ISO 22000:2018 + Amd 1:2024 Food safety management systems

Food safety as a management system

62 requirements. This standard can be certified against by an accredited body. As of 07/2026.

ISO 22000 can be certified against by an accredited body. The HACCP principles are contained within it, absorbed into clause 8.5. Important for suppliers to food retail: ISO 22000 on its own is not recognised by the GFSI. That requires FSSC 22000, meaning ISO 22000 plus the prerequisite programmes of the ISO/TS 22002 series plus additional requirements. Anyone certified to ISO 22000 alone does not meet what many retail chains ask for. This list is a working aid for self-assessment, not a proof. A revision of the standard is under way.

Company	Date	Prepared by

4 Context of the Organization, Expectations of Interested Parties and Scope 4

4.1 **The internal and external issues that can affect the ability to achieve safe food have been determined and are reviewed and updated on a regular basis. This includes the question of whether climate change is a relevant issue for the organization, for example through heat in production and storage areas, changing harvest and raw material quality, or water availability. The outcome of this consideration is available, regardless of whether the answer is relevant or not relevant.**

What proves it: An issues list or a simple table with columns for the issue, its link to food safety and the date of the last review. Suitable evidence includes management review minutes with context as an agenda item, market monitoring, notices from authorities and industry associations, and supplier alerts. For the climate aspect a short, reasoned entry with yes or no is enough. A small operation handles this on a single page that is walked through once a year in the management review and signed off with a new date.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.2 **The interested parties that are relevant to the food safety management system have been identified, and their relevant requirements are known, collected and kept up to date. As a minimum this covers customers, consumers, authorities, suppliers and employees, together with any requirements of these parties that relate to climate change, where such requirements exist.**

What proves it: An overview of the parties that maps each one to its concrete requirements and to the source: customer specifications and customer audits, legal requirements and official conditions, certification and standard requirements, supplier specifications. A reference per row to the document in which the requirement is met is useful. A small operation keeps this as one table into which new customer requirements and changes in legislation are entered as they arise and which is reviewed once a year.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.3 **The scope of the system is defined and available as documented information. It names the products and product groups covered, the processes and the sites with their addresses, and therefore states the boundaries of the system clearly. Outsourced or bought-in activities that have an effect on food safety are explicitly assigned and not tacitly left out. The issues determined under 4.1 and the requirements captured under 4.2 have been taken into account when setting the scope.** Document

What proves it: An approved scope document, which may also sit as a section in the manual or as an annex to the management review, with a product list, a process list, site addresses and a statement of the outsourced processes together with the person responsible. The wording should be clear enough that an outsider can see what is not included. Watch the separation of the two levels: it must be readable what applies to the organization as a whole and what applies to a single site only. A small operation manages with half a page that is dated and signed by top management.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.4 **The food safety management system is established and operating, its processes and their interactions are known, and it is maintained and improved on an ongoing basis. It does not stop at paper but can be found again in daily practice.**

What proves it: A process map or process overview showing which process feeds which other process, together with references to the associated procedures and records. Evidence that the system is actually running comes from current day-to-day records, internal audits, the management review and the records of improvements that have been implemented. A small operation draws the process chain from goods receipt to dispatch on one page and links the matching form to each box.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5 Leadership 5

5.1-a **Top management owns the food safety management system, anchors it in the business strategy and in day to day operations, and provides the people, the skills, the time, the facilities and the funding that the system needs.**

What proves it: Evidence includes an approved budget for hygiene, training, maintenance and laboratory analysis, an organisation chart that assigns food safety to a management level, and dated minutes in which management took decisions with a named owner, a due date and a release of funds. In a small operation the owner is the evidence: a short, recurring record covering complaints, investments and staffing decisions related to food safety is enough.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.1-b **Top management makes sure the intended results of the system are actually achieved, supports the people who contribute to them, promotes a culture of continual improvement, and makes clear that reporting food safety problems is wanted and carries no disadvantage.**

What proves it: Evidence includes performance indicators on objectives with management commentary, records of training and technical support for the people responsible, a reporting route for concerns raised by the workforce, and reports that were evaluated with feedback given to the person who raised them. A small operation can manage with a list of open hygiene reports and a short note on who closed each one and when.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.2-a **A written food safety policy exists that suits the purpose and size of the operation, provides the framework for the objectives, commits to meeting statutory, regulatory and customer agreed requirements, covers internal and external food safety communication, and commits to continual improvement of the system and to the competence the workforce needs for it.** Document

What proves it: Evidence is the approved policy as documented information carrying a date, a version and the signature of top management. A concise one page text is sufficient as long as it fits the objectives and the product range. A change history matters, so it stays visible that the policy was reviewed for currency whenever products, sites or legal requirements changed.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.2-b **The policy is communicated throughout the operation, is understood by the workforce in terms of what it means for their own work, can be applied at every level, and is made available to interested parties in a suitable form.**

