WORKSHEET 4.6

Stage 2: The Kitchen at Full Service

Subchapter 4.6 · case in the book: Salvador

If the certification auditor arrived at the busiest twenty minutes of your busiest day, would your records and your kitchen tell the same story?

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 stall: Vatapá in three timed batches, labelled, discarded after two hours, with a timer and a check by the pool bar supervisor at each change.		
Monitoring frequency: Every operational prerequisite programme was reviewed for whether its monitoring frequency could detect failure during the hours of highest risk, and the frequencies of four were changed.		
Allergen information: Every menu board and buffet label was checked against current recipes for all allergens the hotel had defined, and the check was added to the menu change process.		
Internal audits at full service: The internal audit programme was changed so that every outlet would be audited at least once a year during its busiest service.		

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
"Complete records prove the control works."	No. Stage 2 evaluates effectiveness; monitoring must be able to detect failure.	
"The hotel can choose when the auditor visits each area."	Not as stated. The body plans the audit; timing is part of its method.	
"Monitoring once per service is enough for an OPRP."	Not as stated. Frequency must be commensurate with likelihood of failure and severity.	
"A long tradition shows a product is safe."	No. Control measures are judged against action criteria and evidence.	
"Naming one allergen on the menu is enough."	No. Product information must enable consumers to protect themselves.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Asking for Stage 2 at quiet hours		
Preparing documents, not service		
Monitoring at a fixed time		
Partial allergen information		
Treating tradition as a control		
Ignoring the positive findings		

Operative synthesis

- **Can each OPRP's monitoring detect failure at the riskiest hour? (Food safety team leader): Monitoring times against risk**
- **Do records, observation and staff agree at full service? (Internal auditor): Triangulation notes**
- **Does product information name every defined allergen? (Food safety team leader): Boards and labels checked**
- **Has every outlet been audited internally at its busiest? (Programme manager): Audit programme**
- **Is the hotel ready to be seen at its busiest hour? (General manager): Rehearsal record**
- **Where would an auditor at 12:40 find our weakest control?: A named control, already reviewed**
- **Do our monitoring times match our risk times?: Yes, with the review to show it**
- **What did the auditor say was working?: A named area, used as the model**

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 4.6. 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.