WORKSHEET 3.14

Follow-Up: Proving the Crack Is Sealed

Subchapter 3.14 · case in the book: Durban

Of the findings your last audit marked as closed, how many did someone go back to see: at the hour, on the shift and in the conditions where the problem had been found?

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
Verification planned at the start: Every corrective action would state, when agreed, how and when its effectiveness would be verified, and by whom.		
Three states: The follow-up file recorded each finding as done, working or holding, with the evidence for each state.		
Proportion: Major findings, findings that could reach a guest, and repeated findings would be verified on site under the original conditions.		
The fourteen-day rule: The deadline remained for taking action.		

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
"A finding is closed when the action is taken."	No. Follow-up must verify the actions taken; effectiveness must be reviewed.	
"A photograph of the corrective action is sufficient evidence."	Not as stated. It shows implementation; effectiveness needs evidence under the original conditions.	
"The standard requires closure within fourteen days."	No. It requires action within the agreed time frame; it sets no number.	
"The department that acted can confirm it worked."	Not as stated. Verification is more credible when done by someone independent of the action.	
"Every finding needs an on-site follow-up."	No. Corrective actions must be appropriate to the effects; follow-up can be proportionate.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Closing on the department's email		
Accepting a photograph as effectiveness		
Following up at a convenient time		
Deadline for closure		
No second look		
Same effort for every finding		

Operative synthesis

- **Does each corrective action state how effectiveness will be verified? (Food safety team leader): Action records**
- **Are findings recorded as done, working or holding? (Programme manager): Follow-up file**
- **Are major and recurring findings verified on site under original conditions? (Lead auditor): Follow-up visit notes**
- **Is verification done by someone other than the person who acted? (Programme manager): Records of who verified**
- **Are verification results reported? (General manager): Management review minutes**
- **How many of last year's findings are working, not just done?: A number, with evidence**
- **Which corrective action did not work, and what did we do?: A named action and its replacement**
- **When did someone last check a finding at midnight?: A date and a result**

Action plan for our property

Action	Owner	Due	How we will know it worked

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 6b «The Lens», subchapter 3.14. Edizioni Effedore, 2026. Clause references are paraphrased; this sheet does not reproduce the text of ISO 22000, ISO 19011, ISO 22003-1 or ISO/IEC 17021-1. It is not legal advice: food law is that of the place where the property operates.