**Overall Comments**

There were many low marks indicating poor preparation and lack of basic shipping knowledge. Some Candidates showed little evidence of reading trade press or having much shipping knowledge beyond that required for their immediate work.

The use of the maps provided was generally poor with ports/ countries unlabelled or not named at all – practice is needed. Candidates often failed to answer the question posed and provided information not relevant. Poor spelling was not marked down but key words such as “Principal” – as in key person / Owner - should be learnt. It should be noted that ITF is not a crewing agency and that ISM and ISPS are not organisations that issue certificates.

The examiners are aware that there are differences in terminology and accounting practice and make due allowance when awarding marks.

**Question One – Crewing**

The first part was not answered well, many candidates did not read the question and launched into anything related to crewing and some concentrated on crew welfare etc. Some failed to include the STCW convention in their answer and a good answer would also have mentioned “White List” states. Some knowledge of requirements for certificates and medical fitness was also looked for in answers. It should be noted that use of a crewing agency does not relieve the manager/ operator of responsibility in case of errors or invalid certificates. The second part was better answered, but not many identified the potential financial consequences of a vessel being detained following such an oversight by a ship manager.

**Question Two – Registration & Classification**

It should be known that all trading ships must be registered under a national flag and while class is not a legal requirement, lack of class or choice of a low-reputation class society will limit the ability of a ship to trade. For Flag State roles such as matters of Ownership and the enforcement of National and International regulations should be included. For Class it is ensuring ships are constructed and maintained in accordance with the rules of the society. Many candidates were unduly involved with the processes involved and types of register – FOC etc, thereby missing the main question. The section about class was, however, generally answered well. The second part required knowledge of other agencies / bodies that carry out ship inspections such as Port State, Vetting and Terminals. This part was not well answered.
Question Three – Ship Management

There were some good answers with many candidates having sound knowledge of the organisation of a ship management company. Better scripts included reference to safety, quality, audit and budgeting and reporting. Marks were lost if the DPA was not identified. Marks were lost if no diagram of the Technical department was provided.

Question Four - ISM

The first part called for some knowledge of the background to the introduction of ISM and what it is that the code sought to correct/deal with. A good answer noted successes in reducing accidents and the number of sub-standard ships and managing companies and identified possible reasons as the creation of safety awareness and culture both in crew onboard and in shore management and the establishment of defined responsibility to the master and crew and to shore staff. It was also necessary to mention the Designated Person Ashore. Distinction papers also considered alternate views that there are still many sub-standard ships but these have moved to fringe registers and fringe class societies and that they are limiting trading to areas where control is less stringent.

Part 2 dealt with the practical process of obtaining the certificates and required knowledge of safety management systems, audits, DOC and SMC. It was well answered.

Question Five – Voyage Estimate

Generally well answered, it is necessary to take time to understand the question thoroughly before starting the answer. Candidates are required to show working and were marked down when this is not done.

Part one - cargo lift - most candidates worked out that the cargo was volume limited but even so some still deducted bunkers and constants without considering draft available.

Part two – bunkers – generally well answered, consideration of safe margin was required.

Part three – calculation – The best scripts used a well practiced template to ensure that all elements of the calculation were covered. Common mistakes/problems included; confusion of SHEX terms and charging for total bunkers lifted rather than estimated consumption. In general bunkers should be charged using FIFO prices. Candidates should avoid over-generous rounding up especially in addition to safety margin.

Question Six – Ship Types

Candidates had a chance to describe ships that they really knew about and some descriptions of an LNG carrier were excellent. Candidates should know that a Multipurpose ship is a recognised industry type, some obviously did not know this and offered descriptions of geared bulk carriers or even OBOs. This shows a lack of wider reading of the trade press.

Drawings of RoRo ships were generally poor, lacking description and key dimensions. Also by turning the page drawings could be landscape rather than portrait and a ruler used effectively.

The use of the blank maps provided was poor and easy marks were lost. Maps should be labelled to show salient points of interest and ports correctly positioned. Sections of the map can be expanded as necessary to show finer detail.
### Question Seven – Vessel Operations

Description of the mechanics of weather routing services were good but candidates often failed to note the advantages such as safety of crew, cargo, conservation of bunkers etc. Some candidates only covered CP dispute resolution. It is important to provide a full and balanced answer.

Poor use of maps with New York and Rotterdam often wrongly positioned. Few candidates displayed knowledge of meteorology, in particular ocean currents and prevailing winds.

### Question Eight – Costs & Accounting

The Question asked for a proforma budget estimate of DRC. A number of candidates did not provide a proforma but rather gave a description of fixed/voyage/DRC costs. Many candidates failed to mention how they would monitor costs.

A common mistake was mixing up voyage costs and daily running (or daily operating) costs. Often there was not enough detail shown in the proforma.