

Examiner's Report

Qualifications Framework

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

Table One

Candidates predominantly succeeded in identifying the relevant legislation and the uses of equipment. However, some struggled with the various types of Beer Measuring Instruments, their operation, and permissible errors. It was apparent which candidates had practical experience inspecting licensed premises and had conducted sampling. Those with such experience provided stronger responses and were adept at proposing suitable alternatives when questioned about potential issues. Conversely, those lacking practical experience exhibited less confidence and were more inclined to issue notices rather than offering practical solutions and business support. Measures of length questions were generally well answered, showcasing good knowledge across the board.

Table Two

Candidates demonstrated strong proficiency in identifying most instruments on the table, effectively explaining the associated testing and tolerances, and confidently deciding on actions in cases of non-compliance across Bulk Fuel Tanker Measuring Systems, Water Meters, and Liquid Fuel Measuring Instruments. However, some candidates struggled to identify cubic measures, were unclear about their trade applications, and failed to recall relevant regulations.

A number of candidates were uncertain about the regulations governing certain working standards or testing equipment, and how these could be calibrated in a lab environment. We encourage candidates to gain practical experience in calibration labs and in inspecting and testing instruments during their training, as this significantly enhances their confidence and performance during the exam.

Table Three

The overall knowledge level for this round of exams was consistent with candidates able to recite how to evaluate a Non-Automatic Weighing Instrument, many struggled to explain certain tests such as repeatability, hysteresis, and eccentricity, indicating a lack of deep understanding of these principles. Candidates continued to show less familiarity with testing weighbridges, identifying and explaining load cell operations, and understanding the statutory requirements for public weighbridges. It is essential for candidates to proactively demonstrate their ability to identify relevant legislation, obligations, powers, offences, defences, and regulatory options. They should also reference other sources of guidance for assessing and testing equipment beyond the legislation.

Furthermore, candidates should be prepared to discuss scenarios where a Non-Automatic Weighing Instrument is used for a non-regulation 3 application, but where other provisions within the Weights and Measures Act 1985, such as false or unjust equipment, might be relevant.

Table Four

The overall performance of the candidates was commendable. Many demonstrated the ability to recall specific legislation, OIML reference numbers, and describe test methodologies. Those with practical experience were notably more adept at addressing real-world scenarios, offering balanced and realistic solutions while referencing their powers as needed. In contrast, weaker candidates exhibited a lack of awareness regarding their powers or were unable to recall legislation. When faced with decisions, some candidates showed a tendency to doubt their judgment, opting to verify their decisions later. Although this approach may seem prudent, it undermines their authority when advising businesses in real-time. The highest scoring candidates stood out by confidently justifying their decisions, showing a clear understanding of Primary Authority and its practical application, and employing various strategies to tackle problems.