WORKSHEET 4.10

One Audit, Three Standards

Subchapter 4.10 · case in the book: Munich

If your food safety, quality and environmental audits were combined into one, which part of your kitchens would receive less attention, and which conflicts between your three systems would finally become visible?

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
An equal owner: The food safety team leader became joint owner of the integrated management system with the quality and environmental manager, with equal say over the combined audit plan.		
The plan by process: The combined audit plan would be agreed process by process, with food safety specific processes given the time, competence and timing they would receive in a separate audit.		
Objectives reviewed together: All objectives of the three systems would be reviewed jointly each year for their effects on each other before the management review.		
The conflicts resolved: The leftover rule and the dishwasher rinse temperature were corrected, and both were recorded as findings of the integrated 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
"A combined audit covers the same ground in fewer days."	Not as stated. Reductions are limited, justified and depend on real integration.	
"One competent lead auditor can cover all three standards."	Not as stated. The team must include the competence required for each standard.	
"An integrated system means one manual."	No. It means shared processes and coordinated objectives; documents may be combined or not.	
"Environmental and food safety objectives cannot conflict."	No. They can, and integration is where the conflict can be seen.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
"ISO 22000 does not fit the common structure."	No. It was written to allow alignment or integration with other systems.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Accepting a combined plan without reading where time was cut		
A lead auditor without food safety competence for most days		
Food safety as junior partner		
Objectives set separately		
Peak food services outside the combined audit		
Treating fewer findings as improvement		

Operative synthesis

- **Are shared and specific processes distinguished in the plan? (System owners): Combined audit plan**
- **Does food safety time match a separate audit for specific processes? (Food safety team leader): Plan comparison**
- **Does the team include food safety competence for that time? (Food safety team leader): Team composition**
- **Are objectives of all systems reviewed for conflicts? (General manager): Joint review record**
- **Is there time in the audit for findings between standards? (System owners): Audit plan**
- **Where did the days saved by combining come from?: From shared processes, not kitchens**
- **What conflict between our systems did we find this year?: A named conflict and its resolution**
- **Who owns food safety in our integrated system?: An equal owner**

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 4.10. 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.