WORKSHEET 3.10

Criterion, Evidence, Conclusion

Subchapter 3.10 · case in the book: Verona

If your audit report says that waste separation is inadequate, could someone else go to the same place tomorrow and see what your auditor saw? And how would your banqueting manager tell, from that sentence, which rule was missed and what is only the auditor's opinion?

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 three-part finding: Every finding now has three fields: criterion, evidence, conclusion, and a fourth for its type. A sentence that cannot fill the first field is not a finding.		
A second source: Signatures are read against the agency's billing, forms against the template, statements against observation. What cannot be checked becomes a note for the programme.		
A stated limit: Each conclusion names what was not seen: other months, other bins, other evenings. The word "major" is used only if the hotel defines it.		
Facts before the report: The head of each area confirms or disputes the facts before the report reaches the general manager. Agreement with the conclusion is not required.		

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
Every nonconformity must be graded major or minor	No. ISO 20121 has no such grading; it belongs to the rules for certification bodies (4.7)	
A finding is always a defect	No. Under the guidance, findings indicate conformity or nonconformity and can record good practice	
Audits test against the standard, not house rules	No. Conformity with the organisation's own requirements and the standard (9.2.1 a)	
What the auditor hears is not evidence	Only partially true. Under the guidance, verifiable relevant information counts; a statement counts once it can be checked	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
The report names who made the mistake	No. Results go to relevant management (9.2.2); 10.2 asks for causes, not culprits	
Nonconformities from the audit are handled like any other	Yes. React, causes, action, effectiveness, documented information (10.2)	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Writing an adjective instead of a finding: “inadequate” is defended, a bin with a time is changed.		
Measuring against personal taste where no criterion exists.		
Passing on what was heard without checking it.		
Concluding about the whole hotel from one hour and one bin.		
Naming the person instead of the process.		
Praising without evidence, so the hotel cannot tell what to keep.		
Grading findings “major” without a rule that defines the grade.		
Mixing notes for the programme and questions for management into the findings.		

Operative synthesis

- **Does each finding in our last report name its criterion?: Without a criterion, a finding is an opinion**
- **Could a third person find each piece of evidence again by place, day and document?: Evidence that cannot be found again cannot be acted on**
- **Does each nonconformity rest on a verifiable source, ideally two?: A second source turns an incident into a finding about a process**
- **Does each conclusion state how far it reaches?: A stated limit makes the finding unassailable**
- **Do strengths carry criterion and evidence too?: The hotel must know exactly what to keep**
- **Did each area hear the facts before the report went to management?: Disputes about facts block changes to processes**
- **Act on immediately. Take the last audit report and, for each sentence, write down its criterion, its evidence and its limit. Strike or move whatever cannot be completed.**
- **Plan for. Adopt a three-part finding form, the three types of finding, a rule of function instead of name, and a review of facts with each area before reporting.**
- **Monitor going forward. Track how many findings carry a second source and a stated limit, and whether earlier findings recur.**

Action plan for our property

Action	Owner	Due	How we will know it worked

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 8b «The Lens», subchapter 3.10. Edizioni Effedore, 2026. Clause references are paraphrased; this sheet does not reproduce the text of ISO 20121, ISO 19011 or ISO/IEC 17021-1. It is not legal advice: the law that applies is that of the place where the property operates.