

THE INSTITUTE OF CHARTERED SHIPBROKERS

PORT AGENCY EXAMINATION

2007

EXAMINER'S REPORT

QUESTION ONE - LAYTIME

This question was handled on the whole very well by the candidates. Either candidates showed a commanding grasp of the Laytime statement and submitted a correct answer to the question, or they made some minor calculation errors and submitted an answer that although not correct was very close to the correct answer.

A number of candidates had difficulties with the “Half time to count” scenario, as operations ceased after the Friday 1700 hours clause commenced, therefore that caused additional confusion, which resulted in far fewer factually correct answer, but many that were very close to the correct answer.

QUESTION TWO - VESSEL DIAGRAMS

Most candidates had a reasonable knowledge of the vessel types and could display the rudimentary vessel sketches requested. However, where any type of question asks for a multi-part answer a significant percentage of candidates choose to ignore this request, and thus a number of exam papers, had reasonable sketches but limited comments. The best paper had sketches, tonnage dimensions and then detailed trade routes where actual load and discharge ports were named. Unfortunately most candidates tended to answer the trade route issue by generalising with terms such as “Northern Europe”

QUESTION THREE - AGENCY OPERATIONS/BILL OF LADING

This question was disappointingly answered, as again the candidate was required to answer a multi-part question. In effect the question was two-fold in that it involved the actual agency operation, and the training of agency staff. This aspect was almost completely overlooked by most candidates who saw the words BILL OF LADING, and decided the question was asking them to write about Bills of Lading. Therefore once again the aspect of multi-part questions produced poorer results.

QUESTION FOUR - GENERAL AVERAGE

A well-answered question. Most candidates displayed a very good knowledge of general average.

However, a number of candidates chose to ignore the request for a formal response, and also a large number of candidates chose to ignore the final aspect of the question which concerned onward cargo delivery.

QUESTION FIVE - SHIPPING ABBREVIATIONS

Although a number of candidates chose not to answer this question, those who did answered it to a very high standard, despite the question being perhaps a little more exacting than similar type of abbreviation questions that has appeared in Port Agency examinations over the past years. Candidates could have enhanced their marks by introducing more examples.

QUESTION SIX - VESSEL OWNERS - NON PAYMENT

Generally well answered again, with the better answers taking a firm but fair approach with the shipowner.

Unfortunately the second part of the question that concerned the crew members was sometimes forgotten about, and at best was often treated as an afterthought.

QUESTION SEVEN – P & I COVER FOR AGENCY WORK

This question appeared in a similar guise in the 2006 examination. It is concerning that for two years running it has elicited generally poor marks. There is a specific lack of knowledge amongst Ships Agents why they require P and I cover, few answers could cover the requirement and give actual examples such as “ Acts errors and omissions”. A worrying number of candidates displayed no knowledge whatsoever on the subject and simply discussed the need for the *Shipowner* to have P and I cover, for collision damage.

QUESTION EIGHT – TENDER FOR AGENCY SERVICES

The formal tender for agency service was on the whole well handled
The better candidates that understood the concept of added value services fared well with this question and gave an excellent menu of additional services that compliments the core Ships agency services.

Format in general was quite impressive with many candidates taking care to produce a “Presentation” style answer.

However a number of candidates completely ignored the fundamental aspect of the question which was to align any answer to the Grain market.