

VERIFICATION & CLOSE-THE-LOOP REVIEW

Prove it worked. Prove it stayed fixed.

Tool 6 • Field Edition v1.0

A universal effectiveness-verification and closure tool for foodservice operations of any size.

PURPOSE

Use this tool after corrective action has been implemented. It determines whether the action changed the real operating condition, remained effective under actual work conditions, avoided unintended consequences, and deserves formal closure.

THE CLOSE-THE-LOOP RULE

Completion is not closure. A purchase order, training record, signed action item or repaired component proves that a task was completed. Closure requires evidence that the original condition changed and stayed changed.

WORKFLOW

**PREPARE → VERIFY → STRESS-TEST → CHECK RECURRENCE → UPDATE SYSTEM → DECIDE →
RECHECK**

FOUR POSSIBLE DECISIONS

Decision	Meaning
CLOSE - VERIFIED EFFECTIVE	Evidence confirms the original condition is controlled.
EXTEND MONITORING	Promising, but evidence or elapsed time is incomplete.
REOPEN CORRECTIVE ACTION	Recurrence or failed effectiveness requires more corrective work.
ESCALATE / SYSTEMIC REVIEW	Wider or higher-risk review is required.

1. CASE & ACTION HANDOFF

Case / Action ID	Operation / Site
Department / Process	Risk Level
Action Owner	Implementation Date
Verifier	Verification Date
Authorized Closer	Root Cause Ref
Tool 5 Action Ref	Recheck Date

Original condition / finding

Evidence-supported root cause

Corrective action implemented

2. DEFINE SUCCESS BEFORE VERIFYING

Do not decide what success means after you see the result. Define the expected change and pass criteria before the verification review.

What should be different if the corrective action worked?

Success criteria - measurable or observable pass conditions

Evidence sources to be used

Verification period / sample size / number of cycles

Conditions that must be included (peak volume, different shifts, changeover, etc.)

3. VERIFY IMPLEMENTATION & EFFECTIVENESS

Ref	Verification Control	Result	Evidence / Notes
V1	Corrective action was physically implemented as approved.	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
V2	The correction is being used during normal operation, not only during a demonstration.	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
V3	The correction was tested during peak, pressure or difficult conditions where relevant.	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
V4	More than one operator, shift, production run or service cycle was checked where practical.	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
V5	The verifier compared current performance with the original condition or baseline.	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
V6	Evidence comes from the actual process, records or outcomes rather than self-report alone.	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
V7	The correction did not simply shift cost, work, risk or failure to another department or process.	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
V8	The result meets the success criteria defined before verification began.	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
V9	The verifier is sufficiently independent to challenge the result where practical.	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
V10	For critical / regulated conditions, required authorized or specialist verification has been completed.	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	

3A. VERIFICATION EVIDENCE RECORD

Before / after result - compare with the original baseline

Evidence reviewed - records, observations, photos, samples, KPI data, audit evidence, etc.

People / shifts / runs / service periods / samples checked

Verifier observations under real operating conditions

Unintended consequences / new risks identified

4. RECURRENCE, WORKAROUNDS & RELATED SIGNALS

Ref	Question	Result	Evidence / Notes
R1	Has the original condition recurred during the verification period?	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
R2	Are employees using a workaround, extra labor, manual correction, rework or heroics to keep the result looking acceptable?	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
R3	Do related indicators support the conclusion (cost, yield, downtime, complaints, rejects, overtime, safety, quality, etc.)?	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
R4	Has the same condition appeared in another shift, product, outlet, line, site or department?	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
R5	Did management have to repeatedly remind, chase or intervene for the correction to hold?	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
R6	Has the original root-cause assumption been contradicted by new evidence?	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	

Recurrence / workaround / related-signal notes

5. MAKE THE SYSTEM MATCH THE CORRECTION

A correction that lives only in one manager's memory is fragile. Where relevant, make the changed condition part of the controlled operating system.

Ref	System Element	Status	Required Update / Evidence
S1	SOP / policy / work instruction / visual standard	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
S2	Training and competency verification	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
S3	Forms / records / monitoring frequency	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
S4	Preventive maintenance / calibration / equipment controls	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
S5	Purchasing / specifications / supplier controls	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
S6	Staffing / scheduling / responsibility assignment	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
S7	KPI / dashboard / management review	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	
S8	Other sites, lines, outlets or departments requiring replication review	☐ Verified ☐ Partial ☐ Failed ☐ N/A	

System updates completed / still required

6. CLOSURE DECISION

Decision	Select & Explain
CLOSE - VERIFIED EFFECTIVE	☐
EXTEND MONITORING	☐
REOPEN CORRECTIVE ACTION	☐
ESCALATE / SYSTEMIC REVIEW	☐

Decision rationale - cite the evidence, not only the conclusion

If monitoring is extended: what evidence is still required?

If reopened/escalated: what is the next action and owner?

AUTHORIZED CLOSURE

Verifier

Closure date

Case status

Authorized closer

Recheck date

Next tool / case reference

7. SUSTAINED-EFFECTIVENESS RECHECK

Use this page at the scheduled recheck. A case that was correctly closed can still be reopened if the condition returns.

Recheck date / period

Current condition compared with closure condition

Any recurrence, workaround, related failure or drift?

Evidence reviewed

Recheck Decision	Select
SUSTAINED - KEEP CLOSED	☐
REOPEN CASE	☐
ESCALATE / SYSTEMIC REVIEW	☐

Recheck notes / next action

QUICK USE GUIDE

1. **Start only after Tool 5 action is implemented.** Do not use this as a substitute for corrective action planning.
2. **Define success first.** State the expected operating change and pass criteria before reviewing the result.
3. **Verify the real work.** Observe the process and review evidence under normal and pressure conditions where relevant.
4. **Look for recurrence and workarounds.** A result held together by extra labor, rework or constant management intervention is not fully controlled.
5. **Update the system.** Make sure standards, training, monitoring and other controls reflect the correction.
6. **Choose one closure decision.** Close only when evidence supports effectiveness. Otherwise extend, reopen or escalate.
7. **Recheck important cases.** Schedule a later recurrence check for material, safety, quality, financial or systemic issues.

WHAT GOOD CLOSURE LOOKS LIKE

- The original condition no longer exists or is controlled to the defined standard.
- The result survives normal workload and appropriate pressure conditions.
- Evidence supports the conclusion.
- The fix does not depend on one person constantly compensating for the system.
- Relevant documents, training and controls have been updated.
- A named verifier and authorized closer accept the evidence.
- The case can be reopened if the condition returns.

TOOLBOX HANDOFF

If verification fails: return to Tool 4 - Root Cause Finder and Tool 5 - Corrective Action & Accountability Plan. If the condition is wider than the original case, use Tool 1 - Operations Diagnostic and Tool 3 - Pattern Tracker to determine whether the issue is systemic.