

Case Study: Aqua

Examiners' Observations

1. A case study generally provides a vast amount of information. The CA Sri Lanka case study is designed to provide information at two stages. Based on the advanced information provided during stage one, the candidates may get ready for different possible scenarios that the given case study could be elaborated further through impact information during stage two, and the probable questions that could be raised at the examination. This preparation itself is a part of the training expected by the case study examination. However, it is important to be selective in answering the exact questions raised at the examination.
2. It was observed that most of the candidates had reproduced a pre-prepared answer. It was also observed that some candidates had reproduced the material provided in the advanced information (such as lengthy descriptions about the company), rather than answering the particular questions raised at the examination. The candidates should be mindful that each case study is a new experience and there are no standard answers across different case studies.
3. The case study in relation to Aqua Company had raised three distinct questions and also expected three different answers. Some candidates had failed to formulate three answers for the three questions given. They had rather presented everything within a single answer.
4. The main concentration of the Aqua Case Study had not been about the two investment projects that the company had already decided to implement. The management of the company was seeking the services of a professional advisor to get his/her help to resolve the managerial concerns currently confronted by the company. The major managerial concerns had been presented both in the advanced information and in the impact information. The candidates were supposed to identify them and provide a professional opinion with justifications.

Most of the candidates had failed to identify the current managerial concerns properly and to provide a professional opinion for them.

5. The majority of the candidates had provided a satisfactory answer for question 2 which was about the leadership and management styles of the two managing directors. Unfortunately, some candidates had failed to provide a separate answer for this question.
6. The candidates in general had failed to provide satisfactory answer for question 3. Under this question the candidates were expected to formulate personal advices for the Managing Director and the Chairperson of the company. The majority of the candidates had again presented a part of the answer provided for the question 1 for this question as well. Answer for the question 1, would finally go to the board of directors of the company through the chairperson. It is a part of formal communication. Under question 3, candidates were supposed to provide a personal advice. Therefore, it was expected to present some important information that would be difficult to take up under the formal means of communication, i.e. personal advices.
7. A common mistake made by the majority of candidates was spending considerable time and effort on analyzing the two projects in details. In fact, it was mentioned under the first question that the candidates were not expected to further investigate the feasibility of the projects and the procedural aspects to be followed in listing a company.
8. In general, it is always advisable to read and understand the questions well in advance and take time to plan and structure the answers, rather than providing pre-planned answers.