WORKSHEET 4.5

The Audit Team, and Competence in a Performance Standard

Subchapter 4.5 · case in the book: Bergen

Open your last two audit reports and look for the paragraph in which the auditor tested your normalisation, not the sentence confirming that you have one, and not the note that a method is documented, but the passage in which somebody from outside your property examined whether the method works. If there is no such passage in either report, the single component your entire reported performance rests on has never been looked at by anybody who did not build it.

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
Write one sentence naming what your reported performance rests on.		
Ask, before the visit, who is coming and in what role.		
Where the system rests on a model, request a technical expert and expect to pay for a day.		
Where you can, simplify the method until you can defend it yourself.		
Ask whether any team member has advised this property, and when.		
Request an interpreter where the people operating the significant uses do not work in the audit's language.		
During a witness audit, answer what is asked and notice what the assessor asks the team.		
Object only with a reason, and state it in writing.		
As auditor, say in the report what you were not competent to examine, and what you verified instead.		

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
«The auditor confirmed our normalisation.»	Confirmed that it exists, is documented, predates the results and was applied consistently. Those are procedural tests, and a model that does not work passes all four.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
«Both auditors were highly experienced.»	In the standard and in hotels. The third competence is quantitative, and nothing in their qualification pathway required it.	
«The audit team is the body's business.»	You are entitled to know who is coming and in what role, and to object with a reason.	
«A technical expert sounds expensive.»	It is one day. Compare it with a client's auditor finding the defect fourteen months after certification.	
«The accreditation assessor is auditing us twice.»	They are watching your auditor. It is the only occasion in three years on which somebody checks the audit team.	
«Our model was built by a specialist consultant.»	Who was never asked whether two of his variables move against each other in this particular property.	
«We should ask for an expert on every visit.»	Only where your claims rest on a method somebody has to take on trust. A simpler method you can explain is the better answer.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Assuming that a confirmed normalisation is a tested normalisation.		
Treating the team's composition as none of the client's business.		
Never asking whether anybody on the team can examine the method the system rests on.		
Leaving the most load-bearing component of a system to be audited procedurally.		
Objecting to team members without stating a reason, repeatedly.		
Experiencing a witness audit as a second audit and becoming defensive.		
Using a technical expert as a review service, or expecting advice from one.		
Building quantitative apparatus that nobody in the property can explain.		
As auditor, recording as verified something you had no means to verify.		

Operative synthesis

- **The competence that decides whether an audit of this standard reaches its distinguishing requirement is the one least likely to be in the room. Knowledge of the standard is universal among accredited auditors. Knowledge of hotels is scarcer. The ability to examine the method by which a property converts measurements into claims is scarcer than both, and nothing in an auditor's qualification pathway requires it.**
- **What makes that survivable is that the framework asks for competence of the team collectively. A system whose claims rest on a model must be audited by somebody who can examine a model: an auditor who holds the capability, or a technical expert assigned for the purpose, working under the team's direction and not auditing on their own account. The mechanism exists, it is designed for exactly this, and in this discipline it is almost never used.**
- **The property's rights are real and bounded. It may know who is coming and in what role, object with a reason, ask for an interpreter, and ask for an expert where its system warrants one. It may not choose its auditor or decline members until a comfortable combination arrives. And when an accreditation assessor attends, the property is the venue rather than the subject: it is the only occasion in three years on which somebody independent is watching the audit team, and a property that spends it being defensive has defended itself against its own best protection.**
- **In Bergen two good auditors verified everything their competence reached, honestly and thoroughly, and the component carrying the property's entire reported performance was examined for the first time by a client's procurement auditor fourteen months after the certificate was issued. The remedy, when it came, was not a better model. It was a simpler one that the coordinator could defend without help.**
- **The next subchapter is the one all of this has been serving. Whatever the team's composition, whatever the property's methods, there is a moment at which somebody has to decide what will be accepted as evidence that energy performance improved, and there are four ways in which a true improvement can be produced without anything in the building having changed.**

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 4.5. 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.