WORKSHEET 2.14

Verification: Proving the Plan Works

Subchapter 2.14 · case in the book: Kuala Lumpur

If every log in your kitchen is complete, signed and within limits, what do you actually know, and who, other than the person who wrote it, has checked that the plan is working?

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: Discard cooked rice; stop evening cooking; cook fresh		
Week 1: Logger trial of the real cooling process		
Week 2–3: Batch size, trays, reserved blast chiller slots		
Week 3: Revalidate cooling with three logged batches		
Week 4: Verification plan approved; hygiene officer reporting line		
Quarterly: Analysis of all verification results; summary to 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
"Complete, signed logs prove the plan works."	No. Verification must confirm that controls are implemented and effective, and that hazard levels are acceptable.	
"The chef can verify his own kitchen's logs."	Not the logs he keeps himself. Verification may not be done by the person responsible for monitoring the same activities. A chef who does not do the monitoring is not barred by the clause, but his distance from the kitchen's own account should be weighed.	
"The standard sets how many laboratory tests a hotel must do."	No. The organisation plans methods and frequency; testing is one method among several.	
"A bad sample only concerns the portion that was tested."	No. Affected lots are handled as potentially unsafe, and corrective action is applied.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
“Verification results are kept for the auditor.”	No. They are analysed by the food safety team and reported to top management as an input to review.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Verifying that logs are complete, not that controls work		
The chef signs off his own kitchen		
Praising logs without deviations		
Letting the laboratory choose what to test		
Filing results without a reader or a decision		
Closing complaints against the monitoring log		

Operative synthesis

- **Is there a verification plan derived from the hazard analysis? (Team leader): Plan with purpose, method, frequency, owner**
- **Is every verification activity done by someone other than the monitor? (Team leader): Assignments and reporting lines**
- **Do laboratory samples test the riskiest processes? (Team leader): Sampling plan linked to hazard analysis**
- **Are invariant records checked for plausibility? (Hygiene officer): Weekly comparisons**
- **Are verification results analysed together and reported upward? (General manager): Quarterly summaries; review minutes**
- **What did verification find last quarter that monitoring missed?: A named finding, and what was changed**
- **Who verifies the kitchen, and to whom do they report?: Someone outside the kitchen line, reporting to the GM**
- **Which of our processes has never been tested at the result?: A short list, with a date for each**

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 2.14. 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.