WORKSHEET 3.14

The Quality of an Incident Investigation, and What Audit Does With It

Subchapter 3.14 · case in the book: Santiago

GUIDING QUESTION

Read your last twenty incident investigations in one sitting rather than one at a time. Count how many conclude with a cause that names a person, and how many end in retraining. The two numbers travel together in most properties, and neither is visible from a single file.

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 twenty investigations in one sitting and count the four things. One hour, and the counts are unarguable.		
Test every stated cause: would it still be true if the person had been somebody else.		
Classify the corrective action by rung, and ask what was considered above it.		
Check whether a non-managerial worker took part in determining the action, not merely in being interviewed.		
Build next year's audit programme from the set. It is composed of events the property has already accepted as real.		
Compare the two dates every form carries: when it happened and when the enquiry began. Timely in a hotel means before the space is used again.		
Find a near miss and an injury from the same task and compare the files. Where the near miss has none, that is the finding.		
Look for the review of effectiveness. In most properties completion is recorded and effectiveness never is.		

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 is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
«Human error is a legitimate conclusion.»	It is a description of what happened, not of why. The clause asks for root causes so that the event does not recur, and the next person in that role will do the same thing.	
«Retraining is a corrective action.»	It is an action at the fourth rung. Where no higher rung was examined, the hierarchy has not been applied to the corrective action, which the clause requires.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
«The head of department should investigate their own area.»	They hold the knowledge and the conflict. Nothing forbids it and everything argues for somebody else being in the room.	
«Investigations are records to be sampled.»	They are the property's own account of why its system failed, in its own words. They are evidence, and read as a set they are the richest source an audit has.	
«Workers are interviewed during the investigation, which satisfies participation.»	Being interviewed is being a source. The clause names participation in determining corrective actions, which is a different act.	
«If the action was completed, the finding is closed.»	The clause separately requires the effectiveness of the corrective action to be reviewed. Completion and effectiveness are different questions.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Stopping the enquiry at the first person in the chain. It is true, it is unhelpful, and the next person will do the same thing.		
Answering a cause located in a person with an action located in a person. The loop can run indefinitely without the building changing.		
Reading investigations one at a time. The pattern across a set is invisible from any file in it.		
Leaving the enquiry to the head of the department where it happened. The knowledge and the conflict sit in the same person.		
Treating interview as participation. The clause names taking part in determining the action.		
Closing on completion. Effectiveness is a separate requirement and is almost never recorded.		
Investigating injuries and logging near misses. The standard draws no such line, and the pattern takes three times as long to appear.		

Operative synthesis

- **An investigation is a process with an output, and the output can be assessed by anybody without technical knowledge.** Three tests do most of the work. Does the stated cause survive the person: would it still be true if somebody else had been there. Does the corrective action sit at a rung the enquiry actually examined, or at the rung the enquiry started from. And did a non-managerial worker take part in determining the action, which the clause names and which almost no hotel record shows.
- **The fourth test cannot be applied to a file at all.** Read one at a time, twenty-three investigations are twenty-three properties doing the right thing. Read in one sitting they are a process that converts events into statements about the people they happened to, and then trains those people, and they contain a ramp that appears six times and has never once been the subject of a corrective action.
- **Which is also why the set belongs to the audit rather than to the file.** It is the property's own account, in its own words, of why its system failed, on every occasion it accepts that it did. As a

basis for next year's audit programme it is better than the clause list and better than the register, because nothing in it has to be argued for.

- And the other near misses on that ramp sit outside the set altogether, recorded as lines in a log rather than as investigations, which is why the ramp needed six events to become visible instead of two. An event that injured nobody is investigated in most hotels only if somebody insists, and the standard draws no such line: the enquiry follows what could have happened.
- **Nine causes naming a person.** Fourteen actions that were training, eleven of them retraining the person who was hurt. Six events on one ramp, four managers, eighteen months, and a ramp exactly as it was on the first day.
- All of which has to reach somebody who can change a ramp, which is a question about where the audit's findings go, and who reads them when they get there.

Action plan for our property

Action	Owner	Due	How we will know it worked

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 3b «The Lens», subchapter 3.14. 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.