What proves it: Evidence includes notices in production and staff areas, a policy item in the hygiene briefing with an attendance list and a date, a version in the languages actually spoken on site, and the published version for customers, suppliers and authorities. Understanding is not proven by a signature alone, but by a short comprehension question during the briefing or a brief conversation during a hygiene walk.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.3-a **Responsibilities and authorities for food safety are assigned and communicated. A food safety team leader is appointed and reports to top management on the effectiveness and suitability of the system. It is defined who oversees the reporting duties of the system, who implements hazard control in the operation, and who holds the authority to stop a process and place product on hold. Everyone in the operation is required to report food safety problems to a named point of contact.**

What proves it: Evidence includes a dated appointment letter for the team leader, job or role descriptions with deputy arrangements, a responsibility matrix for monitoring, release and hold, and reports from the team leader to management. The authority to place product on hold must be stated explicitly in writing, otherwise it will not hold up when it matters. In a small operation one page is enough: name, role, authority, deputy, reporting route for concerns, signed by management and posted in the break room.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6 Planning of the Food Safety Management System 3

6.1-a **The context of the organization and the expectations of interested parties have been used to derive which risks and which opportunities could prevent the management system from achieving its intended results or could support it in doing so. This explicitly includes effects of a changing climate, for example heat periods, shifting raw material quality or disrupted cold chains. For the identified items, actions have been planned, integrated into the processes of the system and afterwards evaluated for their effectiveness. This consideration sits at system level and does not replace the hazard analysis for individual food safety hazards in clause 8.5.**

What proves it: Evidence is a risk and opportunity register that refers back to the context analysis from 4.1 and the list of interested parties from 4.2, with a planned action, a responsible person, a due date and a later note on effectiveness for each entry. The climate factors appear as their own rows, not as a footnote. A small operation keeps this as a single table with six columns, reviewed once a year in the same meeting as the management review and signed off with a date. What matters is that events such as a refrigeration failure in summer become visible here and not only in the HACCP documentation.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.2-a **Objectives have been established for the system that are consistent with the food safety policy, that can be measured or judged against agreed criteria and that take applicable legal requirements and customer requirements into account. The objectives are monitored, communicated to the people concerned, reviewed at suitable intervals and updated where needed. For every objective it is planned what will be done, which resources are required, who is responsible, by when it is to be achieved and how achievement will be recognized. Documented information on the objectives is retained.** Document

What proves it: Evidence is a list of objectives with a baseline value, a target value, a deadline, a responsible person and a measure, complemented by the ongoing evaluation, for example the complaint rate per batch, the share of passed hygiene inspections, the success rate of traceability exercises or the training status of staff. Added to this is proof that the objectives were communicated, for example a notice on the board, an item in the shift handover record or a signed briefing list. A small operation manages with three to five objectives on one page, updated monthly with a figure and evaluated in the annual review. Where several sites exist, it is recognizable which objectives apply to the organization as a whole and which apply to the individual site.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.3-a **Changes to the food safety management system are planned in advance and not carried out in passing. Before implementation, the reason and the expected consequences have been considered, the system stays functional during and after the change, the required resources are available and responsibilities are assigned or reassigned. This applies to changes to products, recipes, raw materials, suppliers, equipment, rooms, processes and staff, and equally to changes in legal requirements.**

What proves it: Evidence consists of change requests or change notes stating the reason, an assessment of the impact on the hazard analysis, the prerequisite programmes and the control measures, release by the food safety team, plus a note on the subsequent update of flow diagrams, work instructions and training. A small operation records this in a change log, one line per change with date, short description, a tick where the HACCP documentation is affected and a signature, kept for example as a form at the end of the HACCP folder. Unplanned changes, such as switching a raw material supplier at short notice, are assessed afterwards using the same approach.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7 Support: Resources, Competence, Communication and Documented Information 17

7.1.1 **The resources needed to establish, operate, maintain and improve the food safety management system have been determined and are available. This takes into account what the organization can provide in-house and what has to be bought in, such as laboratory services, pest control or external consultancy.**

What proves it: A resource overview covering people, premises and equipment, monitoring and measuring devices, and externally provided services, together with an approved budget or investment plan and decisions from the management review. A small operation handles this on a single page per year: what we need, what we have, what is missing, who provides it and by when.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.2-a **The people who run the system and control the processes are available in sufficient numbers and are suitable for their tasks. The food safety team is appointed and covers, in terms of expertise, the products, processes, equipment and hazards of the operation.**

What proves it: A letter of appointment or decision record on the composition of the food safety team, giving names, roles and the expertise each person contributes, plus an organizational chart, job or task descriptions and deputy arrangements. A small operation documents the team even when it consists of two people, and closes gaps in expertise through a named external expert.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.2-b **Where external experts carry out system tasks, for example hazard analysis, validation or training, their responsibilities, authorities and required competence are defined in writing. Responsibility for the system remains with the organization.** Document

