



TECHNICAL LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT DOSSIER

ISO 45002:2023 – ISO 45001 implementation guidance

Course + certificate

450,00 €

VAT excluded

Course code

ISO45002-2023

Minimum duration

270 min

Final pass score

70%

Dossier issue

13/10/2026

1. Course identity, purpose and scope

Guidance course for implementing, maintaining and improving an OH&S system using ISO 45002:2023 without adding requirements.

This extended technical dossier describes the pathway as published in CIWZ Academy on the issue date. It consolidates purpose, references, learning architecture, module contents, assessment system, passing criteria and certificate conditions. It does not replace the official texts of the standards, laws, guidelines or schemes referenced.

2. Normative, regulatory and technical references

ISO 45002:2023; ISO 45001:2018; ISO 45001:2018/Amd 1:2024

References are used as the learning and assessment framework within the limits of published content and available sources. For professional application, the official and current versions of the referenced documents always prevail.

3. Learning architecture and assessment system

- 8 structured learning modules
- minimum tracked time: 270 min
- intermediate-check bank: 348 questions
- active final-exam bank: 390 questions
- final exam: 30 questions selected from the bank
- passing threshold: 70%
- Access to the pathway through the personal Academy profile or a corporate assignment.
- Sequential study of the modules, with server-side recording of progress and required minimum time.
- Intermediate checks linked to modules to verify understanding, application capability and quality of reasoning.

- Final exam unlock only after the pathway requirements have been completed.
- Protected final exam assembled by the platform through selection from the active course question bank.
- Recording of the result and, where applicable, the option to request the final certificate.

4. Official catalogue technical information

Course technical sheet

Bilingual CIWZ Academy pathway with server-tracked lessons, sequential slides, randomized intermediate checks and a final exam using a no-repeat question bank.

5. Detailed course syllabus

The following syllabus is derived from the active modules published on the platform. Each module shows its minimum study time and the size of its available intermediate-check bank.

01 How to use ISO 45002 without turning it into a requirement

Minimum time: 25 min | Intermediate questions: 50

02 Leadership and participation in practice

Minimum time: 35 min | Intermediate questions: 50

03 Methods for hazards, risks and opportunities

Minimum time: 40 min | Intermediate questions: 50

04 Operational controls, procurement, contractors and change

Minimum time: 45 min | Intermediate questions: 50

05 Emergencies, competence and operational support

Minimum time: 35 min | Intermediate questions: 50

06 Evaluation, incident learning and improvement

Minimum time: 30 min | Intermediate questions: 50

07 Worker participation, contractors and supply chain: advanced operatio...

Minimum time: 30 min | Intermediate questions: 24

08 OH&S system maturity and evidence-based improvement

Minimum time: 30 min | Intermediate questions: 24

6. Developed module-by-module contents

The following pages analytically describe the content actually associated with each platform module. The structure is designed so that learners, companies, HR, Quality, HSE or CISO functions can understand precisely what is studied and assessed.

MODULE 01**How to use ISO 45002 without turning it into a requirement**

- Minimum required time: 25 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 50 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

ISO 45002 provides examples and guidance consistent with ISO 45001 but does not change or weaken its requirements.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “system design”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

ISO 45002 provides guidance for practical implementation of ISO 45001. It does not change ISO 45001 requirements; instead, it helps translate them into methods, roles, processes and practices for organizations of different sizes and complexity.

“How to use ISO 45002 without turning it into a requirement” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization's context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Choose methods proportionate to size, risks and context, documenting decisions where useful.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.
- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.
- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every

material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

In audits distinguish binding criteria from suggested good practice.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “quality of worker reports”, read together with “verification of critical controls”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?
- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?

- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is building a system separate from real work. Another is failing to coordinate simultaneous activities. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

An auditor cannot raise a nonconformity solely because the organization does not use an example from the guidance.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not "does the document exist?" but "does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?"

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on "we have always done it this way", a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?

- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “How to use ISO 45002 without turning it into a requirement” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 02**Leadership and participation in practice**

- Minimum required time: 35 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 50 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

The guidance shows how leadership and participation can be operationalized through roles, consultation and barrier removal.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “worker involvement”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

ISO 45002 provides guidance for practical implementation of ISO 45001. It does not change ISO 45001 requirements; instead, it helps translate them into methods, roles, processes and practices for organizations of different sizes and complexity.

