WORKSHEET 2.12

# Nonconformity, Corrective Action

*Subchapter 2.12 · case in the book: Istanbul*

When something at an event in your house goes differently from what was decided, does the first question ask who it was, or why it could happen? And how would you know, three months later, that it will not happen again?

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 |
|---|---|---|
| Single-use out of the store: The last box was removed and discarded, and the midnight bar entered the dishwashing plan, with a dishwasher until closing and 300 additional reusable cups. | | |
| Induction with a deputy: For every banquet a deputy is named for induction when the banquet manager is out. The agency now sends its workers half an hour before service, paid, and each signs a card showing routes, emergency exits and bins. | | |
| A yard that explains itself: Demir had the bins labelled with pictograms, lit the service yard and moved the general-waste container to the door, where the organic bin used to stand. | | |
| Remedy and effectiveness: Aydın wrote two sentences to the couple: single-use cups had been served at the midnight bar against the hotel's promise, and the cause had been removed. The night porter received a copy of the case sheet and was asked to photograph the bar and yard after each of the next four weddings. | | |

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 |
|---|---|---|
| A nonconformity is a breach of the standard or of the law | Only partially true. Non-fulfilment of a requirement, including the hotel's own rules (8.1, 9.2.1 a) | |
| Once the consequence is fixed, the nonconformity is closed | No. Causes, action and effectiveness follow (10.2 b) to d)) | |

| What is commonly believed | What actually holds | Our position |
|---|---|---|
| A five-whys analysis is mandatory for every deviation | No. Causes must be evaluated (10.2 b); the method is the hotel's choice | |
| The standard requires naming who was responsible for the error | No. It asks for causes, actions and effectiveness, not culprits | |
| Nonconformities must be documented | Yes. Documented information on nonconformities and corrective actions (10.2) | |
| Every missed target figure is a nonconformity | Only partially true. Objectives are monitored (6.2); adverse trends call for preventive action (9.1 a); what counts depends on what the hotel decided | |

## Common mistakes: a self-check

| Mistake (from the book) | Present here? | Action / owner |
|---|---|---|
| Looking for a culprit: one is quickly found, and the next person stands in the same place. | | |
| Stopping after correction: the bin is emptied and contaminated again after the next event. | | |
| Treating three findings as three mishaps when they share one gap in the process. | | |
| Forgetting consequences outside the house, such as a promise to a client that was not kept. | | |
| Closing a case after one quiet evening. | | |
| Punishing reports, so that next time nobody reports. | | |
| Leaving last season's non-compliant stock within reach. | | |
| Tying a duty such as induction to one person without a deputy. | | |

## Operative synthesis

- **Is a deviation from our own rules recorded as a nonconformity?: Most requirements in the house are ones it set itself**
- **Do we keep correction and corrective action apart on the sheet?: Repairing the damage does not remove the cause**
- **Do we deal with consequences outside the house, including untrue statements?: Clause 10.2 a) asks for remedy as well as correction**
- **Do we seek the cause in the process before discussing people?: Otherwise the next person stands in the same place**
- **Do we check where else the same gap exists?: An appropriate corrective action reaches comparable events**

- **Do we review effectiveness over several events before closing?: One quiet evening proves nothing**
- **Act on immediately. Open a case sheet on the day of the finding, correct the consequence, tell any client affected, and ask for each finding whether someone else would have acted differently.**
- **Plan for. Remove non-compliant stock, add late additions to every dependent plan, name deputies for induction, and change forms and contracts as planned change (2.10).**
- **Monitor going forward. Check effectiveness over several events, keep the case open until it holds, tell whoever reported what came of it, and pass the season's cases to management review (2.15).**

## 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 2.12. 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.