

**General:**

The quality of the candidates' line work was good.

Drawing instruments were used incorrectly by some candidates.

Instructions on the question paper were generally adhered to in most cases.

Examination reports from previous years clearly did not get the required attention from a certain educators. This was evident in mistakes made in previous years that were repeated in 2005.

**QUESTION 1**

Generally very well answered. However, there were cases where projection lines to the auxiliary view were projected at an incorrect angle. Some candidates could not interpret the slot in the auxiliary view correctly.

The top view did not cause problems for most of the candidates. It was encouraging to see that the "heights" in the auxiliary view was determined correctly by most candidates.

**QUESTION 2**

The given isometric axis was interpreted differently by candidates and that resulted in a variety of positions in their answers. In many cases, where the incorrect axis was used, candidates still showed some understanding. The plain geometrical construction to obtain the curve was often omitted from answers and valuable marks were lost owing to this. Marks were also lost because the instruction to do a freehand sketch was ignored and the answer was done mechanically. The exploded view was drawn correctly in most cases.

**QUESTION 3**

The technique to determine the vanishing point had been mastered by most candidates. This resulted in fairly good answers. At some centres it is evident that more attention is required to ensure understanding of concepts applicable to this question

**QUESTION 4**

This question was fairly well answered, but in some cases candidates lost valuable marks owing to the fact that they did not project from the given views. The memorandum was adjusted for this question so as to compensate candidates for the error on the question paper.