

Qualifications Framework Examiner's Report

Qualifications Framework

Stage 2: Food Standards Written Examiner's Report May 2026

General

The range of marks for the paper was between 35 and 68, with 2 candidates scoring above 60 and the remaining candidates scoring between 40 – 60.

Section A

Q1 was answered by 4 candidates and was answered well with candidates understanding the HACCP and being able to identify CCPs in relation to allergen control. One answer scored insufficiently, due to the failure to note that the question asked for CCPs to be identified in relation to allergen control in the restaurant setting and instead identified microbiological and other physical hazards.

Q2 was answered by all candidates and most answered proficiently. One answer scored insufficiently on the question due to not reading part b of the question correctly, therefore failing to provide any additional information that the use of a health claim would trigger. This question called for students to identify additional information statements which are triggered by the inclusion of a health claim such as a statement indicating the importance of a varied and balanced diet and a healthy lifestyle and nutrition labelling.

Q3 was answered by only 2 candidates, who answered the question moderately. Article 7 of assimilated regulation 1169/2011 is a key provision of the Regulation. The explicit misleading practices referred to in Article 7 were not well identified. The question required recall of the Article 7 particulars from 1169/2011.

Q4 was answered moderately by 2 candidates. Where marks were lost related to identifying the requirements correctly for information provision for distance sales.

Q5 was answered by only 1 candidate which was unsurprising as contaminants are a more niche provision within food standards. The question was adequately answered by this candidate. It required the recall of contaminants from the annex to 1881/2006.

Q6.. was answered by all candidates taking the paper and required explanations of definitions from 178/2002. It was answered to a generally high standard.

Section B

Q7 was also answered by all candidates and to a generally high standard. Where marks were lost in question 7, these related to the differing responsibilities of retailer and manufacturer which needed to be identified in order to answer the question. Regulation 8 is a fundamental provision of assimilated EU Regulation 1169/2011 that candidates need to ensure they are aware of.

Q8 No candidates answered question 8 in relation to allergens and precautionary allergens statements. Precautionary statements are linked to the provision of safe food under Assimilated EU regulation 178/2002 and are considered in the Food standards Scoring system in the Food Law Code of Practice so it was surprising that no candidate attempted this question. It required the recall and identification of best practice guidance from the FSA in relation to precautionary statements and recall of the legal provision in relation to safe foods and allergens information.

Q9 was answered by three candidates to a reasonable standard. Candidates were proficient on the information to be included in a notice but less aware of some of the advantages and limitations of using an improvement notice. Further guidance around these points can be found in the Food Law Practice Guidance section 6.4 [Food Law Practice Guidance England - 25-6-26.pdf](#)

Q10 related to sampling and was answered by two candidates. The question asked how to sample two different products and both parts of the question needed to be answered. The second part of the question concerned how to deal with non-compliances found following analysis of a formal sample.

A sampling question could reasonably be expected to appear on a food standards exam paper and when asked about the sampling process candidates must cover the approach to taking the sample and then explain fully how the sample is taken and continuity of evidence preserved. Marks were lost where candidates did not provide an explanation around the differing sampling regimes needed for both products.

Where marks are lost in many cases are due to candidates not reading and considering the question properly and then not answering it fully. It is evident in some cases that candidates answer what they want to be asked rather than what the question actually asks for. When considering answers candidates should take the time to consider what the question is asking and answer appropriately.