

## Examiner's Report

### Qualifications Framework

#### Stage 2: Unit 4 Food Standards Oral Examiner Report November 2025

The Food Oral exam is a test of the candidate's knowledge of the full range of food legislation, a chance for the candidate to demonstrate their practical experience, the candidate's response in situations they may encounter when out on inspection, the candidate's knowledge of powers and their rationale in decision making.

Marks for the November 2025 Oral exam ranged from 31 to 75 and there were 24 candidates. 5 of these candidates fell below the 40 per cent pass mark. 6 candidates scored above 60 with the remainder falling between 40 per cent and 60 per cent.

Candidates that fell below the pass mark failed to identify certain pieces of key legislation such as that relating specifically to sampling and were unable to identify key offences which may occur within the situational context. There was little demonstration of knowledge in the interaction of the key pieces of legislation.

As with previous oral examinations candidates are asked specific questions and should focus on answering the question and while they should be thorough in response also be succinct. The exam is 20 minutes long and elaboration into areas that have not been questioned may prevent demonstration of knowledge elsewhere.

When asked about actions to be taken during non-compliance the best answers were concise, to the point and showed a clear determination in dealing with a situation. The weaker answers were not concise and definite and would mention various enforcement options without committing to one. Practical experience of dealing with non-compliance would be invaluable here.

There was a safety issue resulting from businesses failure to provide food information in each oral examination, yet several candidates did not mention Assimilated EU Regulation 178/2002 in the entirety of their oral examination.

The best responses had the candidates specifically identify where key provisions and offences were found and were able to show the understanding of the links between legislation. For example, weaker candidates identified an offence of not providing allergen information on a prepacked product. Stronger candidates would identify the failure to provide allergen information and that this information needs to be provided in accordance with assimilated EU Regulation 1169/2011 and failure to provide may be an offence under the Food Information Regulations 2014 and may also render the food unsafe under assimilated EU Regulation 178/2002.

Knowledge was generally consistent in relation to mandatory particulars on prepacked foods. Candidates generally had an overview of nutrition and health claims but failed on the more specific provisions of the legislation, such as additional information required when using a health claim.

Sampling did show a lack of experience of candidates in a range of sampling. Some candidates weren't definitive about how they would sample a product and in what circumstances a 3-part sample would be appropriate/inappropriate. While it is understood that in many cases consultation with the Public Analyst is possible, this may not always be the case when out in the field and candidates should have a general idea of how to sample a range of products for various requirements in the absence of the guidance of their public analyst.