WORKSHEET 3.15

Reporting Upward, and the Programme That Survives the Season

Subchapter 3.15 · case in the book: Kotor

GUIDING QUESTION

If the person who runs your internal audits did not come back in May, what would the next person inherit, and would they be able to tell why the programme says what it says?

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
Write one page per department, in the language its people use, and hand it over at a briefing. Then ask somebody what the last audit found.		
Give management review a judgement in a sentence, not a count of findings.		
Add the second column to the programme: why this entry, and when that reason was last true.		
Write the handover for a stranger, and write it before October rather than after.		
Carry a recurring-findings page forward from season to season. Without it every finding looks new.		
Carry forward a line naming every finding waiting for a decision rather than for work, and present it at the review as exactly that.		
Write the departmental sheet in the language the department actually works in. Half a page, and it decides whether anything arrives.		
Report relevant results, not the whole report. Publication produces negotiation, not information.		

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
«The audit report goes to the general manager.»	It goes to relevant managers, and the relevant results also go to workers and their representatives. This standard names them; the quality standard does not.	
«Workers are informed through their head of department.»	A cascade that cannot be evidenced is not reporting. The test is whether a room attendant could say what the last audit found in her department.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
«Management review receives the audit results: we report the numbers.»	Eleven findings, nine closed is a statement about the audit function. The input required is information about whether the system is effectively implemented.	
«The programme is documented, so it is retained.»	The decisions are documented. The reasons are usually in a person, and the standard expects workers to have clear and understandable information about the system, which a programme without its reasons gives nobody.	
«A new coordinator can read the file and continue.»	They can repeat it. Maintaining a programme means changing it for reasons, and the reasons are the part that was not written.	
«Reporting to workers risks alarming people.»	Relevant results, not the whole report. The people concerned were in the building when the condition existed; the report is not where they learn of it.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Reporting upward only. Upward is the part of a hotel that turns over fastest.		
Reporting counts to management review. It produces a discussion about the audit rather than about the property.		
Recording the programme without its reasons. The successor can repeat it and cannot maintain it.		
Writing the handover for a colleague. Write it for a stranger, because that is usually who arrives.		
Letting each season’s findings look new. Without a recurring list, the sixth occurrence reads like the first.		
Letting the findings that need money disappear between reports. They cannot be closed by anybody who receives them.		
Publishing the full report to everybody. It teaches heads of department to manage the audit instead of the risk.		

Operative synthesis

- This chapter has been about an instrument that belongs to the property and is carried, almost everywhere in this industry, by one person. Everything in it (the programme built on hours, the criteria that were chosen rather than inherited, the evidence corroborated before it was written, the sample drawn from a population rather than a list, the finding that travelled faster than a report) exists in that person’s judgement, and judgement is the one thing a filing system does not retain by default.
- **So the chapter closes on two destinations.** The results go to relevant managers and, because this standard says so and the quality standard does not, to the workers whose exposure was examined. In a seasonal property that second destination is not a formality: management turns over and the workforce returns, and reporting downward places the audit history in the only part of the organisation that will still be present in three years.
- **And the programme goes to whoever comes next, which means it has to carry its reasons and not only its decisions.** Two columns instead of one, a page of recurring findings, a handover

written for a stranger. An afternoon a year, against three seasons of judgement bought a second time in May.

- And the findings that needed a decision rather than work are the ones that vanish first: they cannot be closed by the department, cannot be authorised by the coordinator, and stop appearing in reports because each report is written about its own audit. Carried forward as a single line (these are waiting for a decision only this room can make) they are the one thing that makes a management review a meeting about the property rather than about the audit function.
- **A programme that followed the hours, reached the contractors, was weighted to July and named what it had not examined.** A coordinator who did not come back and a general manager who had moved over the winter. A folder, a spreadsheet, and twenty people who return every May and had never been told what a single audit found.
- **All of which is the property looking at itself.** In the second half of this volume somebody arrives from outside who has never seen the building, will spend a few days in it, and will decide whether what it has built is worth a certificate.

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 3.15. 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.