WORKSHEET 1.7

Who Decides by Which Sentence

Subchapter 1.7 · case in the book: Kyoto

If tomorrow a proposal lands on the table that brings in a great deal of money and does not fit what your hotel says about itself, who in your hotel says no, and on the basis of which sentence? And does your board hear about it before it reads about it in the press?

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
A reasoned decision: Ishida wrote half a page by noon. The hotel accepted the gala. It refused the landing on the lawn because of the residential street; guests would come by coach from the heliport. The line with “climate-neutral” could not stand under the hotel’s name, and the sponsor’s lounge was available only without climate claims. The client accepted the gala with the coach and dropped the lounge.		
Questions adopted by the board: In December the board discussed the statement for the first time and adopted four questions, one per principle, for every enquiry.		
A list of cases that go up: Sponsors with their own advertising on the premises, environmental or climate claims under the hotel’s name, events affecting residents and clients under public criticism go to the general manager, who decides with reasons. Whoever earns from a booking does not judge it alone.		
Reporting and signatures: At every board meeting, management presents a list of the cases checked and their outcomes. Mori signed the policy beside Ishida, and the representative of the second family signed too.		

These steps are the book’s method, not requirements of ISO 20121. 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 four principles are a statement for the website	No. They frame policy, objectives and operational plans (4.5)	
The board must sign the policy	Only partially true. Dated and signed by management (5.2); 5.1 names top management and/or the governing body	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
Sponsors are the client's business	No. They should be treated as suppliers; their advertising and products must fit the principles (8.3)	
The standard excludes certain industries as clients	No. It contains no exclusion list; the hotel sets its own purpose and values (4.5)	
Every booking must be approved by top management	No. Assigned responsibilities and reporting to top management are required (5.3)	
Table A.2 is a list of obligations	No. It describes what the principles can mean in practice (guidance)	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Leaving the statement of purpose to marketing: it becomes attractive and decides nothing.		
Having the policy signed without discussing it in the board.		
Treating the sponsor as the client's business, although he stands on the hotel's premises and under its name.		
Pushing sensitive cases upward "for information".		
Letting the chair decide the single case, so the rule is missing next time.		
Reporting only revenue to the board.		
Letting the person who earns from a booking judge it alone.		
Expecting the standard to supply a list of clients to refuse.		

Operative synthesis

- **Has the board discussed and adopted the statement of purpose?: Clause 4.5 makes it the frame for policy and plans**
- **Is there a question for each principle that sales can ask of an enquiry?: Principles must reach the proposal process (5.1)**
- **Is it assigned who reports to the board on the system's performance, and when?: Clause 5.3 requires that reporting to be assigned**
- **Are sponsors checked like suppliers before the contract?: Clause 8.3 requires their advertising to fit the principles**
- **Does the hotel see a client's invitation before it goes out under its name?: No communication may mislead (7.4)**
- **Did we refuse or attach conditions to any booking last year, with reasons?: Only a reasoned decision shows the frame works**

- **Act on immediately. Check every pending booking with sponsors or claims under the hotel's name, and require a written, reasoned decision from management on each.**
- **Plan for. Have the board adopt the statement of purpose, one question per principle and a list of cases that go up; add a sponsor clause to event contracts; assign reporting on the system's performance.**
- **Monitor going forward. Report checked cases at every board meeting, and ask once a year in management review whether the rules still fit (9.3).**

Action plan for our property

Action	Owner	Due	How we will know it worked

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 8a «The Helm», subchapter 1.7. Edizioni Effedore, 2026. Clause references are paraphrased; this sheet does not reproduce the text of ISO 20121. It is not legal advice: the law that applies is that of the place where the property operates.