WORKSHEET 1.4

Where the System Ends

Subchapter 1.4 · case in the book: Phuket

If a guest fell ill tonight after eating somewhere on your property, would your food safety system cover the place where they ate, and who decided whether it would?

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
Day 1: Correct the website to state the certificate's actual scope		
Week 1: Walk the property; list every point of service with operator, consumer and shared resources		
Week 2–3: Place each point in a category with a reason; rewrite the scope statement		
Month 1–6: Bring new outlets into the system, highest hazard first		
Month 6: Extension audit by the certification body		
Ongoing: No new outlet or format opens before scope decision		

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
"You can certify only the outlets that are ready and add the rest later."	Partly. The organisation decides which products and services the system covers, but the scope must include every activity that can influence the safety of those end products. Extending it later requires a decision; it does not happen by itself.	
"Concessions are automatically outside the scope."	No. An independent concessionaire's own food may be outside. What the hotel supplies to it, shares with it or sells under its own name is not automatically excluded.	
"Our certificate covers the hotel."	No. It covers the scope stated on it. A claim broader than the scope is the organisation's claim, not the certification body's.	
"The scope does not need to be written down."	No. The scope must be available and maintained as documented information.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
“A narrower scope only means a smaller audit.”	No. It also means a smaller system. Everything outside it is ungoverned unless controlled by other means.	
“The staff canteen is irrelevant because staff are not customers.”	No. The organisation may decide whether the canteen is an end product in scope, but a canteen that feeds food handlers can influence the safety of food served to guests.	
“Packaged minibar products carry no food safety responsibility.”	No. The hazards are low, but storage, rotation and date control remain the hotel’s. Whether they are in scope is a decision to take, not to assume.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Letting the certification project set the scope		
Writing a scope that names only kitchens		
Leaving concessions out without controlling interfaces		
Ignoring the staff canteen		
Forgetting formats organised outside the kitchen		
Using the certificate in marketing beyond its scope		
Never reviewing the scope after certification		

Operative synthesis

- **The scope is small enough to be checked by an owner in an hour, and important enough to be checked at every review.**
- **The third question is the simplest and, in practice, the most revealing. In many hotels the scope statement has not been read aloud at a management meeting since the day the certificate arrived, and reading it produces the same moment of surprise that the travel manager’s request produced at the Andaman Cove, only without the lawyers. It costs nothing to create that moment deliberately, once a year, at the owner’s table. It costs a great deal to have it created by a client, an inspector or a journalist, on a day of their choosing.**
- **Is there a current map of every point where food is produced, held or served? (Food safety team leader): A dated list with operators, consumers and shared resources**
- **Is every point placed in one of the four categories, with a reason? (Food safety team, approved by top management): A decision table with one-sentence reasons**
- **Does the scope statement name products and services, processes and sites? (Food safety team leader): The documented scope**
- **Do public claims match the scope? (General manager and director of sales): Website, tenders and brochures checked against the certificate**
- **Did the last new outlet pass through a scope decision before opening? (General manager): A dated scope update preceding the opening**

- **Where can a guest eat on this property that our system does not cover?: A short list, each item with a reason and the interfaces we control**
- **What did we open, close or hand to someone else since the last review?: A list matched by scope updates**
- **What does our certificate actually say?: The scope statement, read aloud, and nobody surprised by it**

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 1.4. 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.