

Examiner's report

Qualifications Framework

Stage 2: Legal Metrology Practical Exam

Practical Examiner's Report October 2024

General

13 candidates sat the practical exam. There were 5 fails making a pass rate of 62%. One candidate scored a very impressive 82% however the average of the marks was lower than the May 2024 sitting at 51%. It was clear which candidates had attended a practical and oral preparation course.

All candidates received a NAWI question, but this time some got it in the form of a weighbridge verification scenario that included a partially completed table of results with the invitation to complete it. One candidate did so. The rest preferred to show their results on the opposite page, but that was not what was asked. The same one candidate was the only one to work out the errors correctly demonstrating that sticking to the method indicated in the table was the best course of action.

Topics:

One question asked candidates to describe how they would test to maximum load. Most just said they would use the tractor unit and trailer with no further explanation. But they should have gone further and described how it would be done so marks were lost.

Another question asked what information would be gathered prior to the verification. One candidate had clearly had experience of this and did very well to say they would check the forecast because adverse weather could affect the results.

Some candidates got the bulk fuel verification scenario. The following was noted during marking:

- Only 1 candidate said they would need the calibration certificate for the meter
- Table of results very poorly completed by several candidates – only one candidate got it correct.
- Using notified or authorised body instead of approved body
- Using the crown stamp as a conformity assessment mark
- Description of hose dilation poor in many cases. Need a bit more information when asked to describe
- For sealing, almost no one gave the specific section of the TEC despite having it in front of them

The practical composite measure question proved tricky for a couple of candidates (although one achieved 24 out of 25). The following was noted during marking:

- Results not clearly presented
- MPEs incorrect for nominal length
- Understanding of the purpose of the hook was not answered well
- Comparison against Essential Requirements not well presented
- ID of the standard regularly missed

The comparator question required a methodology to be stated. This was missed by some candidates. The V20 formula was not clearly neatly presented in the pipette question, and it was surprising how many candidates measured the water temperature at exactly 20°C. Practice and preparation are essential, but memorising stock answers can be counterproductive.