WORKING MATERIAL 2.2 · CHAPTER 2 — THE OPERATIONAL PERSPECTIVE · SETTING: ALBEROBELLO, ITALY

Interested Parties in the Village

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 9a — The Small Property, subchapter 2.2 (book page 223)

GUIDING QUESTION

Apart from your guests, who expects something of your house, and do you know these people by name? And when two of them want opposite things, who decides which expectation counts, and do both of them hear the answer?

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
You need a stakeholder analysis with an influence–interest matrix	No	Parties and requirements must be determined (4.2); the house chooses the method	
Every expectation of every party must be met	No	The house decides which requirements its system addresses (4.2 c)	
Interested parties means guests	No	Relevant is whoever can affect the system's results; often neighbours, bank and authorities	
Staff do not count; they belong to the house	No	The common core gives no list; ISO's small-enterprise handbook names employees expressly	
The list must be kept as a document	No	Clause 4.2 requires no documented information; the house may keep it anyway (7.5.1)	
None of this applies to an eleven-room house	No	The standards apply at any size where adopted; legal duties apply regardless	

2 · Common mistakes — a self-check

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

☐ Answering each request separately, so that every answer is polite and together they change nothing.

☐ Filling in a map of categories that fits any house and contains no name from the village.

☐ Knowing only yes or no, and refusing a wish without checking whether part of it is possible.

☐ Treating the bank as a formality, although it asks about every other line of the list.

☐ Forgetting one's own staff, whose expectations change routines the house shows to the outside.

☐ Keeping knowledge inside the house, so that what everyone knows becomes a disappointed guest.

☐ Leaving the authorities off the list because they rarely call.

☐ Writing the list once and never bringing it to the management review.

3 · A Checklist for the Owner's List of Interested Parties

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

Question	Why it matters	Our answer
Does our list name people and bodies rather than categories?	Only names can be telephoned when something goes wrong	
Are our own staff on it, with their expectations?	Their changes alter routines that guests experience	
Does every expectation have a source?	A guessed expectation leads to a wrong decision	
Is every line decided — taken up, partly or not — with a reason?	Clause 4.2 c) requires a decision, not fulfilment	
Do we check whether expectations solve or block each other?	The best answers often lie between two limits	
Does every line taken up have a route of communication?	Clause 7.4 requires knowing who says what, to whom and how	

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?
Are the interested parties listed by name, not by category (4.2 a)?	The parties sheet	☐
Does each party have its expectations with the source of each (4.2 b)?	The expectations column of the parties sheet	☐
Is it stated for each requirement whether the system takes it up, partly or not, with a reason (4.2 c)?	The "taken up" column	☐
Is it settled who tells whom what, when and how — guests, neighbours, suppliers, staff (7.4)?	Booking confirmation text; signs; the communication lines of the parties sheet	☐
Do risks from the list appear on the risk list (6.1)?	The risk list	☐
Is the sheet shared with staff who need it and brought to the annual review (9.3)?	Staff sign-off; the review record	☐

> *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.*