“Leadership and participation in practice” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization’s context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Design accessible channels, involve workers at decision points and close the feedback loop.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.
- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.
- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Assess who participates, in which decisions and with what effect, not just the number of meetings.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “coverage of risk assessments”, read together with “contractor coordination”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?

- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is involving workers only after decisions. Another is providing generic training. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

A committee meets monthly but reports do not change controls: participation is formal, not effective.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not “does the document exist?” but “does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?”.

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “Leadership and participation in practice” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 03**Methods for hazards, risks and opportunities**

- Minimum required time: 40 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 50 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

The guidance supports practical methods for identifying hazards and assessing risks, considering people, tasks, human factors and changes.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “hazard-identification methods”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

ISO 45002 provides guidance for practical implementation of ISO 45001. It does not change ISO 45001 requirements; instead, it helps translate them into methods, roles, processes and practices for organizations of different sizes and complexity.

“Methods for hazards, risks and opportunities” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization's context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Combine observations, data, interviews, task analysis and lessons from internal and external events.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.
- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.
- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Verify source quality and the method's ability to identify less obvious hazards.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “status of control measures”, read together with “emergency simulation results”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?

- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is using risk matrices without stable criteria. Another is not testing emergency scenarios. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

A precise numerical matrix does not compensate for an incomplete hazard list.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not “does the document exist?” but “does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?”.

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “Methods for hazards, risks and opportunities” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 04**Operational controls, procurement, contractors and change**

- Minimum required time: 45 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 50 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

Effective implementation integrates OH&S into procurement, work design, contractors and change management.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “risk assessment and prioritization”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

ISO 45002 provides guidance for practical implementation of ISO 45001. It does not change ISO 45001 requirements; instead, it helps translate them into methods, roles, processes and practices for organizations of different sizes and complexity.

“Operational controls, procurement, contractors and change” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization's context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Embed safety criteria before purchasing or contracting and coordinate operational interfaces between organizations.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.
- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.
- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Sample a recent change to verify prior assessment, authorization, communication and follow-up.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “verification of critical controls”, read together with “competence observed in the field”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?

- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is selecting controls without checking effectiveness. Another is closing incidents without shared learning. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

A competent contractor can still introduce risk if interfaces with internal personnel are not coordinated.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not “does the document exist?” but “does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?”.

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “Operational controls, procurement, contractors and change” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 05**Emergencies, competence and operational support**

- Minimum required time: 35 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 50 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

Emergency preparedness and competence should be verified under credible conditions and updated after exercises or events.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “operational controls”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

ISO 45002 provides guidance for practical implementation of ISO 45001. It does not change ISO 45001 requirements; instead, it helps translate them into methods, roles, processes and practices for organizations of different sizes and complexity.

“Emergencies, competence and operational support” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization's context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Define scenarios, roles, resources, communications and exercise evaluation criteria; train according to real tasks.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.
- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.
- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Use debriefs and observations to identify delays, ambiguities and unexpected dependencies.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “contractor coordination”, read together with “risk reduction after actions”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?

- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is failing to coordinate simultaneous activities. Another is building a system separate from real work. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

A flawless evacuation drill announced weeks in advance may not test real response capability.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not “does the document exist?” but “does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?”.

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “Emergencies, competence and operational support” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 06**Evaluation, incident learning and improvement**

- Minimum required time: 30 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 50 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

ISO 45002 helps turn data, audits, incidents and reviews into organizational learning.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “contractors and procurement”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

ISO 45002 provides guidance for practical implementation of ISO 45001. It does not change ISO 45001 requirements; instead, it helps translate them into methods, roles, processes and practices for organizations of different sizes and complexity.

“Evaluation, incident learning and improvement” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization’s context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Analyse technical, human and organizational causes, define verifiable actions and share relevant lessons.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.
- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.
- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every

material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Verify risk reduction after action rather than merely closing the plan.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “emergency simulation results”, read together with “quality of worker reports”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?
- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?

- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is providing generic training. Another is involving workers only after decisions. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

The same deviation appears in different departments: the response should look for a cross-cutting cause rather than three isolated fixes.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not “does the document exist?” but “does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?”.

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?

- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “Evaluation, incident learning and improvement” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 07**Worker participation, contractors and supply chain: advanced operational integration**

- Minimum required time: 30 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 24 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

Effective implementation requires worker participation, procurement, contractors and simultaneous activities to be managed as one operational system with clear interfaces and responsibilities.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “emergencies and competence”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

ISO 45002 provides guidance for practical implementation of ISO 45001. It does not change ISO 45001 requirements; instead, it helps translate them into methods, roles, processes and practices for organizations of different sizes and complexity.

“Worker participation, contractors and supply chain: advanced operational integration” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization's context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Integrate consultation, prequalification, coordination, permits, critical controls, change management and worker feedback into operational decisions.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.
- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.
- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Consultation records, contractor assessments, coordination plans, permits, field checks, near misses and shared improvement actions.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “competence observed in the field”, read together with “coverage of risk assessments”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?
- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is not testing emergency scenarios. Another is using risk matrices without stable criteria. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

Two contractors work simultaneously with separate assessments but no interface coordination: the risk arises from the interaction, not from the individual documents.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not “does the document exist?” but “does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?”.

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “Worker participation, contractors and supply chain: advanced operational integration” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 08**OH&S system maturity and evidence-based improvement**

- Minimum required time: 30 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 24 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

System maturity grows when incidents, near misses, observations, audits, indicators and worker participation converge into decisions that materially reduce risk.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “learning and improvement”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

ISO 45002 provides guidance for practical implementation of ISO 45001. It does not change ISO 45001 requirements; instead, it helps translate them into methods, roles, processes and practices for organizations of different sizes and complexity.

“OH&S system maturity and evidence-based improvement” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization’s context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Define leading and lagging indicators, verify critical controls, analyse organizational causes and review action effectiveness over time.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.
- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.
- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Exposure and near-miss trends, control verification, incident investigations, audit results, management-review decisions and documented effectiveness checks.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “risk reduction after actions”, read together with “status of control measures”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?
- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is closing incidents without shared learning. Another is selecting controls without checking effectiveness. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

Injuries decrease while near-miss reporting also collapses: the apparently favourable result should be interpreted before concluding that risk truly decreased.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not “does the document exist?” but “does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?”.

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “OH&S system maturity and evidence-based improvement” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

7. Assessment system, final exam and passing criteria

- Intermediate checks are linked to individual modules and provide progressive learning control before access to the final assessment.
- The final assessment consists of 30 questions selected from the active course bank. The platform applies an anti-repetition logic for new attempts when the bank size allows it.
- Final question-bank size detected at generation time: 390 active questions.
- Published passing threshold for the course: 70%.
- Questions are intended to assess not only recall but also interpretation, application, evidence selection, scenario assessment and quality of decision-making, depending on the subject matter.

8. Tracking, learning continuity and session integrity

- Path status, completed modules and recorded time are managed server-side when the course uses the Academy learning mode.
- The platform allows the pathway to resume from the recorded point and retains the results of required checks.
- Assessment sessions may be subject to the integrity and proctoring controls enabled by the platform and described in the applicable usage rules.
- Technical and integrity events support assessment and do not replace professional judgement where human review is required.

9. Certificate, use and limitations

The CIWZ certificate, where provided by the pathway and requested after passing, records the result achieved in the stated CIWZ pathway or assessment. It does not automatically replace personnel certification, professional registration, statutory licence, legal qualification or credentials issued by third-party bodies where such requirements are imposed by the applicable scheme.

10. Commercial and tax conditions

- Course + certificate: 450,00 € VAT excluded.
- UAE VAT is applied to UAE customers according to billing data and the applicable tax rules.
- Any specific commercial terms, agreements or corporate orders override the public price only when formally accepted by Certificato IWZ FZCO.

11. Dossier document control

- Document automatically generated by CIWZ Academy from the course data published at the time of the request.

- Course code: ISO45002-2023
- Document language: EN
- Generation date: 13/10/2026
- For normative and professional application, the current official sources and any applicable procedures/schemes prevail.