WORKSHEET 2.4

CCP or OPRP: The Choice That Decides Everything

Subchapter 2.4 · case in the book: Parma

How many critical control points does your kitchen have, and could the cook responsible for each one tell you, without looking, what to do with the food if the limit is missed?

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: Replace bath element; alarm to station and pass; download log daily		
Week 1–3: Re-run categorisation with station cooks; document reasoning		
Week 3: Withdraw 23 sheets; issue 3 CCP batch sheets and OPRP checks		
Week 4: Brief the brigade; batch-end signing; chef decides on held product		
Month 2: Second water bath; equipment logs for chillers and ovens		
Every quarter: Verify CCP records against equipment logs		

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
"Every significant hazard needs a CCP."	No. Control measures for significant hazards are categorised as OPRPs or CCPs by a systematic approach.	
"More CCPs make the plan safer."	No. The standard asks for the categorisation that fits the control measure; excess CCPs dilute monitoring.	
"OPRPs are less important than CCPs."	No. Both control significant hazards. The difference lies in the nature of the limit or criterion and the timeliness of monitoring.	
"The Codex decision tree is mandatory."	No. A systematic approach is required, documented. A decision tree is one possible method.	
"Action criteria must be measured with an instrument."	No. They must be measurable or observable, with instructions where monitoring is based on observation.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
“When a CCP limit is missed, correct the process and continue.”	No. The products concerned must be handled as potentially unsafe.	
“Handwashing is a CCP.”	Rarely appropriate. It is usually a prerequisite programme. It lacks a measurable limit and batch-specific monitoring.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Making every important control a CCP		
Having no CCPs at all		
Monitoring CCPs at the end of the shift		
Ignoring equipment logs		
Categorising without the cooks		
Correcting the process but serving the product		

Operative synthesis

- **The principle of this subchapter is that categorising control measures is a decision about where the kitchen’s attention will go, and that the most attention belongs where a failure is most likely to reach the guest unseen. A critical control point is not a badge of importance. It suits a control with a measurable limit, monitoring that can catch a failure before the batch leaves the station, and a correction that treats the product as potentially unsafe. Prerequisite programmes, operational prerequisite programmes and critical control points form a hierarchy of attention, not of importance.**
- **Clause 8.5.2.4 of ISO 22000:2018 requires each selected control measure to be categorised as an operational prerequisite programme or a critical control point by a systematic, documented approach that weighs the likelihood and severity of failure and the feasibility of limits, monitoring and timely correction. Clause 8.5.4 sets out what each line of the hazard control plan must contain, and requires products to be handled as potentially unsafe when a critical limit is missed. The standard prescribes no decision tree and no number of critical control points. Running the categorisation with the station cooks, building monitoring around the equipment’s own log and signing each sheet at the end of the batch are method, chosen because they make the requirement work in a kitchen.**
- **In Parma the consultant had written a thorough plan, the cook had filled in his sheets as everyone filled them in, and the chef had inherited both. The real failure was a plan that marked twenty-three steps as critical and so left the one that mattered looking like all the others, while the water bath’s own log, which had recorded the fall to fifty-one degrees, sat unread. Three critical control points and nine operational prerequisite programmes now cost less to run than the twenty-three sheets did, and in May the alarm stopped six portions before they reached a guest.**
- **A critical control point that works still depends on a limit that is right. The next subchapter asks where the limits themselves come from, and what evidence a kitchen needs before it trusts them: validation.**

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 2.4. 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.