WORKSHEET 4.9

The Decision, and Who Actually Makes It

Subchapter 4.9 · case in the book: Warsaw

GUIDING QUESTION

Find the audit report from your last visit and read it for ten minutes as though you had never seen your own property, because the person who decides on your certificate never has. Count how many of its statements would allow a stranger to tell whether your system works. That count, and not the closing meeting, is what your certificate will be decided on.

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
Communicate nothing outside the property until the decision is in writing.		
Ask at the closing meeting who decides, on what basis, and by when.		
Read the draft report as a stranger would, for the two or three areas that carry your risk.		
Correct facts precisely; never request changes to findings or wording.		
Note during the audit what was examined in the critical areas, so you can tell whether the report carries it.		
Brief the general manager and the sales director on the difference between a recommendation and a decision.		
Download the body's appeal route and decision timescales, and file them with the agreement.		
Agree in advance who chases the body, when, and what the internal message is if it runs long.		

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 auditor certified us on Thursday.»	He recommended. The decision is made afterwards by somebody who was not in the building.	
«The review is a formality.»	It can require more evidence, send the matter back, reclassify a finding or decline. Usually it confirms; that is not the same thing.	
«The reviewer can ask the auditor what he saw.»	The decision rests on the audit information. What was seen and not written does not exist at the review.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
«We can ask for a finding to be softened in the draft.»	You may correct facts. Editing the judgement would destroy the impartiality you are paying for.	
«The certificate is dated from the audit.»	It is valid from the date of the decision, which is why announcements made in between are announcements about nothing.	
«If we disagree with the decision, we can argue it with the auditor.»	There is a defined appeal route, handled by people not involved in the decision under appeal.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Treating a recommendation at the closing meeting as a certificate.		
Committing to a certificate date in a tender, a contract or a marketing claim.		
Reviewing the draft report for typographical accuracy and nothing else.		
Asking for findings to be softened, reclassified or removed before the decision.		
Telephoning the lead auditor during the review to ask him to intervene.		
Reading the interval between audit and decision as a sign that something is wrong.		

Operative synthesis

- **Two acts, two people.** The audit gathers evidence and recommends; the decision weighs that evidence and is taken by somebody who was not there. Almost every surprise a property experiences in the weeks after an audit comes from collapsing those two acts into one, and the collapse is easy because the auditor is the only person the property has met.
- **The practical consequence is that the report is the property, as far as the decision is concerned.** Whatever was seen, explained, demonstrated or understood in three days exists at the review only in so far as it was written down. This is not a reason to manage the report; it is a reason to make the critical areas easy to evidence while the auditor is present, and to read what he wrote about them as a stranger would.
- The separations that produce this friction (between auditing and deciding, between advising and certifying, between selling and judging) are the entire mechanical basis of the document's worth. A property that experiences them as obstruction is objecting to the reason its certificate means anything to the client who asked for it, and the conversation that ought to follow in any hotel is not about the delay but about what the delay is protecting.
- **In Warsaw the audit was sound, the auditor was right, the system was mature and the certificate was issued.** Two minor findings, ninety minutes on a plant floor that produced a satisfactory conclusion and four lines of text, one reviewer who had never seen the building and could not tell from those four lines what had been examined, eleven days of silence, three weeks of resolution, and a tender that had to be corrected because a closing meeting had been heard as a decision. The only irrecoverable part was the letter to the client.
- **A certificate now exists, dated from the decision and valid for a fixed period.** What happens to it during that period (who comes back, how often, what they look at, and why a system can be lost between one visit and the next) 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 4.9. 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.