What proves it: A contract, engagement letter or service agreement with the external expert stating the task, the authority granted and the qualification required, together with evidence of that qualification and the reports resulting from the work. A small operation records this in a two-page engagement letter rather than relying on a verbal arrangement with the consultant.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.3 **The buildings, areas, utilities and equipment needed for safe products are in place and in a condition that supports food safety. Maintenance and replacement are planned and are not triggered only after a breakdown.**

What proves it: An equipment and asset register, a maintenance plan with due dates and responsibilities, maintenance and repair records, calibration and verification records for measuring devices, plus plans for water, compressed air, steam and ventilation where these come into contact with the product. A small operation keeps one maintenance list per machine with date, activity and initials, which is sufficient evidence.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.4 **The environment in which work is carried out is designed so that safe products are possible. This covers physical factors such as temperature, lighting, noise, air quality and hygiene, and human factors such as workload pressure, shift length and the induction of new staff.**

What proves it: Measurements and records for room temperature, lighting and air, a hygiene plan covering changing room and hand washing rules, inspection walk records, plus shift and induction plans. A small operation demonstrates this through a weekly hygiene walk with a checklist and through temperature records for the production areas.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.5 **Where ready-made elements are adopted from outside, such as sector guides, generic hazard analyses or purchased template manuals, they are tailored to the organization, verified against its own products, processes and sites, implemented and kept up to date. A template adopted unchanged does not count as the organization's own system.** Document

What proves it: The source document as received, a comparison note showing which points were adapted, added or deleted, and the approved in-house version with date and signature. A small operation writes in the header of the adopted guide who verified and adapted it for the operation, and when.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.6-a **For suppliers and service providers whose performance affects food safety, defined criteria exist for selection, evaluation, ongoing monitoring and re-evaluation. The results of these evaluations are retained as documented information, and the consequences of poor performance are defined.** Document

What proves it: A supplier list with approval status, evaluation criteria such as certification, conformity to specification, complaint rate and delivery reliability, an evaluation sheet per supplier with a date, plus audit or questionnaire results and evidence of blocked suppliers. A small operation keeps a table with one row per supplier and an annual evaluation in three columns.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.6-b **What is expected from external providers is communicated to them before the service starts. This includes product and process requirements, hygiene and transport specifications, and the obligation to report changes and incidents. Externally provided processes, products and services are controlled so that they do not weaken the ability of the organization to deliver safe products.**

What proves it: Purchasing documents and framework contracts referring to the specification, approved raw material and packaging specifications, hygiene and transport requirements for contractors, and an agreement to notify changes in recipe, origin and process. A small operation attaches a one-page requirements list to the purchase order and has it countersigned once per supplier.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.2-a **For every task that affects food safety, the necessary competence has been determined. This applies to the organization's own staff as well as to external providers and contractor personnel working on site, and it applies explicitly to the food safety team and to the people who monitor CCPs and OPRPs.**

What proves it: A competence matrix with one row per person and one column per task, for example incoming goods checks, thermal processing equipment, metal detector, cleaning release, hazard analysis. The competence required for each task is stated in a short requirement line. A small operation manages this with a one-page matrix in which each cell shows whether the person is instructed, practised or still open.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.2-b **Where competence is missing, actions are taken, for example training, instruction, on-the-job induction, reassignment to another task or buying in expertise, and the effectiveness of those actions is evaluated. Competence is supported by records; an attendance list alone is not evidence of ability.** Document

What proves it: A training plan, training records with topic, date, trainer and signature, plus evidence of effectiveness: a test, workplace observation, sign-off by the line manager or a successful dry run at the CCP. Diplomas, certificates and work experience also count. A small operation adds a line to the attendance list in which the line manager confirms, after a few weeks, that the person performs the task reliably.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.3 **Everyone working in the operation knows the food safety policy, knows which objectives apply to their area, understands their own contribution to the effectiveness of the system and understands what happens if requirements are not met. It is also known that anything unusual must be reported without delay to a named person.**

What proves it: Records of instruction with the content covered, notices and short versions of the policy at the workplace, reporting routes with names and contact details, plus sample interviews during the internal audit in which staff describe their contribution in their own words. A small operation uses a short briefing at the start of the shift and records topic, date and participants in a logbook.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.4.1 **Communication on food safety is planned. It is defined what is communicated, when, with whom, by which route and by whom. Communication reaches both internally and outwards along the food chain.**

What proves it: A communication plan as a table with the columns trigger, content, recipient, route, responsible person and deadline, separated into internal and external. Distribution lists, minutes and email trails serve as additional evidence. A small operation fits this on one page and attaches the emergency contact numbers to it.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.4.2 **For external communication it is defined which information is exchanged with suppliers, contractors, customers, consumers, authorities and other links in the food chain, so that hazards along the chain are controlled. A person with the authority to communicate externally is appointed. Incoming and outgoing information is recorded and is available to the food safety team.** Document

