WORKSHEET 3.2

An Audit Programme That Follows the Service

Subchapter 3.2 · case in the book: Bologna

On the days when your kitchens are most at risk (the busiest breakfast, the largest banquet, the first week of a new menu) has an internal auditor ever been there to see them?

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 rating sheet: The three inputs would be rated once a year in January, and again after any trigger, by the food safety team.		
The fair calendar: The audit calendar would be drafted from the trade fair calendar and the menu calendar, not from the department list.		
The follow-up on repeated findings: The dairy cold-room seal, three times minor, was reclassified as a failed corrective action.		
A programme review: Each January the food safety team would review the previous year's programme: what was audited, what was found, which triggers fired, and what should change.		

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 area must be audited once a year."	No. The standard sets no frequency; it requires the programme to weigh importance, changes and previous results.	
"Audits should avoid peak periods so as not to disrupt operations."	No. Nothing requires this; a programme that never sees the riskiest periods ignores the importance of the processes.	
"The programme is the list of audit dates."	No. It includes frequency, methods, responsibilities, planning requirements and reporting.	
"A change in equipment waits for the next scheduled audit."	No. Changes in the system are an explicit input to the programme.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
“Complaints are handled by the complaints procedure, not by the audit programme.”	Not as stated. Both are handled; the results of monitoring and analysis are inputs to planning audits.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Auditing only in quiet periods		
One audit per department per year		
Copying last year’s programme		
Ignoring repeated findings		
No triggers for change		
Using peak audits to catch individuals		

Operative synthesis

- **Is each process rated on importance, change and previous results? (Food safety team leader): Rating sheet**
- **Do high-risk processes have audits in their busiest window? (Programme manager): Calendar against occupancy and events**
- **Are triggers for unscheduled audits written down? (Programme manager): Programme document**
- **Have repeated findings changed frequency or depth? (Programme manager): Programme changes and reasons**
- **Is the programme reviewed each year and reported to management? (General manager): Programme review; review minutes**
- **When did an auditor last see breakfast at its busiest?: A date in a peak week, and what was found**
- **What changed in the programme this year, and why?: Named changes linked to results or events**
- **Which finding has come back more than once?: The finding, and the new action on its cause**

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 3.2. 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.