WORKSHEET 3.5

Consultation and Participation Inside the Audit Programme

Subchapter 3.5 · case in the book: Rotorua

GUIDING QUESTION

Your workers have been asked what is dangerous in this building. When were they last asked where the auditor should go, and at what hour, and who, exactly, was in the room when that question was put?

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
Put the other question at the next committee, in those words: where would you send an auditor, and at what hour.		
Put it again where the programme never goes: the night briefing, the contracted crew, the seasonal intake in their third week.		
Show people the programme. One page, the departments and the hours, before it is fixed.		
Name the obstacles in your property rather than asserting there are none, and attach a countermeasure to each.		
Record what was proposed and what was decided, including a reasoned decision to change nothing. That line is the evidence; without it the consultation is invisible.		
Check who answered last time. Four years of the same five names is a relationship, not a sample.		
Ask the contracted and agency crews through their supervisor, in their own shift. A refusal is a finding about the arrangement.		
Report the relevant findings back to the people who were consulted, naming the finding that came from what they said.		

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
«Consultation is about hazards.»	Hazards are on the list. So are the policy, the objectives, the controls applied to contractors, what is monitored, and the audit programme.	
«The audit programme is a technical document; workers have nothing to contribute to it.»	It is named as a matter for consultation with non-managerial workers. They are also the only people who know what happens during the hours it does not visit.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
«We have a committee, therefore we consult.»	A mechanism is required and is not sufficient. The requirement names the matters, the time, the information and the removal of obstacles: four things a committee does not supply by existing.	
«We asked everybody in the annual survey.»	The survey asked what is dangerous. Where the auditor should go is a different question with different answers, and it has probably never been asked.	
«Consultation outside working time shows commitment.»	The standard requires the time to be provided. Unpaid attendance is an obstacle, and obstacles are to be removed rather than admired.	
«We report audit results to management, who cascade them.»	The requirement names workers and their representatives directly. A cascade that cannot be evidenced is not the reporting the clause asks for.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Consulting about hazards only. The standard's list reaches the system's own processes, and the audit programme is named on it.		
Asking the question only where the programme already goes. The morning committee cannot describe the hours it does not work.		
Treating a mechanism as the requirement. A committee is a mechanism; matters, time, information and obstacles are the requirement.		
Asserting that there are no obstacles. Determining them means producing a list, and most seasonal hotels share the same five.		
Accepting everything proposed. The question is where the property's attention should go, not what people would like improved; but ask of each proposal what exposure lies behind it before setting it aside.		
Consulting and then reporting nothing back. It teaches the workforce, accurately, that the exercise was decorative.		

Operative synthesis

- The audit programme is named in the standard as a matter on which non-managerial workers are to be consulted, and few properties have acted on it. Consultation is understood as being about hazards; the lists also reach the policy, the objectives, the controls over contractors, what is monitored, and the programme itself.
- **The reason it matters is that the two questions are not the same.** Asked what is dangerous, people name what is already in the register. Asked where an auditor should be sent, and at what hour, they name what has never been looked at, which is a statement about the property's attention rather than about its risks, and it is the only source for that information anywhere in the building.
- There is also an obligation most properties have never noticed, and it sits in the same clause: mechanisms, time, training and resources are to be provided. Training appears in that list, and it is not training about hazards. It is whatever a worker needs in order to take part: which, for somebody in their first season, in a second language, who has never been in a room where a

manager asked a question and waited for the answer, is not nothing. A property that provides a mechanism and no preparation has met part of the sentence and wonders why the room is quiet.

- The requirement also asks for the time to be provided, for the information to be accessible, and for obstacles to be determined and removed. In a seasonal hotel the obstacles are usually the same five, and the population holding the most useful answers is the one furthest behind all five. The audit clause closes the circuit by requiring the relevant results to go back to workers, which is what makes the question worth answering a second time.
- **One practical note on timing, because the exercise has a season.** The best moment to ask where an auditor should be sent is not at the start of the year, when the programme is being written and the property is quiet, but six or eight weeks into the peak, when the operations that exist only in season are running, when the newest people have been there long enough to have formed a view, and when the difficulty is present rather than remembered. The programme can still be moved at that point, and subchapter 3.2 established that moving it is what maintaining it means.
- **A treatment block on a still morning.** A changeover at four with two hundred arrivals in forty minutes. A bore head that nobody from the office had visited in eleven years. Three answers, from one question, asked once, in a property that had been consulting properly for years.
- Which leaves the auditor standing in the treatment block at seven in the morning with a smell nobody has assessed, and the question of how an audit tests a hazard identification process against what it never found.

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 3.5. 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.