WORKSHEET 2.12

Reporting Without Reprisal

Subchapter 2.12 · case in the book: Galway

GUIDING QUESTION

Nobody in your hotel will ever be dismissed for reporting a hazard. Now list the things that can be done to a person's working week without anybody having to justify a decision, and ask which of those would be noticed.

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
List the currencies. What can be taken from somebody's week in your hotel without anybody having to justify a decision? Shifts, section, station, cover, holiday, next season. That list is the map of where reprisal lives, and it is not in your disciplinary procedure.		
Build the look-back. Eight weeks after a report, somebody who does not build rotas checks what happened to that person's hours and shifts. Fifteen minutes a quarter, and it usually finds nothing.		
Write the return criteria and publish them. For seasonal workers this is the only protection that means anything, and it is the one thing a property can offer that is checkable.		
Watch the reporting rate by department, as 1.6 established. It is the most sensitive instrument in the building and it moves within weeks of a single unanswered case.		
Recognise the visible instance when it happens. One publicly known case of an inconvenient report being answered well teaches more than five years of handbook.		
Do not build an approval gate. Making a reporter expensive to manage produces avoidance, which is a reprisal nobody has to decide on and which cannot be appealed.		

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
"Our handbook states that nobody suffers detriment for raising a concern."	A workforce cannot verify a promise about what will not happen; it observes what does. The policy competes with an observation, not with another policy.	
"We have never dismissed or disciplined anybody for reporting."	The guidance names those as examples. In hospitality the currency is shifts, sections, stations and next season, none of which requires a justification or leaves a record.	

What the property took to be true	What actually holds	Our position
“The rota changed for operational reasons.”	Very probably. In an environment where nothing is recorded, neither the accusation nor the defence can be made, and the workforce resolves the uncertainty by watching.	
“Reprisal is an ethical matter, not a technical one.”	The standard treats it as four things at once: a leadership duty, an obstacle to be removed, a hazard to be identified through social factors, and an administrative control.	
“Seasonal staff are protected by the same policy as everyone else.”	Their exposure is the return list, against which no policy operates. The meaningful protection is explicit criteria for being asked back, stated and checkable.	
“The hazard was fixed in three days, so the system worked.”	The reporting system worked once. What the hotel lost was the reporter, and everybody who watched learned the price of the report.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Protecting against dismissal in an industry that penalises with rotas. The formal forms require justification; the hospitality forms require nothing.		
Relying on a policy statement. A workforce cannot verify a promise about what will not happen and resolves the question by observation.		
Treating the subject as ethics. The standard makes it a leadership duty, an obstacle, a hazard and a control, and only the last three can be managed.		
Forgetting the return list. For seasonal workers it is the entire exposure and no policy touches it.		
Building an approval gate. It converts the reporter into an administrative cost and produces avoidance instead of protection.		
Congratulating the property because the hazard was fixed. The hazard was fixed and the reporter left, and the second fact is the one the workforce recorded.		

Operative synthesis

- Reprisal appears in this standard four times and in four roles: a duty of top management, an obstacle to participation that must be determined and removed, a social factor that hazard identification must consider, and an administrative control. Nothing else in the document occupies all four positions, and a property that has read only the first has written a paragraph.
- **The guidance names dismissal and disciplinary action, which are the industrial forms.** Hospitality does not use them: its currency is shifts, sections, stations, cover and next season, none of which requires a justification or leaves a record, which is why a policy prohibiting detriment governs nothing that actually happens. Protection therefore cannot be declared; it can only be observed, which makes the mechanism a look-back (what happened to this person’s hours in the eight weeks after they reported) rather than an approval gate, since making a reporter expensive to manage produces avoidance. And for the seasonal population, whose entire

exposure is the list drawn up in March, the only meaningful protection is explicit, published criteria for being asked back.

- **He reported it in the middle of race week, on the form, to his supervisor, and it was fixed in three days.** Eleven days later the rota moved him to mornings, nobody said anything, and by April he was working somewhere else.
- **That is the last of the requirements that govern how the work is done.** What remains of this chapter belongs to the people who decide whether any of it continues, beginning with the annual hour in which everything in this volume is supposed to be put in front of them, and usually is not.

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 2.12. 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.