WORKSHEET 4.8

Nonconformities, Root Cause and the Response the Body Accepts

Subchapter 4.8 · case in the book: Banff

GUIDING QUESTION

Find the last three corrective actions your property closed. Read only the cause you wrote for each, and give yourself thirty seconds per cause to answer one question: if this cause were removed tomorrow, would the conditions that produced the problem be gone, or would preventing it still rest on a careful person? If the honest answer is the second, you have probably written a symptom in the space where the cause goes, three times.

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
Go to the place and ask the people who were there, before drafting anything.		
Apply the carefulness test to every cause: could this still happen to someone tired or new?		
List the controls whose required authority is absent at the hour the work occurs.		
Do the extension, and write down where you looked and what you found there.		
Decide what evidence the operation will generate by running, before choosing the action.		
Read the finding back at the closing meeting to confirm the requirement and the evidence.		
Name the owner and the dates in the first week of the permitted period.		
Keep one form with five sections, and abandon whatever else you have built.		

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
«Retraining the person closes the finding.»	That is a correction. It deals with the instance and leaves the condition that produced it untouched.	
«Human error is a root cause.»	It is where the analysis stopped. A cause that depends on someone being careful has not been found.	
«A major finding means somebody was in danger.»	It means the system's ability to achieve its outcomes is in doubt. Nobody need have been at risk that day.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
«The auditor can tell us what the cause is.»	He states the requirement, the evidence and the gap. Supplying the cause would make him the author of the remedy.	
«A good plan closes the nonconformity.»	A plan closes nothing. Evidence of implementation and of effect closes it.	
«The finding concerns the place where it was found.»	The requirement extends to wherever the same condition could exist, and the property must go and look.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Submitting the correction and calling it the corrective action.		
Writing a person, a lapse or an attitude into the space where the cause belongs.		
Stopping at insufficient awareness when the whole population shares it.		
Declaring a finding isolated without evidencing any search elsewhere.		
Sending a plan as closure evidence for a major finding.		
Reaching a cause so deep that no identifiable person can act on it this quarter.		

Operative synthesis

- A nonconformity is an invitation to find out why the system allowed something, and almost every rejected response is a property answering a different question: what happened, or who did it. The distinction between correction and corrective action is the whole discipline, and it can be held in one sentence: the correction deals with this morning, the corrective action deals with every morning after.
- **The strongest responses share a shape.** They were written after somebody went and asked. They name a condition rather than a person. They remove that condition by changing a route, an authority, a time or a design. They report where else the property looked and what it found. And they close with evidence the operation produced by running, not with a document produced to be sent.
- There is a temptation to treat the whole exercise as an administrative transaction with the certification body, to be completed at the lowest cost that will be accepted. That instinct is exactly inverted. The response is the only point in the certification cycle at which an outsider obliges a property to examine the design of its own arrangements, and the properties that get value from certification are the ones that treat a returned response as the beginning of the useful part.
- **In Banff nobody was hurt and nobody was careless.** Two men clipped onto anchor points at six in the morning and cleared an ice dam before the doors opened, because a signature they needed did not exist at that hour and the doors opened anyway. It took two rejected responses to find that out, a trained deputy to fix it, and fourteen permits in six weeks to prove it: seven of them raised at a time of day the old system had made impossible. The extension found the same contradiction in three more places, none of which any audit had ever reached.
- What happens to the response once it is accepted is not, however, the end of the matter, and here properties are routinely surprised. The auditor who raised the finding and verified its closure

does not decide whether the certificate is issued. Somebody who has never been to the property does, on the strength of a document, and what that document contains, and what it cannot contain, is the subject of the next subchapter.

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 4.8. 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.