company name would require notification to Companies House, although fewer stated that this must be done immediately. Examiners also accepted 'January 2017' or 'within 14 days' or 'on acquisition'. A significant number of candidates did not state when a notification must be made for any of the changes that they had identified. Marks were also available for answers about the change of shareholder, with 'on next Confirmation Statement' (Annual Return was also accepted).

Candidates performed less well on part b), where the personal details to be provided are the same as those on the IN01 application form, including title, former name(s), country/state of residence, nationality, date of birth or age, occupation and date of appointment. Answers about addresses earned no marks. Again, the need to read the question carefully was important.

Almost all candidates correctly identified 'Articles of Association' in part c).

Question 5

Candidates earned high marks on this costing question, with more than 25% achieving between 13 and 15 marks. This style of question, where candidates are not required to format their answers, allows them to demonstrate numeracy and understanding of the principles involved. My comments about presentation do not apply to answers to this question.

The most common mistakes were to give 0.05 and 0.04 for the two answers to be given in pence per kilometre. For these, marks were awarded for 5p/£0.05 and for 4p/£0.04 only.

Question 6

Part a) of this question was quite well answered by most candidates, with those that read the circumstances described in the case study successfully identifying FCA as the appropriate Incoterm to be used, with others also earning marks for giving EXW, which was a credible alternative in this case. The reasons given earned fewer marks.

In part b) very few candidates correctly gave credible reasons why DDP would not be appropriate. These included that there would be: no duty payable, that the goods were in free circulation, that the seller was not paying for the transport / the buyer was paying for the transport. The many answers that simply copied phrases that explained the Incoterm DDP did not earn marks.

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

In setting the pass mark, examiners considered the relative difficulty of this paper, compared to previous sessions, finding that the notional pass mark of 30 was not appropriate. As described in the Syllabus, Student and Tutor Guide, the Awarding process forms part of the system that seeks to ensure that all candidates are treated fairly, regardless of which session they sit the case study paper.

The pass mark was set at 28 and approximately 55% of candidates achieved this level.

The pass mark for the December 2016 R1 (Multiple Choice) paper was set at 41 and 54.6% of candidates achieved this level.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Skills and Employment

Telephone: 02476 851509

Fax: 02476 421944

Email: vocational.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2016

