

# Examiner's report

**CTSI Professional Competency Framework** 

Stage 2: Unit 4 Product Safety Written Examiner's Report September 2022

## General

As this exam round was a retake round, the number of candidates was far fewer than during May. The highest mark was 44% and the lowest was 37% and 2 out of 3 candidates passed.

Generally, the standard was adequate and sometimes good, and all candidates produced handwriting that could be easily read during this round.

There are a couple of general comments before providing feedback against each specific questions. Firstly, where candidates answer multipart questions (for example (a) and (b)) it is essential that they include these references in their script to assist with the marking process. Also, care must be taken to ensure that the correct question numbers are referenced! Failure to do this risks the examiner awarding no marks for a good answer.

## Section A

Candidates were required to answer four out of six short answer questions which were written to reflect the large range of knowledge necessary to carry out product safety work. Questions carried ten marks each. Students generally addressed the question as it was phrased although occasionally the point was missed. Bullet points were used by a number of candidates, and this is perfectly acceptable.

#### Q1

This question was attempted by all candidates, but easy marks were often missed for the specific function of notices and the circumstances under which they should be used.

# Q2

This question was generally well answered by those who attempted it, but again marks were missed for not considering the process of design risk management and the use of standards when doing this.

## Q3

This question was well answered in bullet form by one candidate.

#### Q4

This question was attempted by multiple candidates and answers were generally good, but the terminology used was not correct. Simple, intermediate and complex PPE are terms which are no longer used, having been replaced by Categories I, II and III in UK law in 2018. Easy marks were missed for not listing those products which are exempted from the PPE regulation.

#### Q5

Unfortunately, this question was not well answered. Marks were awarded for the specific requirements which relate to battery operated toys, not a general discussion of the Toys (Safety) Regulations. Mention of conformity assessment would have been relevant in the specific context, however.

## Q6

This question was generally well answered, but there was some misunderstanding of the specific routes to conformity for machines and also the extended scope of the regulations.

## **Section B**

Candidates were required to choose two out of four longer questions in this section, each carrying thirty marks.

#### Ω7

This question had a lot of easy marks available and was generally well answered, although every candidate that attempted it missed the easy point that the question relates to the legal manufacturer in Great Britain of a product made by a third party in China.

It is also clear that conformity assessment is not adequately understood by a number of candidates, and all those who answered did not have sufficient focus on this process for soft toys.

#### **Q8**

This question on the New Legislative Framework was not attempted by any candidate.

#### 09

This question is about all of the products which may be supplied with a furnished let, not just upholstered furniture. The Furniture and Furnishings (Fire)(Safety) Regulations do apply to product which has previously been placed on the market, and General Product Safety Regulations also apply in this way to all products over and above the specific flammability requirements. Lots of very easy marks were missed as a result of this misunderstanding.

# Q10

This question focussed on the way in which the Cosmetic Products Regulation manages risk and didn't just require a recital of the regulatory elements that the candidate could recall. That said, there were some reasonable answers and candidates did manage to get the marks awarded for recall rather than analysis.