WORKSHEET 1.2

# The Context of a Kitchen

*Subchapter 1.2 · case in the book: Mombasa*

If your kitchen were moved, unchanged, to a city with ten degrees more heat and half the reliability of power and water, which of your controls would still hold, and who in your organisation has asked?

This worksheet turns the tools of the subchapter into a form you can fill in. The texts come from the book; the empty columns are for your own property. Adapt it before use: an unadapted checklist is exactly what the book warns against.

## Practical application: what to do in your property

| Step (from the book) | Done? | What we found / owner |
|---|---|---|
| Week 1: Working session: list conditions, apply the relevance test | | |
| Week 1: Record the decision on climate change and its reasons | | |
| Week 2–4: Connect each issue to a destination and an owner | | |
| Week 2: Move fish receiving to early morning; set acceptance limit; ice as supplier condition | | |
| Month 2–4: Replace condensers; install automatic transfer switch | | |
| Every review: Context as a standing item of management review | | |

These steps are the book's method, not requirements of ISO 22000. Evidence can take whatever form suits the property; a separate document is needed only where an applicable requirement, or the property's own system, makes it necessary.

## Verification Pact: what is believed, tested against the standard

| What is commonly believed | What actually holds | Our position |
|---|---|---|
| "The context analysis must be a SWOT or PESTLE." | No. The standard requires issues to be determined; it prescribes no method. Any method that produces a sound determination is acceptable. | |
| "Since 2024 every food safety system must treat climate change as a risk." | No. The amendment requires the organisation to determine whether climate change is a relevant issue. The decision is required; its outcome is not prescribed. | |
| "Climate change must now be included in the hazard analysis." | No. The amendment acts on clauses 4.1 and 4.2. If climate is relevant, its effects reach the hazard analysis through the system, not by direct insertion. | |

| What is commonly believed | What actually holds | Our position |
|---|---|---|
| “Food fraud and food defence are requirements of ISO 22000:2018.” | No. They appear among the examples of issues in a note to clause 4.1. A note is guidance. Subchapter 2.12 returns to them. | |
| “The context analysis is done once, at certification.” | No. Information about the issues must be identified, reviewed and updated. | |
| “Our group’s standards already cover our context.” | Not necessarily. The requirement applies to the organisation and its own conditions. Group standards are an input; the determination is local. | |
| “Context is a management exercise with no effect on the kitchen.” | No. Context informs scope, risks and opportunities, infrastructure, prerequisite programmes, emergency preparedness and hazard analysis. | |

## Common mistakes: a self-check

| Mistake (from the book) | Present here? | Action / owner |
|---|---|---|
| Describing the market instead of the conditions that affect food | | |
| Adopting group context without local determination | | |
| Treating permanent conditions as normality | | |
| Handling recurring disruptions as exceptions | | |
| Mentioning climate without taking a decision | | |
| Leaving context out of the capital plan | | |
| Explaining deviations instead of correcting them | | |

## Operative synthesis

- **For an owner who wants to know whether the hotel has determined its context or only described it, four checks and one question are enough.**
- **The fifth line is the one that decides. A context that has never changed anything has not been determined, however long the document is.**
- **Are the permanent conditions named, and designed for? (General manager and chief engineer): Equipment rated for site conditions; specifications that cite them**
- **Are the recurring disruptions planned for? (Food safety team leader): Emergency arrangements tested against the real frequency of events**
- **Has a decision on climate change been taken and recorded? (Top management): A dated paragraph with reasons and consequences**
- **Does every relevant issue have a destination? (Food safety team leader): A connection map from issue to clause, owner and action**
- **When did the context last change something? (Owner, at management review): A date and an example**

## Action plan for our property

| Action | Owner | Due | How we will know it worked |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 6a «The Helm», subchapter 1.2. Edizioni Effedore, 2026. Clause references are paraphrased; this sheet does not reproduce the text of ISO 22000. It is not legal advice: food law is that of the place where the property operates.