What proves it: The appointment of the authorized person and a deputy, a contact list for authorities, customers and suppliers, product and use information for customers including allergen and storage instructions, and records of complaints, customer enquiries and contacts with authorities. A small operation keeps a communication file in which every external food safety matter is filed with date, sender and outcome.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.4.3 **Internally it is defined that the food safety team is informed in good time of all changes that may affect food safety, among them new or changed products, raw materials and suppliers, changes to equipment, premises, cleaning and process parameters, new legal requirements and customer requirements, and new knowledge about hazards and complaints. This information feeds into the updating of the system and into the management review.**

What proves it: A procedure or form for reporting changes stating who reports and to whom, plus minutes of food safety team meetings showing the reported changes and their evaluation, and evidence that the hazard analysis was reviewed again where needed. A small operation handles this with a fixed agenda item on changes in the weekly meeting and a short set of minutes.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.5.1 **The system includes the documented information required by the standard at the individual clauses, the documented information the organization itself needs for effectiveness, and that required by legal requirements, authorities or customers. Its extent and depth match the size, products and processes of the operation.** Document

What proves it: A document overview or matrix that names, for each clause of the standard and each legal requirement, the corresponding document or record, with a reference to its storage location and owner. Watch the two levels: it should be visible which documents apply to the organization and which only to a single site. A small operation maintains this overview as a single table and saves itself an additional manual.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.5.2 **When creating and updating documented information, identification, description and format are defined, for example title, number, date, version and author. Before use it is reviewed for suitability and approved, and it is visible who granted the approval.**

What proves it: Document templates with a consistent header or footer showing number, version, date, author and approver, plus the approval records themselves. Photos, videos and files in a folder on the server also need a recognizable version. A small operation defines one standard header and uses it for every form posted in production.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.5.3 **Documented information is controlled so that it is available and legible where it is needed, and protected against loss, unauthorized change and unintended use of obsolete versions. Distribution, access, storage, version control, retention period and disposal are defined. Documented information of external origin, such as customer specifications, legal texts and safety data sheets, is identified as such and controlled as well. Records remain legible and unalterable and are retained at least as long as legal requirements, customers and product shelf life demand.**

What proves it: A document control list with version, storage location, distribution and retention period, evidence that obsolete versions were withdrawn, access rights and backups for digital storage, plus the rule that only the approved version is posted in production. A small operation works from a single approved folder that everything is printed from, backs it up daily and destroys printed copies of obsolete versions immediately.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8 Operation: prerequisite programmes, hazard control and handling of nonconformities 22

8.1 **The processes needed for safe food are planned, implemented and controlled. It is defined which criteria apply to them, how they are controlled against those criteria and which records are produced in the process. Planned changes are assessed beforehand, unplanned changes are reviewed for their consequences and, where necessary, contained. Outsourced processes such as external storage, contract filling, pest control or cleaning by a service provider remain under the control of the organization and are governed by contract and by evidence.**

What proves it: Process descriptions with their set points, release and change notifications, review of changes by the team. For outsourced activities, the contract or service agreement with the agreed food safety requirements, inspection records of the service provider and your own effectiveness check. A small operation keeps the control criteria directly in the work instructions and adds a one page annex to the service contract stating hygiene requirements and reporting duties.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.2 **The prerequisite programmes are established, implemented and maintained: building and layout conditions, cleaning and disinfection, pest monitoring, personal hygiene and training, water and air quality, waste disposal, maintenance, handling of chemicals, glass and hard plastic, and protection against intentional contamination, as far as applicable to the operation. They match the size of the operation and the product, are approved by the food safety team, take account of legal requirements, customer requirements and recognised guidance, and their effectiveness is verified.**

Document

What proves it: Cleaning and disinfection schedule stating agent, concentration, contact time and responsible person, cleaning records, pest monitoring reports with bait station plan, hygiene training with attendance lists, water analyses, glass breakage records, maintenance plan. Approval of the programmes is evidenced by a signed list or a team record, and where an industry guide is used the derivation is traceable. A small operation keeps a one page PRP overview and references the corresponding plan and record form on each line.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.3 **The traceability system links the lots of purchased raw materials, ingredients and product contact materials seamlessly to the end products made from them and to the first customer. It works forwards and backwards, covers rework and reprocessing, and is tested at defined intervals. The retention period for records is defined and is based at least on shelf life, legal requirements and customer requirements.**

Document

What proves it: Lot identification on goods and containers, incoming goods register with supplier lot, production records with quantities used, dispatch documents with lot reference. Evidence that the system works is a documented traceability test with start time, end time, quantity reconciliation (dispatched, in stock, discarded) and an assessment of the result. A small operation manages this with a lot book or a spreadsheet and one test run per year that takes about an hour and whose mass balance has to add up.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.4 **For events that can suddenly endanger food safety, such as power or refrigeration failure, water ingress, raw material contamination, sabotage, fire or breakdown of a key item of equipment, it is defined in advance who decides, who is informed and which immediate actions apply. Emergency contacts are current and reachable, the arrangement is tested and, after every actual incident, reviewed for its suitability.**

