WORKSHEET 3.7

What a Camera Can Prove: Remote Auditing

Subchapter 3.7 · case in the book: Tallinn

If your next internal audit of a kitchen were carried out through a phone held by the kitchen's own manager, which of your findings from the last on-site audit would it still have 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
The hybrid programme: Each property would receive one hybrid audit a year: a remote part for documentary and digital criteria, an on-site part for physical and sensory ones, assigned by the criterion table.		
Virtual locations in scope: The sensor platform, the recipe and allergen data and the room-service web pages were added to the audit scope of every property, to be audited remotely each year.		
The alarm finding: Across the group, every temperature alarm would require a recorded response: what was found, what was done, and what happened to the food.		
The sensor positions: All cold-room sensors in the three properties were first checked for accuracy against a verified reference placed beside them.		

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
"ISO 22000 does not allow remote internal audits."	No. It leaves methods to the organisation; it requires objective, impartial audits.	
"The 2026 guidance makes remote audits equivalent to on-site audits."	No. It expands guidance on remote methods and notes they can be combined with on-site methods for a full audit.	
"A remote audit is just an on-site audit by video."	No. Feasibility and methods are determined in planning; some evidence cannot be obtained remotely.	
"Virtual locations are an IT matter, not a food safety one."	No. Audit scope includes virtual locations where the system's work is performed.	
"If the auditee shows it on camera, it is evidence."	Not as stated. Information must be verified; the auditor should control what is shown.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Choosing remote or on-site for the whole audit		
Letting the auditee lead the camera tour		
Passing criteria seen only partially		
Auditing the building, not the software		
Trusting sensor data without checking position		
No preparation for kitchen video		

Operative synthesis

- **Is the method assigned criterion by criterion in each audit plan? (Programme manager): Audit plan**
- **Are virtual locations in the audit scope? (Programme manager): Scope statement**
- **Does the auditor control the remote view? (Lead auditor): Audit notes**
- **Are criteria not testable remotely recorded as such? (Lead auditor): Report**
- **Are on-site findings that remote would miss tracked each year? (Food safety team leader): Comparison record**
- **What did our last remote audit not see?: A list of criteria recorded as not audited**
- **Who audits our software and web pages?: A named auditor and date**
- **What happens when a temperature alarm sounds at night?: A recorded response for every alarm**

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 3.7. 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.