WORKSHEET 4.10

Surveillance, Recertification and the Three-Year Cycle

Subchapter 4.10 · case in the book: Melbourne

GUIDING QUESTION

Take one hour and plot, month by month across the last three years, how many internal audits you ran, how many reports your workers filed and how many permits you raised. Do not analyse the totals: look at the shape. If the line rises in three places and lies flat between them, you have not been running a system for three years. You have been running it for six weeks, three times.

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
Plot five series by month across your whole cycle, and look at the shape rather than the totals.		
Build the internal audit programme on your own risk and hours, not on the external audit date.		
Ask the change question at an existing monthly meeting, and minute the answer in one line.		
Notify the body in writing of any change to activities, sites, scope, staff or who performs the work.		
Treat outsourcing as a change to the system, not only as a procurement decision.		
Book recertification with enough margin to absorb a major finding without a lapse.		
Report surveillance results to your board as information about a sample.		
Keep a one-line change log for the whole cycle, with notification dates.		

These steps are the book's method, not requirements of ISO 45001. 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
«Recertification is a longer surveillance.»	Surveillance checks a compulsory core and samples the rest. Recertification also samples, but evaluates the whole system across the whole period.	
«Three clean visits mean three good years.»	Sampling can pass a system that runs only when observed. The distribution of your own data will say which you have.	
«We tell the body about changes at the next visit.»	The duty is to inform without delay, and it is in the agreement you signed.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
«A new outlet is an operational matter, not a certification matter.»	New activities, new premises and a change in who performs the work are exactly what the notification duty covers.	
«If the certificate lapses, the body can backdate the new one.»	It cannot. The new certificate runs from the decision, and the gap is real.	
«The auditor would have warned us at the last surveillance.»	He raises what is non-conforming now. Managing your cycle is not a service you bought.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Running the internal audit programme against the external audit calendar.		
Reading two clean surveillance visits as three sound years.		
Treating a new outlet or an outsourcing as an operational matter not requiring notification.		
Reporting totals to the board where the distribution is the finding.		
Booking recertification with no margin for a major finding.		
Expecting the body to backdate a certificate across a lapse.		

Operative synthesis

- **The cycle is not three tests.** It is a continuous claim about a system, checked three times, and the checks are designed on the assumption that the claim is true between them. Surveillance samples and can therefore be passed by a property that is not running a system; recertification evaluates the period and generally cannot. That asymmetry is why the third year surprises people who were not surprised in the first two.
- **The discipline is two habits and neither is expensive.** Plot your own distribution and look at the shape once a quarter. Ask the change question every month and write the answer down. A property doing both would have caught everything that happened in Melbourne in the month it happened, at a cost of perhaps three hours a year.
- **It is worth being explicit about why the six-week window is so common, because condemning it explains nothing.** It is rational. Preparing intensively three times costs far less than operating continuously, and it works for two visits out of three. What defeats it is not virtue but arithmetic at the end of the cycle, when somebody finally plots the months and the strategy becomes visible in four seconds.
- **In Melbourne every visit was clean or nearly so.** Fourteen internal audits, eleven of them in three six-week windows; two hundred and thirty worker reports, a hundred and fifty-one in the same windows; a rooftop bar with a hundred and forty seats and outdoor work above a public street, opened in month fourteen and unassessed in month thirty-six; nineteen maintenance workers who changed employer and not plant room; and eleven weeks without a certificate at the end, which cost more than the three years of auditing that preceded it.
- A certificate held continuously is also a certificate that can be taken away, and not only for the reasons examined so far. The next subchapter deals with the hardest case in this volume: what happens when someone is hurt while the certificate is valid.

Action plan for our property

Action	Owner	Due	How we will know it worked

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 3b «The Lens», subchapter 4.10. Edizioni Effedore, 2026. Clause references are paraphrased; this sheet does not reproduce the text of ISO 45001. It is not legal advice: health and safety law is that of the place where the property operates.