

Qualifications Framework Examiner's Report

Qualifications Framework

Stage 2: Weights and Measures Oral Examiners Report May 2026

Station 1

The candidates were generally well informed about capacity serving measures, spirit measures, and length and composite measures. Responses regarding beer meters varied, particularly in relation to the scenarios presented to candidates concerning the actions they would take if inaccurate beer measures were identified on the day before a major festival was due to open.

Some candidates were able to propose well-considered and appropriate resolutions, outlining a range of viable options, whereas others indicated they would close the event without offering alternative solutions.

Greater exposure to the relevant equipment and increased experience in undertaking inspections would have been beneficial for many of the candidates. Higher-scoring candidates made clear reference to relevant legislation and guidance, including OIML, WELMEC and applicable standards. These candidates demonstrated confidence in their responses and maintained good eye contact, communicating as though they were addressing a business.

Station 2

Generally, candidates were able to correctly identify water meters, tanker measuring systems and cubic measures, and explain how these instruments operate in trade. Candidates demonstrated an understanding of how to test the instruments and knew which tolerances to apply. They were also able to explain conformity markings confidently and quote the correct legislation and OIML recommendations.

However, few candidates were able to identify the 1985 Order for fuel delivery documents. Some candidates were non-committal when identifying specific non-compliances in the scenarios and avoided deciding what action they would take. We encourage candidates to gain more practical experience in testing instruments and to shadow inspectors during training, to help build confidence.

Station 3

Candidates showed adequate knowledge of the Non-Automatic Weighing Instruments Regulations 2016 (NAWIs), including identification, instrument classes, uses, assessment, and testing. However, hesitation was observed in several candidates about whether equipment was in scope of the "medical weighing" provisions within the Regulations or not.

Higher-scoring candidates referred to relevant legislation and guidance such as OIML, WELMEC, Standards, and OPSS, so candidates should actively reference these when responding. It was clear which candidates had more practical experience of testing NAWIs, weighbridges, including how and when substitution could be used. Similarly correct identification of relevant paperwork for a particular piece of equipment was variable – which is a necessary skill for effective assessment of a NAWI.

Understanding about the framework for approved manufacturers/approved verifiers could be improved, along with who can requalify a NAWI. There was some uncertainty about whether a Local Authority Weights and Measures department can requalify instruments.

Station 4

Whilst overall candidates did well those with practical knowledge and experience stood out as it allowed them to talk confidently about scenario questions. Stronger candidates made clear justified decisions, were able to refer to OIML documents as well as product specific and Food Information Regulations when talking about PGR.

Lack of confidence about powers and when to use them was disappointing in a small number of candidates. Appreciating nerves, good communication and eye contact is also expected as when talking to businesses talking confidently rather than seeking reassurance is needed.