WORKSHEET 4.9

Multi-Site, and the Outlets in Concession

Subchapter 4.9 · case in the book: Punta Cana

If your group asked for one certificate covering all its hotels, could it show one system behind it, and could a guest tell which bars and restaurants on your property that certificate does not cover?

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 central food safety function: A group food safety team was created in Punta Cana, with authority over the food safety systems of all four properties and a reporting line to the regional director.		
One system: A group manual, a single hazard analysis method and group prerequisite standards were adopted, each resort adapting them to its conditions in a common format.		
Scope by outlet: Every outlet on every property was classified as operated, outsourced and controlled, or excluded, with reasons, and exclusions visible to guests where they could otherwise be misled.		
Sequence: Each Caribbean resort sought individual certification first;		

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
"Hotels under one brand qualify for one certificate."	No. Multi-site requires one system under central control, not one brand.	
"Sampling means some sites are never examined."	Not as stated. Every site is audited internally by the centre; the body samples on that basis only where the rules permit sampling, which for full hotel kitchens they do not.	
"A problem at one site affects only that site."	No. A major at one site blocks certification of the whole until resolved.	
"A difficult site can be left out to certify the others."	Not as stated. Removing a site from scope to avoid a finding during certification is not permitted.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
“Concession outlets are automatically outside the certificate.”	Not as stated. The scope must state them; if inside, they are controlled as outsourced processes.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Seeking multi-site for brand-linked hotels		
No central internal audit		
Corrective action stays at one site		
Unclear scope for concessions		
Concessions excluded without telling guests		
Expecting fewer audit days to mean less work		

Operative synthesis

- **Is there one system with a central function? (Group quality director): Group manual; authority**
- **Does the centre audit every site? (Group quality director): Group audit programme**
- **Are corrective actions checked across sites? (Group food safety team): Cross-site records**
- **Is every outlet classified for scope? (Resort general managers): Outlet list**
- **Are concessions inside the scope controlled by contract? (Resort general managers): Contracts; audits**
- **If a problem is found at one hotel, who checks the others?: The central team, within a week**
- **Which outlets on our property are not covered?: A named list, visible to guests**
- **Do we have one system or several with one logo?: One, with the evidence**

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 4.9. 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.