WORKSHEET 3.9

Why the Procedure Failed

Subchapter 3.9 · case in the book: Bogotá

Look at the causes written in your last ten corrective actions. How many say, in one form or another, that a person made a mistake, and how many of those problems have come back?

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 juice bar: A dosing pump calibrated for the current disinfectant replaced the bottle cap.		
The spread: The same measures were applied at the bars and in the staff canteen, and a sample from each was added to the laboratory plan for three months.		
The corrective action process: The four tests were added to the corrective action form.		
Effectiveness before closure: Each corrective action would state how its effectiveness would be checked and when.		

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
"Retraining is an adequate corrective action."	Not as stated. It is adequate only if lack of competence was the cause; the action must eliminate the cause.	
"A corrective action is closed when the action is done."	No. Its effectiveness must be reviewed and verified.	
"The investigation concerns the area where it happened."	No. The organisation must determine whether similar nonconformities exist or could occur elsewhere.	
"The standard requires five whys or a fishbone."	No. It requires causes to be determined; the method is the organisation's choice.	
"Three separate nonconformities need three separate investigations."	Not as stated. Trends in monitoring results must be reviewed as part of corrective action.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Recording “human error” as the cause		
Retraining as the default action		
Closing on the day of the action		
Investigating only where it happened		
Treating repeats as new events		
Not asking the person involved		

Operative synthesis

- **Do stated causes pass the four tests? (Food safety team leader): Corrective action records**
- **Are repeated nonconformities read together? (Food safety team leader): Trend review**
- **Is the spread of each cause investigated? (Food safety team leader): Records of other areas checked**
- **Is effectiveness checked before closure? (Lead auditor): Closure evidence**
- **Are people involved interviewed as witnesses? (Lead auditor): Investigation notes**
- **Which problem has come back after being closed?: A named problem, and what changed the second time**
- **How many of our causes name a person and nothing else?: Few, with the reason stated**
- **How do we know our last corrective action worked?: A later result that shows 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 3.9. 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.