WORKSHEET 3.5

The Energy Near-Miss

Subchapter 3.5 · case in the book: Busan

Ask whoever operates your building management system for two lists covering the last twelve months: every occasion on which a control was placed in manual, and the moment each one was returned to automatic. Then read your twelve monthly energy reports and count how many of those occasions appear in them. The difference between the two numbers is the quantity of information your property generated, paid nothing for, and threw away.

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
Obtain the manual-override log from the building management system for the last twelve months.		
Sort the returns into those made by the system and those made by a person.		
For each of the second kind, record what was changed, why, what returned it, and what it would have cost if it had held.		
Compare that list with the monthly reports and note how many appear in neither.		
Add three lines to the shift handover: what is in manual, why, and when it must be returned.		
State the rule that the register is never used in relation to an individual, and say it again when asked.		
In the operating criteria, write how each control returns from manual.		
Ask, and record, whether the register has ever been used against anybody.		

These steps are the book's method, not requirements of ISO 50001. 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
«We have had no significant deviation in two years.»	That is a statement about what crossed a line the property drew itself. It says nothing about what happened beneath it.	
«The override was returned, so there is nothing to report.»	It matters what returned it. A timed control returning itself is an operating control; a man remembering at two in the morning is luck.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
«The rise was explained by the weather.»	A true explanation covering most of a rise is routinely accepted as an explanation of all of it.	
«Near-miss reporting is a safety concept.»	The structure transfers exactly: an event whose consequence was cancelled still contains its cause.	
«If we log overrides we will see who is responsible.»	The first time the log is used that way it stops being a log, and nobody will tell you it has stopped.	
«Our engineers are experienced, so overrides get returned.»	They do, and that is the finding: the property's operational control currently consists of one person's memory.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Reporting no significant deviation as though it were a statement about the property rather than about a threshold.		
Treating a return as a success without asking what produced it.		
Accepting a true explanation that covers most of a rise as an explanation of the whole rise.		
Recording near-misses in a system that also carries names for performance purposes.		
Setting a target number of entries, which guarantees the register fills with nothing.		
Correcting the engineer rather than the handover.		
Building a procedure where a notebook was asked for.		

Operative synthesis

- **A property that has recorded no significant deviation has made a statement about a line it drew itself. Underneath that line, in a hotel with a building management system, sits a year of events in which a control was altered for a good reason and came back because somebody remembered. Those events cost nothing, contain the same causes as the ones that cost something, and are already written down in a log nobody has asked for.**
- **The definition that makes them usable is narrow on purpose. A change to a control, a schedule, a set point or an operating state which would have produced a significant deviation had it persisted, and which did not persist for a reason other than the system's own controls. What the system corrected is a control working. What a person happened to catch is luck, and a list of luck is a map of where the property has no control at all.**
- **Two conditions keep the collection alive and both are social rather than technical. The register records correct acts, because most near-misses are correct acts. And it is never, on any**

occasion, used in relation to a person: a rule that costs nothing to keep and cannot be recovered once broken.

› **Han Ji-eun's report contained one sentence that the group has since put into its own audit guidance. A property with forty-one returned overrides and two permanent ones does not have a good energy management system with two bad months. It has a system that is working forty-one times a year in a way nobody designed, and the next subchapter is about the only reliable way to find out whether the people doing that work understand what they are doing, which is not by reading their training records.**

Action plan for our property

Action	Owner	Due	How we will know it worked

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 4b «The Lens», subchapter 3.5. Edizioni Effedore, 2026. Clause references are paraphrased; this sheet does not reproduce the text of ISO 50001, ISO 50003 or ISO/IEC 17021-1. It is not legal advice: energy law is that of the place where the property operates.