SITE survey. APP

SITE SURVEY REPORT

Food Product Recall Exercise

Prepared for	Marshgate Bakery Ltd
Date	23 Sep 2026
Site	Marshgate Bakery, Wisbech
Prepared by	S. O'Connell

FORM

Food Product Recall Exercise

1. Record details and scope

Project	Marshgate Bakery, Wisbech: product recall exercise (completed example)
Site or premises address	Marshgate Bakery, Unit 3, Marsh Lane, Wisbech
Client or organisation	Marshgate Bakery Ltd
Record date	23 Sep 2026
Person completing the record	S. O'Connell, technical manager, Marshgate Bakery Ltd

> This is a simulated food recall exercise, not a public recall notice, an assessment of whether food is unsafe or an automatic notification tool. It does not cover all non-food product regimes.

> Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 (General Food Law, retained in UK law), Article 18 requires traceability one step back and one step forward, and Article 19 requires a food business that believes its food is unsafe to withdraw it, recall it from consumers where needed, and inform the competent authority. FSA guidance covers planning for food withdrawals and recalls, including traceability and incident response. An exercise can test those arrangements; an actual food incident requires the business to follow the applicable reporting and response process.

2. Simulation brief

Simulated issue, product and batches	EXERCISE: possible undeclared milk in steak and ale pies, batches MB-0915-A and MB-0915-B, after a supplier glaze mix-up
Approved recall procedure reference	Withdrawal and recall procedure QP-09 rev 4
Exercise leader and participants	S. O'Connell, with the production manager, despatch lead and office manager
How exercise communications are clearly marked as simulation	Every email, call script and note headed EXERCISE ONLY, NO ACTION ON PRODUCT. Customers told in advance on 2026-09-16.

3. Response timeline

Exercise event 1: 2026-09-23 09:00

Date/time	2026-09-23 09:00
Decision or simulated contact	Simulated supplier call received about glaze mix-up
Responsible role	Technical manager
Evidence or contact-list reference	Exercise log EX-0923 entry 1

Exercise event 2: 2026-09-23 09:20

Date/time	2026-09-23 09:20
Decision or simulated contact	Incident team called together, batches identified from production records
Responsible role	Technical manager
Evidence or contact-list reference	Production sheets PS-0915

Exercise event 3: 2026-09-23 10:05

Date/time	2026-09-23 10:05
Decision or simulated contact	Despatch records pulled for both batches
Responsible role	Despatch lead
Evidence or contact-list reference	Despatch log DL-09
Delay or gap identified	Farm shop delivery on 16 September recorded on a paper note, not in the despatch log. Found after 25 minutes.

Exercise event 4: 2026-09-23 10:40

Date/time	2026-09-23 10:40
Decision or simulated contact	Simulated calls to the four business customers using the exercise script
Responsible role	Office manager
Evidence or contact-list reference	Customer contact list CCL-03
Delay or gap identified	One customer phone number out of date. Reached by email instead.

Exercise event 5: 2026-09-23 11:30

Date/time	2026-09-23 11:30
Decision or simulated contact	Decision recorded: simulated recall to consumer level would be needed. Plan for notifying the local authority reviewed but not sent.
Responsible role	Technical manager
Evidence or contact-list reference	Exercise log EX-0923 entry 9

4. Batch reconciliation

Traceability exercise/report reference	Traceability exercise TE-0923, run in the same session
Distributed quantity and unit	960 pies (480 per batch)

Quantity located, held or simulated recovered	912 pies: 300 held in our chiller, 612 confirmed at customers by phone (simulated)
Unreconciled quantity and explanation	48 pies not reconciled. Farm shop sold some before the call; they could not say how many were left. Treated as reaching consumers.
Simulated disposition plan reference	Simulated hold and return plan RP-0923

5. Debrief

Contact, decision and retrieval weaknesses	Paper delivery notes are missed by the despatch log. Customer contact list not checked since spring. Decision to escalate took 2.5 hours from first call, inside the 4-hour target in QP-09.
Retest scope and responsible person	Retest in January with a different product, S. O'Connell
Reviewer	D. Hart, managing director

6. Actions and review

Are further actions required?	Yes

Further action 1: All deliveries to go in the despatch log, including farm shop runs

Action and evidence reference	All deliveries to go in the despatch log, including farm shop runs
Person responsible	Despatch lead
Target date	30 Sep 2026
Action status	Completed
Completion evidence	Despatch log updated with a farm shop line from 24 September.

Further action 2: Check and update the customer contact list every quarter

Action and evidence reference	Check and update the customer contact list every quarter
Person responsible	Office manager
Target date	7 Oct 2026
Action status	In progress
Outstanding limitations and information to pass on	Exercise only. No product was unsafe and no real recall notice was issued.
Record status	Ready for review
Reviewed by	D. Hart, managing director
Review date	25 Sep 2026

Author signature



Signing records the information entered. It does not itself certify legal compliance, remove a limitation or authorise unsafe work.