What proves it: Emergency plan with escalation chain, contact list covering authority, laboratory, customers and service providers, rules for handling affected product, plus exercise and incident records. After real incidents, a short review documents what was changed. A small operation posts a laminated emergency card on the production door and works through one scenario with the team once a year, for example loss of refrigeration overnight.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.1.1 **Before hazards are analysed, all the information needed for the analysis is collected, current and traceable. The food safety team is appointed, its members cover the necessary knowledge and experience regarding products, processes and equipment, and the sources used from legislation, customer requirements, technical literature and the organization's own experience are recorded with reference and date.** Document

What proves it: Team list with role, qualification and deputy, plus an overview of the sources used with dates, for example legislation, industry guides, expert opinions, laboratory results, complaint analyses. A small operation staffs the team with the owner, the production manager and one person from cleaning and brings in missing expertise externally on a daily basis, evidenced by the consultancy contract and the meeting records.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.1.2 **For all purchased raw materials, ingredients, additives and product contact materials, descriptions are available covering composition including allergens, origin, method of production and treatment, packaging and delivery form, conditions for storage and transport, shelf life, applicable legal requirements and the criteria by which the material is accepted before use. The descriptions are kept current and are updated when a supplier or a recipe changes.** Document

What proves it: Specifications and data sheets per item, declarations of conformity for food contact materials, allergen information from the supplier, incoming goods acceptance criteria such as temperature, integrity, sensory check or certificate of analysis. A date or version number on each specification shows that it is current. A small operation collects supplier specifications in a folder per item and reviews them once a year, plus at every change of supplier.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.1.3 **For every end product or product group there is a description covering composition, allergens, safety relevant characteristics such as pH value, water activity or salt content, shelf life, packaging, labelling and the conditions for storage, transport and distribution. It also records how the product is intended to be used, which misuse is reasonably foreseeable, for example consumption without the intended heating step, and which consumer groups it is intended for, including particularly vulnerable groups such as infants, pregnant women, sick or elderly people.** Document

What proves it: Product specifications with recipe, analytical values and label text, label samples with allergen and preparation information, details of the chilled or frozen chain. For intended use, one paragraph per product group is enough, naming intended preparation, foreseeable misuse and target group. A small operation records this on a single sheet per product group instead of keeping a separate document for every variant.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.1.5 **For the products or product groups within the scope, flow diagrams are available that show every step from incoming goods to dispatch in the correct sequence, including purchased items, rework, reprocessing, intermediate storage, removal of waste and outsourced steps. The diagrams are verified on site against reality. In addition, the process steps and the environment in which they take place are described, that is hygiene zones, personnel and material flows, separation of raw and ready to eat areas, and the equipment and parameters used.** Document

What proves it: Flow diagram per product group with date and approval by the team, plus a note confirming the on site verification with date and the name of the person who made the walk through. For the environment, a zoning or site plan with movement and material flow serves the purpose, together with short process descriptions. A small operation draws the diagram on one page and confirms it once a year by signature after a walk through the production area.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.2.2 **For every step of the flow diagram, all reasonably expected biological, chemical and physical hazards are identified, including allergens and including the hazards introduced through raw materials, personnel, equipment, environment or cross contamination. For each hazard it is stated where it arises or is introduced. For each hazard an acceptable level in the end product is determined and justified, derived from legal requirements, customer requirements, intended use and technical sources.** Document

What proves it: Hazard list per process step with columns for hazard type, source of introduction, acceptable level in the end product and justification with a reference, for example a limit from a regulation, a customer specification or a recognised microbiological guide value. A small operation works with a table in which each row represents one process step and bases the justification on the industry guide instead of generating its own studies.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.2.3 **Every identified hazard is assessed to determine whether it needs to be controlled so that the product is safe. The assessment is based at least on the likelihood of occurrence before the control measures are applied and on the severity of the possible health consequences. The method used is described and is applied consistently. The result states unambiguously for each hazard whether it is significant or not, and the classification is justified.** Document

What proves it: Description of the assessment method, for example a matrix of likelihood and severity with clearly defined levels, plus the completed assessment sheet per hazard with classification and a short justification. Evidence for the classification can be your own measurements, complaint data, retained sample results or literature. A small operation manages with a three by three matrix, as long as the levels are defined and everyone on the team applies them in the same way.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.2.4 **For every significant hazard, control measures or combinations of control measures are selected that prevent the hazard, eliminate it or reduce it to the acceptable level. Each measure is categorised with justification as a CCP or as an OPRP, and the categorisation follows a systematic, traceable approach that considers, among other things, the effect on the hazard, the feasibility of monitoring with timely intervention, the severity of the consequences of failure and the interaction with other measures. The distinction is drawn cleanly: a measure with a measurable limit whose breach directly affects the batch concerned and triggers an immediate correction is a CCP, whereas a measure that is managed through action criteria and observable evidence, and whose failure has to be assessed afterwards, is an OPRP.** Document

