WORKSHEET 4.7

Weigh the Gap, Not the Cases

Subchapter 4.7 · case in the book: Bologna

If the auditor laid three findings on the table at the closing meeting, which would you consider the most serious, and by what measure? And what would you put forward if you wanted to contest a grading?

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
The programme read against the site plan: The internal audit programme now names every part of the scope by its name in the manual, and the internal auditor audited the courtyard kitchen and the vaulted hall in December, with a record the body could verify.		
Measurement where there was none: A scale borrowed from the main kitchen stood in the courtyard kitchen the morning after the audit; one of its own and a weighing list followed. The management review received an addendum: the objective stated separately for each kitchen, each figure with its source.		
A deputy for every step: Every step with its own criterion, including the seventy-two-hour adjustment, now has a named deputy, and the banqueting software flags any order without an adjustment forty-eight hours before the party.		
A register that follows the rules: The legal register is reviewed whenever new rules are adopted, not only at fixed dates. The brochure line was withdrawn, and the observation entered the hotel's own list of actions.		

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
Three identical errors make a major nonconformity	No. Major means capability to achieve intended results is affected; several minors against one requirement may show systemic failure, but no number is given	
A major nonconformity prevents certification	No. Correction and corrective action are verified before the decision (9.5.2); then the decision can be taken	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
A minor nonconformity can wait for the next audit	No. The body first reviews and accepts the plan (9.5.2); under 10.2 the hotel reacts to every nonconformity anyway	
The auditor decides on the certificate	No. Those who decide must differ from those who audited (9.5.1.1)	
An observation is a small nonconformity	No. The definitions know only major and minor; observations are each body's own matter	
Only breaches of the standard are nonconformities	No. Non-fulfilment of any requirement, including the hotel's own (ISO 20121, 3.36, 8.1, 9.2.1 a)	
The grading can be negotiated at the closing meeting	Only partially true. Facts change with evidence, and the grading may follow; the grading itself follows the definition (4.14)	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Counting cases: three errors at one point weigh less than one blind part of the system.		
Playing down a missing audit: whoever skips it cannot see a whole area.		
Contesting with the wrong document: a hygiene checklist does not evidence measurement of leftovers.		
Negotiating the grade: only the facts can change, and only with evidence.		
Forgetting the observation until it becomes a nonconformity.		
Expecting the auditor to grant the certificate.		
Treating the hotel's own rules as outside the audit.		
Leaving minor nonconformities until the next visit, when 10.2 requires a reaction to each.		

Operative synthesis

- **Does our audit programme name every part of the scope as the manual names it?: A part left out becomes a blind part**
- **Does every figure in the management review state which measurement it comes from?: A part may otherwise speak for the whole**
- **Was the legal register reviewed when new rules on claims were adopted?: Clause 6.1.3 covers emerging requirements**
- **Does every step with its own criterion have a named deputy?: Holidays are when own rules lapse**

- **Do we know by which definitions our body grades major and minor?: The grading decides the timing of the certificate**
- **Do we carry the body’s observations in our own list?: An unrecorded observation is next year’s nonconformity**
- **Act on immediately. Read the internal audit programme against the site plan and the scope in the manual. Any building, kitchen or hall not named is audited before the certification body arrives.**
- **Plan for. Attach a source to every figure in the management review, name a deputy for every step with its own criterion, and review the legal register whenever new rules are adopted.**
- **Monitor going forward. At every closing meeting, check facts before grades, contest only with evidence, and carry observations into the hotel’s own list.**

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 4.7. 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.