WORKSHEET 3.15

Did the System Keep Its Promise?

Subchapter 3.15 · case in the book: Porto

Your food safety policy makes promises to your guests. When did an auditor last tell you, in one page, which of those promises the system is keeping, which it is not, and which nobody has checked?

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
The quinta in the programme: The quinta was added to the audit programme with two audits in its season, one during a wedding, and its allergy path was traced as the Vancouver subchapter describes.		
The producers: The twenty-two suppliers known only by questionnaire were grouped by risk as in Hobart, and the six whose products were eaten raw or with no step in the hotel to reduce a hazard were visited before the season.		
The objectives: The training objective became the share of staff, permanent and seasonal, who answered the three Seville questions correctly at their station.		
The verdict each year: The annual summary of the audit programme would take the form of a promise map, with a verdict for each promise and objective, as the first input to the management 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
"If every audit is clean, the system meets the policy."	No. Whether the system meets the intent of the policy and objectives must be determined in its own right.	
"Objectives met means the policy is met."	Not as stated. Objectives must be consistent with the policy; a met objective can measure the wrong thing.	
"The policy is a statement, not something to audit."	No. The audit programme must determine whether the system meets its intent.	
"A site added to the scope is audited at the next cycle."	Not as stated. Changes to the system are an input to the programme; the programme must cover the scope.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
“The verdict belongs to management, not the auditor.”	Not as stated. The audit determines whether the intent is met; management reviews and decides.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Annual summary as a list of findings		
Reporting objectives met as success		
No “not tested” category		
Scope changes not reflected in the programme		
Verdict written by the system’s author		
Policy treated as a statement		

Operative synthesis

- **Is there a yearly verdict on whether the system meets the policy and objectives? (Programme manager): Promise map**
- **Does the verdict name what was not tested? (Lead auditor): Not-tested category**
- **Do the objectives measure the policy’s promises? (Food safety team leader): Objective review**
- **Does the programme cover the whole current scope? (Programme manager): Programme against scope**
- **Is the verdict the first input to the management review? (General manager): Review agenda and minutes**
- **Which of our policy’s promises are we keeping?: A named list, with evidence**
- **Which have we not tested?: A named list, with a plan**
- **Which objective did we meet without keeping its promise?: A named objective, now rewritten**

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 3.15. 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.