WORKSHEET 2.13

Management Review at the Board Table

Subchapter 2.13 · case in the book: Luang Prabang

GUIDING QUESTION

Read the minutes of your last three management reviews side by side. How many of them contain a sentence that could only have been written about that particular year?

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
Read the last three minutes side by side. If the concluding sentence is identical, the review has been recording a formula rather than reaching a verdict, and the diagnosis takes ten minutes.		
Write the conclusion as three paragraphs (fit, implementation, results) and refuse to accept any of them that could have been written last year.		
Map the seven outputs against who can decide them. Where two of them sit above the room's authority, that is a routing problem to be solved rather than a failure to be minuted as noted.		
Bring consultation and participation as a performance input. It is named in the clause, no hotel does it, and it is the input that would tell top management most about whether anything in this volume is working.		
Distribute the review across the year. The guidance permits it, four sessions of an hour beat one of a day, and only one of the four has to carry the judgement.		
Communicate the outputs downward in a paragraph. It is required, it costs nothing, and until it happens the exercise is invisible to everybody who fed it.		

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
"We hold the review annually and minute the conclusion."	The conclusion is three separate verdicts: does the system fit this organisation, is it implemented appropriately, is it achieving its intended results. Reciting the three words is not answering the three questions.	
"The review considers all the required inputs."	Performance information is to be expressed in terms of trends, and the consultation and participation of workers is a named input. A single year of figures and no account of consultation supplies neither.	

What the property took to be true	What actually holds	Our position
“The meeting produced minutes and an action list.”	The clause requires decisions on seven matters, including resources needed, integration with other business processes and implications for strategic direction. Noted is not a decision.	
“The general manager chairs it, so top management has reviewed the system.”	Very possibly true, and two of the seven required decisions sit above his spending authority. A property should establish who can decide what before deciding where the review is held.	
“Resources were raised and referred to the budget process.”	The adequacy of resources is a required input and resources needed is a required output. Referral to a template in which the line does not exist is the mechanism by which the requirement is satisfied and defeated at once.	
“The review is a management matter.”	Top management is to communicate the relevant outputs to workers and their representatives. A review whose conclusions never leave the room is, from the operation’s side, indistinguishable from one that did not happen.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Reciting suitable, adequate and effective. They are three separate verdicts with three separate definitions in the guidance.		
Reviewing inputs and producing no decisions. The clause is built around seven outputs, and most hotels deliver two.		
Holding the review at a table that cannot decide two of the seven. It is a routing problem, and noted is the honest record of it.		
Presenting one year of numbers. Performance information is to be given in terms of trends, and a trend needs more than one point.		
Leaving out consultation and participation. It is a named performance input and it is the one that would tell top management whether the rest of the system is real.		
Keeping the conclusions in the room. Communicating the relevant outputs to workers and their representatives is a requirement, not a courtesy.		
Answering everything in one day a year. The guidance says the topics need not be addressed all at once, and the annual production is unrepeatable by design.		

Operative synthesis

- The management review is a judgement, and the judgement is three separate ones: whether the system fits this organisation, whether it is implemented appropriately, and whether it is achieving its intended results. A minute reciting all three words in a single sentence, identical across three years, is a formula rather than a verdict.
- The clause is built around seven required outputs, of which most hotels produce two, and the last three (resources needed, integration with other business processes, implications for strategic direction) are the reason it belongs at a table where those things can be decided. In a managed property they frequently cannot be, and the honest response is to route them rather than to

minute them as noted. The inputs include performance expressed as trends, the adequacy of resources, and the consultation and participation of workers, which is the input no hotel brings. The outputs are to be communicated to workers. And the whole thing can be distributed across the year, which the guidance permits and which is the only version most properties can sustain.

- Three years of minutes, three identical closing sentences, and seven required decisions of which two had ever been taken. The two that could not be taken in that room had been recorded, accurately, as noted.
- One input to that review is named in the clause and has been circling this volume since the first subchapter, where the standard's opening sentence extended the property's responsibility to physical and mental health. What that means in a hotel (in hours, in workload, in the shape of a season) is what remains.

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 2.13. 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.