What proves it: Decision sheet per significant hazard stating the selected measure, the criteria examined and the justified categorisation. This becomes traceable through a decision tree or an assessment table with documented answers to the questions. A small operation records the justification in two or three sentences per measure, but checks for every CCP whether there really is a measurable limit and an immediate response behind it, otherwise the measure belongs among the OPRPs.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.3 **Before use, it is demonstrated that the selected control measures and their combinations are actually capable of bringing the significant hazards to the defined acceptable level. The evidence comes from a suitable source and relates to the conditions in your own operation, not to an ideal case. When recipe, process, equipment or raw material change, the capability is demonstrated again.** Document

What proves it: Validation record per CCP and per OPRP stating the question, the method, the result and the conclusion. Suitable sources are guidance and literature values, predictive models, equipment manufacturer data, challenge tests, temperature distribution measurements in the oven or autoclave, shelf life studies. What matters is the link to your own worst case, for example the thickest product at the coldest point of the equipment. A small operation relies on a recognised guide and demonstrates with its own series of measurements that the conditions stated there are reached in its own equipment.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.4.1 **There is a documented plan that brings together the control of the significant hazards and records for every CCP and every OPRP: the hazard, the control measure, the critical limit or the action criterion, the type and frequency of monitoring, the corrections in case of deviation, the responsibilities and the associated records. The plan is approved and is genuinely in use in the operation.** Document

What proves it: The plan as a table, often called the HACCP plan, with one row per CCP and per OPRP and the columns named above, approved with date and version. Its use is evidenced by the monitoring forms actually completed in day to day operation, which match the rows of the plan. A small operation keeps CCPs and OPRPs in a single table and marks the type in a separate column instead of maintaining two separate plans.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.4.2 **For every CCP, critical limits are set in measurable terms so that the decision between safe and not safe is unambiguous, for example as core temperature, time, pH value or the response of the metal detector to the test piece. For every OPRP, action criteria are set that are measurable or observable and show whether the measure is working. The choice of limits and criteria is justified, and where a criterion rests on an observation it is safeguarded by instruction, training and reference samples.** Document

What proves it: The values entered in the plan with unit and tolerance, plus the justification with a source, for example a legal requirement, a validation result or a guidance value. For observational criteria, limit samples, photo samples or assessment instructions serve as evidence of the safeguard. A small operation writes one sentence of justification next to each limit so that nobody has to guess in the audit where the figure comes from.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.4.3 **At every CCP and for every OPRP it is monitored whether the critical limit is met or the action criterion is achieved. For every monitoring activity it is defined what is measured or observed, by which method, at which intervals, by whom and with which record. The frequency is chosen so that a deviation is detected in time and the product concerned can still be held back. The people who monitor are instructed and authorised to respond immediately.** Document

What proves it: Monitoring forms with target value, actual value, time, lot and initials, plus the instruction that specifies method and frequency. Where recording is automatic, data logger or equipment records with time stamps serve as evidence, together with proof of who reviews and releases the data. A small operation uses one form per shift and sets the frequency so that in the event of a fault only the product between two measurements is affected, which keeps the quantity of blocked stock small.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.4.4 **For the case that a critical limit is exceeded or an action criterion is not achieved, it is defined in advance what happens: how the affected product is identified, blocked and assessed, how the process is brought back under control and who decides. At a CCP, all product since the last check found to be in order counts as affected and is not released without assessment. At an OPRP, it is assessed whether and to what extent the product is affected. Response and result are recorded.** Document

What proves it: The defined corrections in the hazard control plan or in a procedure, hold tags and hold notes, assessment and release decisions signed by the authorised person, a record of what became of the product. A small operation keeps red hold tags and a segregated hold area available and enters every deviation in a simple list showing date, lot, quantity, decision and decision maker.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.6 **After changes, the information on which the prerequisite programmes and the hazard control plan are based is reviewed and, where necessary, updated. Triggers include new or changed products and recipes, new equipment, changed processes or suppliers, new legal or customer requirements, findings from complaints and new technical information such as recalls by other market participants. The product descriptions, the flow diagrams and the hazard analysis are affected as well.**

What proves it: Change list or revision register with the trigger, date, documents affected and the person who approved the update. A fixed rule helps: every recipe and equipment change passes through the food safety team before implementation. A small operation ties this to a short change slip that does not reach production without the signature of the responsible person.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.7 **The equipment and methods used to monitor and measure at CCPs and OPRPs deliver reliable values. The measuring devices are fit for their purpose, identified, calibrated or verified at defined intervals, and protected against unintended adjustment and against damage. If it turns out that a device measured incorrectly, it is assessed which products since the last check found to be in order are affected, and action is taken accordingly. Software used for monitoring is also checked for suitability before use.** Document

