WORKING MATERIAL 1.6 · CHAPTER 1 — THE VISION OF OWNERSHIP · SETTING: USHUAIA, ARGENTINA

The Owner as Bottleneck: Absence, Deputies and Knowledge Held in One Head

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 9a — The Small Property, subchapter 1.6 (book page 79)

GUIDING QUESTION

What happens in your property if tomorrow morning you cannot get up — not for an hour, but for five days? And who answers in the first night when the telephone on your bedside table rings?

1 · Verification Pact: market claims against the standard

Copied from the book. The last column is for your property: what holds here, and how you know it.

What is claimed	Binding?	What actually holds	In our property
The owner must appoint a formal deputy	Only partially true	Roles must be assigned and communicated (5.3); how is the property's choice	
Only one person may know the passwords	No	Information must be protected and available where and when needed (7.5.3)	
An emergency manual is mandatory	No	The standards know no manual; the property determines what is necessary (7.5.1)	
Risks must be scored in a matrix	No	Risks are determined and addressed (6.1); no method is prescribed	
A small house need not write anything down	No	Less extent under the note to 7.5.1, but what is necessary is documented	
Capturing knowledge means a knowledge-management system	No	The ISO handbook for small businesses advises simple means; this is guidance	

2 · Common mistakes — a self-check

Tick each mistake you recognise in your own property, and note where it shows.

☐ Mistaking the owner's knowledge for a strength of the house; the house loses it with her.

☐ Arranging the deputy only in the emergency.

☐ Keeping passwords only in one head, so that data is safe and the duty impossible.

☐ Sticking passwords to the screen, so that the duty is possible and the data unprotected.

☐ Treating regular guests' allergies as a matter of memory.

☐ Leaving the owner's absence off the risk list.

☐ Giving the night number only to the owner.

☐ Never testing the emergency sheet.

3 · A Checklist for Five Days Without the Owner

The book's checklist, with a column for your own answer.

Question	Why it matters	Our answer
Have we written down what must happen in five days without the owner?	Gaps can only be closed once they are visible	
Does each urgent task have a named deputy who knows it?	A deputy named in the emergency is too late	
Can the deputy meet guest registration duties on time?	Daily duties cannot wait for the owner's return	
Are system accesses both protected and reachable?	Clause 7.5.3 requires availability and protection together	
Are allergen lists and consented guest allergies kept where breakfast staff find them?	A wrong memory at breakfast is dangerous	
Have we tested a day without asking the owner in the last year?	An untested sheet shows its gaps at night	

4 · What would show this is working

Questions drawn from the subchapter's reading of the standards and its practical application. Clause numbers in brackets point to the harmonized structure or the standard the subchapter names; where the evidence lives, and the sheets named, are this book's method, not a requirement of any standard.

Question	Where the evidence lives	Seen?
Have we written down every task that would have to happen in five days without the owner, ranked by urgency?	The five-day list in the folder	☐
Has each urgent task a named deputy with their own access (5.3, 7.1)?	The role-and-deputy sheet; a second named access to the guest register	☐
Is there an emergency sheet with numbers, keys, access and the first twenty-four hours, in more than one place?	Copies behind reception, in the folder and with the deputy; a card by the night phone	☐
Are passwords both protected and reachable when the owner is away (7.5.3)?	A sealed envelope in the safe, whose code the deputy knows	☐
Is the owner's absence on the risk list (6.1)?	The risk list	☐
Has the arrangement been tested on a trial day, and the gaps added the same evening?	The dated trial-day note; the updated emergency sheet	☐

> *What this sheet is not: no management-system standard prescribes this form, and filling it shows conformity with nothing. It is a working aid drawn from the book; the standards' own texts govern the real case, and legal duties are established with competent local expertise. Independent material; not affiliated with or endorsed by ISO or any certification, accreditation or scheme-owning body. The standards' own texts prevail; legal duties must be confirmed locally.*