WORKSHEET 2.15

Updating the System, and the Helm and the Lens

Subchapter 2.15 · case in the book: San Sebastián

Your food safety plan was correct on the day it was approved. How would you know, today, which parts of it no longer describe the hotel you are running?

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: Suspend delivery; begin fermentation hazard analysis		
Week 2–3: Delivery flow, packaging, labels, time limit		
Month 1–2: Fermentation controls validated with laboratory		
Month 2: Pantry unit replaced; south-wind rule		
Month 2: Sweep method, sources and owners approved		
Each review: Register of updates reported		

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
"An annual signature on the plan's cover keeps it up to date."	No. The team evaluates whether the hazard analysis, the plan and the PRPs need review, based on defined inputs.	
"If we plan changes, we never need to update afterwards."	No. Planning changes and updating the system are separate requirements; both apply.	
"Updating means rewriting the whole plan every year."	No. The standard asks for updating as necessary, based on evidence; not for rewriting.	
"Climate change is an environmental topic, not a food safety one."	No. Since the 2024 amendment, the organisation determines whether it is relevant to its food safety context.	
"Updates are the food safety team's business."	No. Top management must ensure the system is continually updated, and updates are reported to management review.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Re-dating the plan instead of updating it		
Relying on change control alone		
Looking for changes only in the kitchen		
Ignoring gradual change		
Treating climate as a separate subject		
Not reporting updates to management		

Operative synthesis

- **When did the team last compare the plan with the building, menu and channels? (Team leader): Record of the last sweep**
- **Does the sweep reach sales, engineering and purchasing? (General manager): Source reports by owner**
- **Were the findings of the last sweep taken through hazard analysis and validation? (Team leader): Updated plan; validation records**
- **Has climate been assessed as a relevant issue with practical consequences? (Team leader): Context record; equipment checks**
- **Are updates reported to the management review? (General manager): Review minutes**
- **What did the last sweep find that change control missed?: Named findings, each updated**
- **Which of our sales channels does the plan not yet cover?: None, or a date for each**
- **What in the plan was written for a hotel we no longer are?: An honest answer, and a date for the update**

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 2.15. 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.