

## Homework May 2018

### Name

Atroshkina  
Dzamashvili

Cerny

Dreher

Fialka

Hajdu

Jelinek

MacDonald

Polosina

Sibirsky

Ahmed  
Corsini  
Sitta

Stasakova

Urbankova

Vankova

Vostrej

Comments	Mark
Shale model is good. Answers to questions all correct and well argued	8
Models were fine and analysis was ok. Didn't answer question 6 very well, as didn't make a choice when asked to do so, but overall adequate responses	7
Forgot to change the discount rate in the conventional model and there was some misunderstanding over question 6. Would like him to look at question 6 again and answer it appropriately. Overall, did demonstrate a reasonable understanding though, so prepared to give a low pass.	6
Good understanding of the models and interesting answers on the comparison of the two fields.	8
Good analysis and the models appear to be fine. I would have preferred a more numerical answer to question 4, but overall very satisfactory	7
Again all the analysis and conclusions are fine. However, the answers are almost exactly the same as for the Fialka homework (almost word for word). Not sure what to say about that. Has there been some blatant copying or did they work together? If the latter then fine, as long as they both understand the analysis. Would be better if the answers were not exactly the same though.	7
Something went wrong with the shale model. Difficult to pass, because sensitivities also went wrong. Not sure how much of the output was wrong because of initial model problems. I will send through the shale model again and suggest that another attempt is made. If in doubt consult with other students (e.g. Atroshkina) who got the answers correct.	4
Good answers and I understand how the logic of the calculations he did in some of the questions due to the phraseology of the question. Clearly understood the maths, though, and answered Q6 very well	10
Had a big problem with the conventional model in Q1. Please see correct model and understand differences. Other answers were fine, allowing for the initial mistake, so I can award a pass as the understanding is there.	6
I cannot pass this as there were too many mistakes and misunderstanding of the question. I would be happy to look at another attempt if the student wishes to make one.	3
All answers correct and good analysis	10
All answers correct and good analysis	10
Enough correct answers and understanding for a pass, but got the wrong answer for the shale model because did not have the export % at 75%. Should try to rerun her answers with that change and will get the correct results.	6
As above - problem with shale model skewed the rest of the answers. Please rerun using 75% oil export in revenue page. Just enough understanding for a pass, but please do rerun the shale model for understanding	5

As above - problem with shale model skewed the rest of the answers. Please rerun using 75% oil export in revenue page. Just enough understanding for a pass, but please do rerun the shale model for understanding 5

Has a problem with breakeven calculations but otherwise demonstrated adequate understanding for a pass 7

Serious problems here. Didn't send the models so I'm not sure why. Outcomes from both models were wrong, as were breakeven calculations. I think he needs to look at the models which I will send you and also discuss the outcomes with some of the students who got the calculations correct. Needs to re-submit if he wants a pass 3

Marking            10 high  
                          1 low  
6 or more Pass

5 or below Fail