

Examiner's Report

Qualifications Framework

Stage 2: Unit 4 Weights and Measures Oral Examiner Report May 2025

General

Candidates demonstrated confidence in identifying Liquid Fuel Tankers and key components and were able to trace the flow of fuel through a dispenser. Good demonstration of using powers of entry, testing procedures and taking action that was proportionate to scenarios put to them.

Areas for further development include being able to identify cubic measures, understand what they are used for and be able to apply the relevant regulations. Understand what EEC markings are and the regulations that apply.

Know what tanker system components should be sealed and understand what the requirements are for printed tanker delivery tickets."

Most candidates were able to demonstrate good knowledge of the prescribed quantities for intoxicating liquor, powers of entry, testing procedures and what action to take which was proportionate to scenarios put to them. Some candidates struggled to accurately identify the correct legislation applicable to each of the instruments, particularly in relation to 'Crown stamped' equipment.

Some candidates struggled with the correct terminology, using 'optics', 'flasks', and 'pub kit' and failed to provide more detailed terminology when prompted.

It was evident that several of the candidates hadn't seen or tested a beer measuring instrument, with some failing to recognise that the instrument automatically dispensed a specified volume of liquid.

Candidates were generally able to identify equipment, describe its function well, the applicable laws and guidance documents. Higher scores were awarded to those better able to discuss scenarios and confidently explain practical application, indicating that their training extended beyond the classroom.

All candidates were able to describe the 'packers rules' clearly and talk about its application to a range of packages, often food products. Whilst most were either able to confidently answer correctly, or recognise they were unsure and respond accordingly, there were some wrong answers provided from candidates who were unsure but gave an opinion, with the caveat they would check specific regulations, are still able to demonstrate good knowledge.

All candidates demonstrated sufficient knowledge in relation to the Non-Automatic Weighing Instruments, Weighing Principles and weights area. In general, most were able to identify the various pieces of equipment, how to assess a NAWI, including necessary markings and what the different classes mean, with examples. Some had difficulty recalling the maximum permissible errors when asked.

Apart from a few candidates, it was noted that there was a lack of confidence in relation to weighbridges. This may be down to the lack of opportunity to gain practical experience of weighbridge testing. It was clear which candidates were more familiar with weighbridges and how to test them, particularly in relation to explaining load substitution. Not all candidates knew who is responsible for issuing a certificate of competence to operate a public weighbridge.

A couple of questions were posed around whether equipment was caught by the requirements of NAWI. This was to generate discussion and for the candidate to demonstrate their thought process when deciding the applicability [or not] of the relevant legislation to a particular situation or piece of equipment.

The candidates that referred to the legislation, guidance and other sources of information without prompting gained higher scores. Proactively demonstrate that you know the legislative framework, powers, offences/defences and regulatory options including notices and legal proceedings.