WORKSHEET 2.2

Engaging Interested Parties

Subchapter 2.2 · case in the book: Valletta

If a client asked you to attach the result of your last engagement with interested parties, could you say whom you spoke to, what you changed as a result and what those people heard back from you? Or would you attach an average?

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 register beyond the customer database: Mark Vella listed, separately for congresses, corporate events, weddings and the hotel's own events, who commissions, plans, supplies, contributes, attends, permits or bears consequences, using 4.2 a) to i) as a check. Each party received a line with role, requirements and source, agreed channel, responsible person and last contact.		
Six conversations in the parties' own channels: The general manager invited the residents to an evening in the hotel at the end of March and met the local council in early April. Vella spoke with the coach company's dispatcher and two drivers, held two conversations with the agency's owner and eight of its staff during their break, and arranged a video call with three regular clients. Each conversation produced a one-page record.		
A decision on every requirement: Coaches would wait in a holding area on the city side of the main entrance with engines off, written into the order to the coach company. The agency would receive rosters ten days ahead, and after midnight the hotel would pay its staff's taxis. Residents would receive a quarterly list of evening events on the terrace and a night-time telephone number.		
Feedback, including on what was refused: The residents had asked for no terrace events after 10 p.m. The hotel had weddings sold until October and would honour them; from next season, music outside would end at 10 p.m. and continue indoors. Zammit said this herself at the residents' evening, and it stood in the letter the twenty-six participants received a week later, in English and Maltese.		

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 customer survey satisfies 4.2	Only partially true. A process identifying and engaging parties by role is required (4.2); a survey can be one means within it	
Parties must be ranked by influence and interest	No. The yardstick is their role in the event's value chain (4.2)	
Every conversation must be minuted	No. Results are documented where appropriate (4.2)	
Whoever neither books nor supplies is not a party	No. Authorities and communities, including residents, are listed (4.2 h, i)	
The hotel chooses the channel alone	No. The most effective means are identified together with the parties (7.4)	
The roles in Table A.1 must be worked through one by one	No. A note to 4.2 points to A.1 as an aid	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Sending a survey and calling it engagement, which produces an average without a sender or consequence.		
Treating the customer database as the register, so that whoever books nothing is missing.		
Sorting parties by influence instead of role, which drops residents and agency staff from planning.		
Collecting wishes without deciding, so that unanswered expectations turn into disappointment.		
Choosing one channel for everyone, so that those who do not read the questionnaire are never heard.		
Forgetting feedback, so that the next concern goes to the client rather than to the hotel.		
Holding names of private individuals in the register without their consent.		
Treating engagement as a one-off project rather than a process repeated for each type of event.		

Operative synthesis

- **Does our register go beyond the customer database?: Those who book nothing still bear consequences**
- **Does every party have its role at our events stated?: Clause 4.2 orders engagement by role in the value chain**

- **Does every requirement have a source and a decision with a reason?: The standard requires deciding which requirements are addressed**
- **Have we asked each party how it wants to be engaged?: Clause 7.4 requires identifying effective means together with them**
- **Do we speak with agency staff themselves, not only the agency owner?: They do the work and know the problems first**
- **Does every party hear what we took up and what we did not?: Unanswered concerns travel to the client instead**
- **Act on immediately. Start a register of interested parties by role, enter every complaint and remark the hotel already holds, and tell coach operators where to wait and with engines off.**
- **Plan for. Write an engagement plan with channels agreed with each party, hold the first round of conversations with one-page records, and decide in writing on every requirement.**
- **Monitor going forward. Send feedback to every group, including on what was refused, and review the register after every large event and once a year.**

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 2.2. 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.