WORKSHEET 3.6

Interviewing for Awareness

Subchapter 3.6 · case in the book: Antigua Guatemala

Choose one person whose work touches a significant energy use and ask them a single question: what happens if you leave that machine on through the afternoon. Not whether it is allowed, not what the rule says: what happens. If the answer cannot be given in any unit at all, not money, not time, not quantity, then your training records are evidence of attendance and of nothing else, however many signatures they carry.

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
Build the interview list from the significant energy uses, not from the organisation chart, include the night shift, and add a decision-maker, a buyer and any contractor working on a significant use.		
Ask what happens if, about the specific machine the person touches.		
Ask who would find out, and write the answer down word for word.		
Ask where they learned it, every time the answer is a good one.		
Interview without the supervisor, in the person's working language, and say that not knowing is an acceptable answer.		
Sort every answer into does not know, knows from elsewhere, or knows and is ignoring it.		
Write the third kind as a finding about consequences, and put it on the management desk, not on the person's.		
Never report awareness as a percentage.		

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
«Everybody attended the awareness training and signed for it.»	Attendance is evidence that a session happened. It is not evidence of awareness of anything.	
«All eleven gave the same answer, so the message is consistent.»	Concordance shows a common source. It does not show what the source was, or that anybody understood it.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
«They know the policy.»	The policy is the one item of the four that everybody passes, and the standard also asks about the impact of their own activities.	
«He knows exactly what the machines cost, so awareness is good here.»	Ask where he learned it. Knowledge acquired elsewhere is not evidence about the property's programme.	
«He knows and does it anyway, so he needs retraining.»	If he knows, training will not touch it. What he is responding to is which consequence has his name on it.	
«The quiz scores were high.»	A quiz in a second language tests words reliably and meaning unevenly, and the scores will not show you which.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Auditing awareness by asking about the policy, which is the item everybody passes.		
Reading concordant answers as evidence of a working system.		
Testing facts about the property instead of consequences of the person's own work.		
Stopping before the question about who would find out.		
Classifying all three kinds of answer as an awareness finding and prescribing training for each.		
Interviewing with the supervisor present.		
Conducting the interview in a language the person works in but does not think in.		
Turning the interview into an examination, after which it will report success for ever.		

Operative synthesis

- **Awareness cannot be audited from a signature, and it cannot be audited from a policy question, because the policy is the one thing everybody has been given. It is audited by asking a person what happens if they do the thing they actually do, and then asking who would find out: two questions, in that order, about work the person performs with their own hands.**
- **The three answers that come back are three different findings and keeping them apart is the point of the exercise. Not knowing is a training matter. Knowing from a previous job is evidence that the property's programme is inert. Knowing and doing it anyway is not an awareness finding at all: it is a statement about which consequences the property has attached to which names, and it belongs on a manager's desk rather than on a night porter's.**

- **In Antigua the file was perfect, the attendance was complete, the scores were high, the answers were identical, and one man in the building could say what a machine cost, because he had once paid the bill himself. The remedy the audit proposed was not another course. It was a card on the wall of the laundry with a number on it, in quetzales per hour, in the language the people in that room actually use.**
- **The next subchapter leaves the building. The property buys energy, equipment and certificates from parties outside its control, and the internal auditor has a right to look at that relationship: at what a contract obliges a supplier to disclose, and at what a certificate does and does not assert about this hotel.**

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 3.6. 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.