Overall Comments

The quality of the candidates' answers was of an extremely high standard this year. However candidates did struggle with multi part questions, and also did not use many working examples of present day port practice which could have been used to enhance answers.

Question One

A question that was answered to a very high standard. Most candidates were comfortable with the concept of the Deep Sea container terminal and could discuss in detail on the equipment which would expect to be found at such a terminal. This would include:

Post Panamax gantry cranes

Straddle carriers

Reach stackers

Warehousing

Vehicle Entry/Departure control gates

Forklift trucks

Container handling trucks

Mafi trailers

Question Two

This question was really looking for a three part answer to cover the issues of the developing security protocols which have come into place since the terrorist attacks of 9/11.

The candidates who answered this question well, covered all three developments:- ISPS, CSI and CTPAT.

Unfortunately there were a number of candidates who only focused on the ISPS protocol which is perhaps the highest profile development.

Question Three

This was in effect a two part question which was generally well handled by the candidates.

The first point was a slightly theoretical review of the "Four P's" which candidates did well to relate to the requirements of a conventional cargo port.

However, what was less well handled was the requirement to discuss in more technical terms the actual facilities which the port would offer to clients.

This aspect was generally poorly handled, and thus the answers tended to be rather more theoretical than practical.

Question Four

Generally this answer was handled rather well.

The successful candidates answered in depth on the various techniques which the Port Authority would employ to control debt. Examples of this would be requiring pre funding for new business, using credit reference companies to check new customer viability, limiting credit terms to existing and long term customers, strict review of debts.

However, this was then balanced by the introduction on a more balanced financial/commercial stance whereby the candidate introduced customer relationships into the answer, and sought to find a middle ground where existing long term customers of the port were treated in a beneficial manner, although at all times keeping a close eye on the debt position.

Question Five

This was not a particularly popular question. The few candidates who did attempt it, showed a reasonable amount of working knowledge and could apply a reasonably objective amount of analysis of the changes in port ownerships.

However, most answers tended to be somewhat brief and failed to develop the theme of whether or not the change in ownership was successful or not.

Few candidates were able to bring into their answer working examples of Port Authorities who had undertaken change in ownership.

Question Six

ISGOTT - Few candidates attempted this but generally it was well handled by those who did attempt it.

MIDAS Port – Well handled, although very few examples were given by candidates.

AGV – Candidates were very comfortable with this question.

LCL – Well handled, although this should have been a banker question, very few candidates supplied any depth on the container trade.

SWL – Candidates handled this question well.

UNCLOS - Few candidates attempted this question, and it rather looked like many were unaware of the UN role.

ITF – Candidates comments were somewhat brief on ITF issues, and did not discuss the strength of the union particularly in Australian ports.

Question Seven

This question was not particularly popular with candidates, as it required very specific information.

The candidates who did tackle this question tended to struggle as they were unable to be more specific on the HSE issues within the grain terminal.

Some good use of HASAWA and Dock regulations, however their use was general rather than specific.

Question Eight

This question was reasonably well answered.

Most candidates could provide information on the particular port areas which required to be reviewed.

However, what was slightly disappointing was that fewer candidates could actually provide examples of the ratios which define the specific areas of port productivity.