WORKSHEET 2.15

Improvement, and the Finding Closed Three Times

Subchapter 2.15 · case in the book: Wellington

Take the list of nonconformities your property has closed in the last three years and look for any finding that appears more than once. If one does, it was never closed. It was answered, and the answer did not change the thing that caused 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
Read three years of the register backwards and link every finding that has returned.		
Refuse any cause that simply restates the finding, and ask why until the answer is something other than an instruction.		
Record where else the same cause was looked for, and what was found.		
Send causes involving capital, staffing, suppliers or technology to management or ownership, with a cost.		
Record each deferral of a project that would remove a cause as a decision to keep the risk.		
Verify every temporary measure, and give it an end date.		
Give every corrective action a date and a person to look again, and close it only on that evidence.		
Show the management review what returned, not only what was closed.		

These steps are the book's method, not requirements of ISO/IEC 27001. 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 action is closed, so the finding is solved.»	An action is closed on paper. The finding is solved only when evidence shows it has stopped.	
«The cause was that the upgrade had not been done.»	That is the finding restated. The cause is why it had not been done, and it is usually not in the hands of whoever was told to do it.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
«A temporary measure closes the finding.»	Only if it is verified, has an end date, and the permanent action is decided. Otherwise it is the next finding.	
«A finding that returns is a new finding.»	A finding that returns proves the previous corrective action failed, and that failure is itself a nonconformity.	
«Improvement means new projects.»	Most improvement is removing causes of what already went wrong, so it stops going wrong.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Closing a corrective action on the day the instruction is sent.		
Recording that the action was not done as the cause.		
Accepting a temporary measure without checking it or giving it an end date.		
Looking only where the auditor looked, not wherever the cause could be.		
Leaving a cause that needs capital with a manager who has none.		
Giving a returning finding a new number and treating it as new.		
Reporting closed actions to the management review without asking whether they worked.		

Operative synthesis

- **A nonconformity is closed when its cause has changed, and the proof is looking again. The hotel asks why a finding happened and why that was possible, until the answer is something other than an instruction; asks where else the same cause is at work; sends the cause to whoever holds the budget to remove it; changes conditions rather than repeating instructions; verifies its temporary measures; closes only on evidence; and treats every returning finding as a corrective action that failed.**
- **The instrument is the closure test: seven questions that separate a closure on paper from a closure that holds, answered for every corrective action that matters and checked again on a set date. Together with a single register that shows recurrence and a management review that sees what returned and what is waiting for a decision, it is what turns the clause on improvement from a column of closed actions into a system that actually gets better.**
- **In Wellington nobody had been careless. A general manager wrote the only corrective action within his authority, twice. An IT provider did what it could and said what it could not. An owner deferred a project that seemed able to wait, without being told what was waiting on it. A night auditor restarted the same computer every night for years and knew exactly why, and nobody had asked her. The finding came back each year because everything that produced it was still**

there, and it stopped the month the hotel changed that. This volume has followed the same pattern through thirty cases, from the owner's first decision to the last corrective action: a hotel protects its guests' information not by instructing people to be careful, but by deciding who is responsible, giving them what they need, and checking that what was decided actually happens.

› **Which raises the question the companion volume takes up. Everything in this one has been seen from the helm, by the owner who decides and the management that runs the system. Whether any of it is real, whether the page exists, whether the test was done, whether the finding was truly closed, is a question for somebody who looks from outside with the evidence in hand. That is the view of the lens, and the next volume turns to it.**

Action plan for our property

Action	Owner	Due	How we will know it worked

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 5a «The Helm», subchapter 2.15. Edizioni Effedore, 2026. Clause references are paraphrased; this sheet does not reproduce the text of ISO/IEC 27001. It is not legal advice: data protection and information security law is that of the place where the property operates.