



# EXAMINER'S REPORT NOVEMBER 2024

## PORT AGENCY

The questions were selected from within the port agency syllabus. Questions were set on laytime, operational issues, relevant abbreviations, ships certificates, ship ownership, bills of lading, marketing and cargoes.

### **Question one- Change of Ownership**

Generally, this question was well handled, and most students were very comfortable in discussing the major companies that a port agent interfaces with in terms of the change of a ships ownership. Most students were able to highlight the roles of buying and selling owners, port authorities, class surveyor, flag state and brokers who will all play a role in the sale of a ship.

### **Question Two: Abbreviations**

Most students were able to answer the question on DNV and IMO. However, students struggled to identify the requirements of the port agent in terms of cover from a PI club and only recognise the requirements of the shipowner in terms of PI cover. Also, LAT was a challenge for many of the students.

### **Question Three – Bills of Lading**

This was a multi part question. The students were expected to discuss the role of bills of lading in international trade, offer some options in terms of the damaged cargo and handle the issue relating to the delayed sailing and associated costs. Although students generally produced positive answers to this question, very few were able to provide the in-depth type of answer that covered all three aspects required.

#### **Question Four - Marketing**

This question was well answered, students were able to give good historical and operational details of the company, and thereafter some relevant added value services aligned to the grain trades. Some students lost a mark due to poor format, but overall, this was a well-handled question. Students did struggle to influence the examiner to select their company as the potential port agent.

#### **Question Five- Certificates**

The question on certificates was a “banker” question for nearly all the students who attempted this question. This was very well handled by the students. From an examiners perspective this question perhaps needs to be re constructed to make it slightly more challenging. The students who attempted this question achieved very high marks.

#### **Question Six – Laytime Question**

The question on laytime was very well handled, previously only a low percentage of students achieved a full mark for this question, however in the November session a much-improved number of students achieved full marks which was a very promising sign.

#### **Question Seven- Disbursements**

This question, although relatively straightforward created several difficulties for students. Many students overlooked the need to create four disbursements and thus lost marks on format. Many students then struggled to identify and codify the correct costs to the correct disbursements, and many students failed to identify which disbursement was for which party. Thus, a relatively straightforward questions became far more challenging than it should have been.

#### **Question Eight – Trades**

The majority of students chose grain trades, and there were a number of errors. Students tended to use “large cities” as export points Buenos Aires and Rio De Janeiro as examples, when in fact the more appropriate ports would be Rosario and Paranagua. Also, many students selected cape size bulk carriers as the main vessel type which is not the case as these cargoes are primarily handled by handysized – panamax tonnage.

The few students who chose LNG were able to give strong answers.