

### General comment

The overall standard for the Port Agency examination in 2015 was reasonable. Students displayed a wide knowledge of the synopsis and also brought in working examples into their answers, this was very useful. The students did tend to struggle on questions regarding financial controls and in particular the lack of geographical and laytime knowledge was concerning. The questions were chosen from a wide range of subjects within the syllabus. Laytime, marketing, insurance and vessel operations were all covered.

### Question One

Generally poorly handled. Few students had the necessary techniques to create a formal laytime statement. Very few dealt with the issue of "half time to count" on the Friday. It appeared that the amount of information in the question can overwhelm students to a degree. High percentage of students made an incorrect calculation. However those that had applied a reasonable technique gained marks as the examiner could ascertain where mistakes were made in the laytime calculation timesheet.

### Question Two

The time old problem for students here, in that they chose to only answer certain aspects of the question. For example many students chose to completely overlook the plight of the ships crew. Worryingly a number of students blindly ignored that the vessels owners had declared bankruptcy and failed to understand the implications of that basic fact. Numerous students also failed to introduce the requirement to involve their P & I club in the situation

### Question Three

The response in this question was a mixed bag. The student who displayed awareness handled this well, others produced a complete lack of understanding  
Shex – Well handled but lacked examples.  
Mates Receipt – A good level of understanding was displayed here. Naabsa- Well handled but lacked examples

### Question Four

Students handled the pragmatic issue of creating alternative options for the shipowner well.  
Fewer considered the need for P & I involvement in the situation, and almost all students overlooked the detrimental effect on the relationship between the owner and the agent.

### Question Five

A polarised answer. Those students who understood the concept gave a well rounded answer, with numerous relevant examples such as warehousing, freight forwarding and customs. However many students failed to understand the concept and gave a list of husbandry services and discussed the agency fee

### Question Six

Students gave a general response to this question. The question was set to elicit a response on a particular tanker sector. Most students completely overlooked this and gave a vague response, sometime going off on tangents to talk about stevedoring and warehousing service, which are of no use to a tanker operator. Few students gave a solid company background aligned to tanker trade experience.

### Question Seven

Generally this question was well handled. Students displayed an improved level of understanding from previous years. Most students were able to understand the agents need for coverage for acts errors and omissions, breach of warranty of authority and cash handling. A few students still thought the question referred to shipowners needs for P & I, not ships agents.

### Question Eight

Students tended to give reasonable answers on the chosen trades, however many students failed to use the map provided, and others displayed a somewhat questionable knowledge on the rudiments of world geography when attempting to locate the load and discharge ports that they had selected for the routes. A more detail answer to this question would have been expected.