WORKSHEET 1.6

Leadership and the Duty That Cannot Be Delegated

Subchapter 1.6 · case in the book: Montevideo

GUIDING QUESTION

Name one decision in the last twelve months that went the expensive way for safety reasons. Who took it, and if nobody can name one, what does that tell you about where the accountability actually sits?

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
Apply the expensive decision test. Find one decision in the last twelve months that went the costly way for safety reasons, and identify who took it. The answer, or the absence of one, is the most honest measurement of leadership available and it takes ten minutes.		
Put safety into the documents where decisions are made rather than into documents about safety. One line on the capital sheet, one field on the banquet event order, one standing item in the operations meeting where the roster is agreed. Integration is a change to existing paperwork, not new paperwork.		
Write the list of decisions that require a safety input before they are taken: refurbishment scheduling, event acceptance above a threshold, changes to shift patterns, new equipment, change of contractor. Ten lines, signed by the general manager, and it is the arrangement that a word cannot substitute for.		
Watch the reporting rate as a leadership indicator rather than a safety one. A fall of the size seen at Pocitos is not a sign that hazards have decreased; it is a measurement of what people expect will happen to them, and it responds to management behaviour within weeks.		
Treat any adverse change to a reporter's conditions as a matter for the top of the house, not for the department. It need not be a disciplinary process. It needs to be visible, answered, and known to have been answered, because the audience is everybody who saw the first thing happen.		
Push authority outward once the accountability is clear. Support heads of department to lead in their own areas, and make it explicit that a rota, a purchase and a shift pattern are safety instruments in their hands. Accountability at the top and authority only at the top is the concentration failure described above.		

These steps are the book's method, not requirements of ISO 45001. 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 the property took to be true	What actually holds	Our position
“Safety is Andrea’s responsibility. That is why we employ her.”	The clause requires top management to take overall responsibility and accountability for prevention. The work is delegable; that ownership is not, and naming a specialist does not transfer it.	
“We support the safety function fully: her budget is never cut.”	Resources are one item on a list of thirteen. Integration into business processes, culture, protection from reprisal and the existence of a consultation process are separate obligations, and none of them is discharged by funding.	
“The rota is housekeeping’s business.”	Where the rota is used to move somebody who reported a hazard, it is the reprisal the clause requires top management to protect against, and it is exactly the kind of matter over which a safety function has no authority.	
“The safety meeting is where safety is managed.”	The requirement is integration into the organisation’s business processes. A system that appears in a separate meeting and in none of the documents where decisions are taken is running alongside the business rather than inside it.	
“The general manager had a word. The matter was dealt with.”	A word is not a decision and leaves no trace. Two hundred and ten people had already read the outcome from the rota, which does leave one.	
“Our reporting rate proves the culture is healthy.”	A reporting rate measures what people believe will happen to them if they report. It is the most sensitive instrument in the building, and it moves within weeks of a single unpunished reprisal.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Reading the appointment of a competent safety manager as the discharge of the duty. It is the delegation of the work, and the clause is explicit that the accountability does not travel with it.		
Running the system alongside the business. A separate meeting with excellent minutes is not integration, and the test is whether safety appears in the documents where decisions are actually taken.		
Answering a reprisal with a word. It leaves no trace, and the audience has already read the trace that the rota left.		
Treating the reporting rate as a safety statistic. It is a measurement of trust, it is the most sensitive instrument in the building, and it falls faster than any hazard can be created.		
Confusing leadership with presence. An owner who takes everything personally produces a property that works while he is watching and reverts within a season, which the clause anticipates by requiring support for other management roles.		
Believing the policy on the wall is evidence. At Pocitos it was signed, framed, accurate and entirely uninvolved in anything that happened.		

Operative synthesis

- **The work of safety is delegable and the accountability for it is not.** This standard states that directly, requiring top management to take overall responsibility and accountability for the prevention of injury and ill health, and adding four obligations that no safety department can discharge on its own: integration into business processes, culture, protection from reprisal, and the existence of a consultation process.
- Integration is the operative test, because in a hotel the business processes are the roster, the budget, the capital plan and the commercial calendar, and a system that appears in none of them is running alongside the business however competently it is run. The short version fits in a corridor: name one decision in the last twelve months that went the expensive way for safety reasons, and name who took it. The absence of an answer is the finding. And the arrangement that follows must push authority outward as well as holding accountability at the top, because a property in which only one person can act has exchanged one failure for a slower one.
- **Nobody announced anything.** Two hundred and ten people watched what happened to somebody who reported a lift, drew the correct conclusion, and the best safety instrument the hotel owned was switched off by a rota.
- Which leaves the requirement that the general manager could not have delegated even if he had wanted to, and that this standard alone among the three in this series makes a matter of obligation rather than of good practice: that the people who do the work take part in deciding how it is made safe, and that whatever stands in the way of their doing so is removed.

Action plan for our property

Action	Owner	Due	How we will know it worked

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 3a «The Helm», subchapter 1.6. Edizioni Effedore, 2026. Clause references are paraphrased; this sheet does not reproduce the text of ISO 45001. It is not legal advice: health and safety law is that of the place where the property operates.