What proves it: Measuring equipment register with device, number, place of use, interval and status, calibration certificates traceable to national or international standards, internal verification records such as the ice water or boiling point check of a thermometer, test piece checks on the metal detector, plus the assessment of affected product after a device fault. A small operation has one reference thermometer calibrated externally and checks the working thermometers against it regularly. This saves cost and still remains traceable.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.8 **It is planned and carried out how it is verified whether the prerequisite programmes are implemented and effective, whether the hazard analysis is up to date, whether the hazard control plan is being followed and whether the hazards in the end product are actually at the acceptable level. Verification is not carried out by the same person who performs the monitoring concerned. The results are not merely filed but brought together and analysed: trends are recognised, recurring deviations are named and the need for updating or improvement is derived from them. The analysis feeds into the management review.** Document

What proves it: Verification plan with activity, method, frequency and responsible person, plus the results: review of monitoring records by a second person, hygiene inspections and swab samples, product and environmental testing, cleaning checks, internal audits, analysis of customer complaints, traceability test. The analysis exists as a report or as a section of the management review, with statements on trends and the actions derived. A small operation analyses on two pages every six months and handles the record review through the four eyes principle with a second trained person.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.9.2 **Deviations at CCPs and at OPRPs are detected, the affected product is identified and controlled, and the immediate correction is carried out. Beyond that, the cause is investigated and eliminated so that the deviation does not recur. The need for corrective action is evaluated, its implementation is tracked and its effectiveness is reviewed. It is defined who is allowed to assess a deviation and take the decision.** Document

What proves it: Deviation form or deviation log with date, lot, deviation, immediate correction, root cause analysis, defined action, due date, responsible person and the later evidence of effectiveness. For root cause work, a structured method such as repeatedly asking why or a cause and effect diagram is enough. A small operation keeps a single deviation log for all cases and sets a follow up date for the effectiveness check, typically four to eight weeks later.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.9.4 **Products for which it cannot be ruled out that they are unsafe are blocked and do not enter the market as long as they have not been assessed. The assessment is made against the defined acceptable levels and rests on robust evidence, for example an analysis, a demonstrably effective further treatment or a justified technical judgement. If release is not possible, a decision is taken on further processing, alternative use or destruction. If affected product has already left the operation, action is taken and the affected parties are informed.** Document

What proves it: Hold procedure with a marked hold area, hold list with quantities, release or rejection decision with justification and the signature of the authorised person, laboratory results, evidence of destruction or alternative use. A small operation states in one sentence that only one named person may block and release, and keeps the hold area physically separate so that blocked product is not taken away by mistake.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.9.5 **For withdrawal from the trade and recall at consumer level, it is defined who decides, who is notified, how the affected quantity is determined and how the returned product is secured and handled. The responsibilities are named, the contacts to customers, authorities and, where necessary, the public are prepared. The arrangement is tested at defined intervals, the test is evaluated, and the product remains under supervision until a decision on its disposition is taken.** Document

What proves it: Recall plan with decision authority, escalation chain, templates for customer and authority notifications, rules for storing returned product. Evidence that it works is a recall exercise with date, time taken, quantity reconciliation, a check that the contacts are reachable and an assessment of what was changed as a result. Real cases are documented to the same extent. A small operation ties the recall exercise to the annual traceability test and checks at the same time whether the phone numbers of the first customers are still correct.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9 Monitoring, internal audit and management review 8

9.1.1-a **It is defined which parameters of the food safety management system are monitored and measured, by which methods, at which intervals and at which points in time the results are evaluated, so that the resulting information is reliable and comparable over time.**

What proves it: A monitoring and measurement plan that names, for each parameter, the method, the frequency, the responsible person and the evaluation date, for example cold chain temperatures, cleaning checks, microbiological environmental samples, pest monitoring and customer complaints. Small operations keep this as a single A4 table in a binder and reconcile it once a year with the changes made in the operation.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.1.1-b **The results of monitoring and measurement are retained as records and can be clearly traced to the date, the location or site, the person who carried out the activity and the method or device used.** Document

What proves it: Measurement records, temperature data from loggers or manual readings, laboratory results and hygiene walk checklists, each with a date and an initial. Where the organization runs several sites, the records can be kept per site and are consolidated for the overall picture. A small operation manages with one form per process and one annual binder; digitally, a spreadsheet with a locked history is enough.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.1.2-a **The available data are analysed systematically in order to judge whether the system as a whole is working: whether the prerequisite programmes and the hazard control plan are effective, whether critical limits and action criteria are met, how deviations, complaints and supplier performance are developing, and whether the hazard analysis needs to be updated. The results of this analysis are recorded.** Document

What proves it: A periodic analysis, for example quarterly, with trend charts on CCP exceedances, OPRP action criteria, complaints, rejections, results of verification activities and audit findings, together with a short written conclusion by the food safety team. Small operations handle this in a one hour meeting with a one page record in which every indicator is rated as rising, stable or falling and the consequence is stated.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.2-a **An audit programme exists and defines the frequency, methods and responsibilities for internal audits, taking into account the importance of the processes, changes in the operation, feedback from monitoring and the results of previous audits. Records of the implementation of the programme and of the audit results are retained.** Document

