WORKSHEET 3.8

The Plate That Did Not Leave: Near-Misses

Subchapter 3.8 · case in the book: Taipei

How many times last month did someone in your kitchen stop a plate, discard a tray or remake a dish because something was not right, and where is the record of any of it?

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The objective: The objective of zero incidents was withdrawn.		
The card: The four-question card and the phone code were introduced at every station, and the register was redesigned to record corrections, catches and causes, not only incidents.		
Monthly analysis: The food safety team grouped the month's records by cause and reported the patterns to the management review, as an input under clause 9.1.2.		
Audit method: Internal audits of clause 8.9 would always compare the register with waste records, the sensor platform and maintenance requests, and would include conversations at the pass.		

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 nothing reached the guest, there is nothing to record."	No. When a critical limit or action criterion is not met, corrections must be recorded with nature, cause and consequences.	
"The standard requires near-misses to be reported."	Not as stated. It does not use the term; it requires records of corrections and analysis of trends in failures.	
"Two entries a year show an excellent system."	No. The analysis must identify trends; an auditor must test whether the records are complete.	
"Zero incidents is a suitable food safety objective."	Not as stated. Objectives must be consistent with the policy, monitored and verified; one that discourages recording undermines the data it is verified against.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
“Discarding the food is the end of the matter.”	No. The need for corrective action must be evaluated and causes determined.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Recording only what reached a guest		
Rewarding a low count		
Auditing the register alone		
Long reporting forms		
No feedback to reporters		
Reading events one by one		

Operative synthesis

- **Are corrections recorded when criteria are not met? (Food safety team leader): Register entries**
- **Are downstream catches recorded as process failures? (Food safety team leader): Register entries**
- **Does the audit compare the register with other traces? (Lead auditor): Audit notes**
- **Are records grouped by cause and trends reported? (Food safety team leader): Monthly analysis**
- **Do objectives and incentives encourage reporting? (General manager): Objectives and bonus criteria**
- **How many plates were stopped last month, and why?: A number, and the main causes**
- **What did we change because of a near-miss?: A named change and its date**
- **Does any bonus depend on a low count of incidents?: No, or a plan to change it**

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 3.8. 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.