WORKSHEET 2.5

Identifying and Evaluating Issues

Subchapter 2.5 · case in the book: Punta Cana

If someone put your list of significant issues in front of you and pointed to one line, could you say who rated it, by which rule and on the strength of which feedback? And who apart from you has ever seen that list?

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
Issues at the level of a decision: Peña merged the fourteen decoration lines into two and split “waste” into four: glass, food, flowers and decoration, and firework residue. Fifty-two lines became twenty-three.		
A criteria sheet with anchors: Marte approved a sheet with one sentence for each level of each criterion before anyone rated again. Frequency was struck as a criterion, with a sentence explaining that in the wedding business it hid rare effects.		
Two raters and numbered feedback: Every line was rated by two people independently. The authority’s letter became feedback no. 3, the couples’ interviews nos. 5 to 7, and the florist was asked in person.		
Version and distribution: The register received a date, a version number, four occasions for updating and a distribution list. The authority received the lines on fireworks, noise and the shore; seasonal staff saw the register at induction.		

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 standard prescribes a points scale	No. It requires documented criteria (6.1.2); no points scale is required	
The register is drawn up once and filed	No. Results must be kept up to date (6.1.2)	
Department heads can rate issues among themselves	Only partially true. Criteria must include interested parties’ feedback (6.1.2); the brainstorm in A.10 is only an example	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
What the hotel neither controls nor influences drops out	Only partially true. A.10 suggests, as guidance, keeping such issues as a third group where significant	
What is permitted cannot be significant	No. C.2.3 notes, as guidance, that legal compliance does not cover everything	
The thirty-two issues in Table C.1 are the register	Only partially true. C.1 is a checklist; issues depend on type, place, workforce and supply chain	
The register is an internal working paper	No. Results must be shared with relevant interested parties (6.1.2)	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Adding points, so that rarity offsets harm.		
Using levels without anchors, so that the scale measures the person rating.		
Taking criteria from a template without deciding whether they fit the business.		
Leaving feedback in a notebook, where it never reaches a rating.		
Listing napkins and “waste” in the same register, one too fine and one too coarse for a decision.		
Recording a number without a sentence that explains it.		
Treating a permit as proof that an issue is not significant.		
Keeping the register on one computer, with no version, no occasion for updating and no distribution.		

Operative synthesis

- **Does every issue sit at a level at which someone in the house can decide?: Lines too fine or too coarse lead to no action**
- **Does every level of the scale have a written description for each criterion?: Without anchors the scale measures the rater, not the issue**
- **Does the overall rating follow a rule that never offsets a high criterion?: Otherwise rare but serious effects fall below the threshold**
- **Can we show which rating each piece of feedback entered?: Clause 6.1.2 requires feedback to be included in the criteria**
- **Does every line carry a one-sentence justification?: A number without a reason cannot be checked or defended**
- **Do we know who received which lines, and when?: Results must be shared with relevant interested parties**

- **Act on immediately. Re-read every line rated not significant that concerns an effect beyond the property, and check whether any feedback already received contradicts its rating.**
- **Plan for. Write a criteria sheet with anchors, adopt a rule in place of the sum, number all feedback and have every line rated by two people.**
- **Monitor going forward. Update the register on its four fixed occasions, keep every old version, and record who received which lines and when.**

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 2.5. 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.