What proves it: An annual audit plan with dates, areas and auditors, together with the filed audit reports and evidence that the findings have been worked off. A small operation realistically plans two to three audit dates per year and arranges the sequence so that higher risk areas such as allergen management or the cold chain come up more often than administration.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.2-b **For each individual audit the objectives, criteria and scope are defined, the auditors are selected so that they do not audit their own area of responsibility, the findings are reported to the responsible management and to the food safety team, and any necessary corrections and corrective actions are initiated without undue delay and checked for effectiveness.**

What proves it: An audit plan per date stating objective, criteria and scope, an audit report with a distribution list, an action list with responsible persons, due dates and a completion note, plus a short effectiveness check at the next audit. Where independence is hard to achieve in a small operation, a collegial swap with another area, a trained employee from administration or an external auditor on an hourly basis will do.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.3.1-a **Top management reviews the food safety management system at planned intervals and judges whether it remains suitable, adequately dimensioned and effective, and whether it still fits the strategic direction of the company.**

What proves it: Meeting invitation and attendance list including the management, an agenda and minutes from which the interval is recognizable, for example annually, plus additional reviews triggered by major changes. In small operations this is a scheduled half day with the owner, the person responsible for production and the person responsible for quality, not a side remark in the weekly meeting.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.3.2-a **The review takes the following inputs into account in a traceable way: the status of actions from the previous review, changes in the context and in interested parties including climate related effects on raw materials, supply chains and storage conditions, performance data from monitoring, verification and analysis, deviations, emergencies and withdrawals, results of internal and external audits as well as of official inspections, customer complaints and supplier performance, the status of resources, and the effectiveness of internal and external communication.**

What proves it: A fixed input list used as a template for the review, each item with a data sheet or a reference to the source, for example an audit report, a complaint analysis, a traceability test, an emergency exercise or a supplier evaluation. Climate related effects are addressed concretely, for instance heat periods affecting cooling and transport, or crop failures leading to a change of supplier. Small operations use the same template and enter either a figure or a short no change against every item.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.3.3-a **The review results in decisions on improvements, on changes to and updating of the system including the policy and the objectives, on resource needs, and on the question of whether the hazard analysis and the hazard control plan have to be adapted. These decisions are recorded together with responsible persons and due dates.** Document

What proves it: Minutes of the management review with an action section that lists a responsible person, a due date and a status for every decision, plus the release by top management. The action section is called up again as the first item at the next review so that the loop is closed. A small operation keeps this in a table with five columns and no more than ten rows; a few items that actually get done beat a long list that stalls.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10 Improvement 3

10.1 **Whenever a nonconformity is detected, the first response is to contain it and deal with its consequences, after which it is decided whether the underlying cause must be eliminated so that the nonconformity does not recur or appear elsewhere. Corrective actions are proportionate to the significance of the nonconformity, their effectiveness is reviewed afterwards, and the management system or the hazard analysis is adjusted where necessary. Documented information records the nature of the nonconformity, the cause investigation, the actions taken and the outcome (clause 10.1).** Document

What proves it: A nonconformity and action log with one entry per case: description, immediate correction, root cause analysis (for example 5 Why or Ishikawa), responsible person, due date, effectiveness review with date. Typical sources are audit findings, customer complaints, out of specification analytical results, findings raised by authorities, and exceeded critical limits at CCPs or action criteria at OPRPs. A small operation manages with a single table in which each row is one case and the final column carries the sentence explaining why the action is considered effective.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.2 **The suitability, adequacy and effectiveness of the food safety management system are continually improved, and top management ensures that improvement is a recurring item in team communication and in the management review (clause 10.2).**

What proves it: Minutes of the management review and of food safety team meetings in which improvement decisions are recorded with a responsible person and a due date, plus a list of implemented improvements stating the before and after situation, such as fewer complaints, shorter changeover times in cleaning, fewer readjustments at a CCP. A small operation captures this as a short improvement list following the annual review, supplemented by ideas raised by the team.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.3 **The food safety team updates the management system in a planned manner, evaluating feedback from internal and external communication, verification results, nonconformities, trend analyses and changes to products, processes, raw materials, legal requirements or the operating environment. The update covers both levels, that is the organization and the individual site, and its results feed into the management review. The update activities are retained as documented information (clause 10.3).** Document

What proves it: An update log or change history stating date, trigger, affected documents (flow diagram, hazard analysis, PRP plan, control plan with CCPs and OPRPs) and approval by the food safety team, together with the revised document versions. Completeness is demonstrated by a scheduled review at least once a year plus event driven updates whenever a relevant change occurs. A small operation keeps a change table with the columns date, trigger, changed document, new version, approval.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification