WORKSHEET 4.11

Findings: Major, Minor, and the Deadline

Subchapter 4.11 · case in the book: Fez

If your certification auditor raised a major nonconformity three weeks before your busiest season, what would you send her, by when, and would it convince her, or only reassure you?

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
A response procedure: Responses to external audit findings would be prepared by the food safety team, with correction, extent, cause, corrective action and effectiveness for every major, and a plan with evidence for every minor.		
Recipe changes: No recipe change could reach any menu, buffet or label without sign-off by the food safety team, recorded in a single recipe list used by every outlet.		
The question route: Every allergy question from a guest would go to the chef on duty, named on each shift board, not to the pass.		
Protected time: The two weeks after each external audit would be kept free of other projects for the food safety team.		

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 major nonconformity withdraws the certificate at once."	No. The body requires correction and corrective action within a defined time; action on the certificate can follow if they are not verified in time, or earlier where the system is found to have failed seriously.	
"A list of actions taken closes a major."	No. Cause analysis, corrective action and verification of effectiveness are required.	
"The deadline can be extended if the hotel is busy."	Not as stated. The body defines the time under its own rules and, where one applies, the scheme's.	
"Minor findings can wait until the next audit."	Not as stated. A plan must be accepted now; implementation is checked at the next audit.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
“Three minors are three small problems.”	Not as stated. Several minors against one requirement can together be a major.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Responding with corrections only		
Responding before the cause is known		
Ignoring the minors		
Not checking other outlets		
General manager writes the response		
Arguing classification in the response		

Operative synthesis

- **Does every major response include cause, extent and effectiveness? (Food safety team leader): Response file**
- **Is there a plan for every minor? (Food safety team leader): Response file**
- **Were other outlets checked for the same cause? (Food safety team leader): Extent check**
- **Is the response prepared by the team, not management alone? (General manager): Response authors**
- **Is time protected after external audits? (General manager): Calendar**
- **What caused our last major finding?: A cause in the system, not a person**
- **Where else did we look for the same cause?: A list of outlets checked**
- **How did we prove the action worked?: Evidence after the action**

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 4.11. 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.