WORKING MATERIAL 1.3 · CHAPTER 1 — THE VISION OF OWNERSHIP · SETTING: DUBLIN, IRELAND

One Structure for Every Topic: The Harmonized Structure of Management-System Standards

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 9a — The Small Property, subchapter 1.3 (book page 39)

GUIDING QUESTION

How many folders do you keep for quality, environment, safety and data protection, and how often do they say the same thing in different words? What would change if your house had only one framework for all of these topics?

1 · Verification Pact: market claims against the standard

Copied from the book. The last column is for your property: what holds here, and how you know it.

What is claimed	Binding?	What actually holds	In our property
Every standard needs its own system	No	All follow the same framework, which is meant to enhance integration	
Every topic needs its own policy	No	One policy under 5.2, carrying the commitments of each applied standard	
All management-system standards are the same	Only partially true	The framework is shared; the discipline-specific requirements differ	
ISO 45001 and ISO 22000 do not fit the framework	Only partially true	ISO 45001 follows the older version without 6.3; ISO 22000 structures clause 8 its own way	
A standard can replace data-protection law	No	The law always applies; ISO/IEC 27001 is voluntary	
Integrating means certifying everything	No	Whether and for what to seek certification is the house's decision	
The policy must commit to satisfying applicable requirements	Yes	Required by 5.2, for every topic the system covers	

2 · Common mistakes — a self-check

Tick each mistake you recognise in your own property, and note where it shows.

☐ Opening a separate folder for every standard.

☐ Treating data-protection law as if it were a voluntary standard.

☐ Adopting policies from different consultants that contradict each other.

☐ Buying standards before collecting the questions the house must answer.

☐ Overlooking the deviations: ISO 45001:2018 has no 6.3, and ISO 22000:2018 structures clause 8 its own way.

☐ Adding changes to the common core several times, and missing one.

☐ Assuming integration means certification for everything.

☐ Letting a supplier’s folder stand in for the route the law provides.

3 · A Checklist for an Owner Bringing Topics Under One Framework

The book’s checklist, with a column for your own answer.

Question	Why it matters	Our answer
Have we laid the contents pages of our standards side by side?	Shared clauses should be done once	
Is there one context and one scope for the whole house?	Two versions drift apart	
Does one policy cover every topic, with each standard’s commitments?	Several policies contradict each other	
Are all risks and opportunities on one list?	The same risk is otherwise rated twice	
Are legal duties recorded as applicable requirements, separate from standards?	Law applies whether or not a standard is used	
Is there one management review a year?	One review sees the whole house	

4 · What would show this is working

Questions drawn from the subchapter’s reading of the standards and its practical application. Clause numbers in brackets point to the harmonized structure or the standard the subchapter names; where the evidence lives, and the sheets named, are this book’s method, not a requirement of any standard.

Question	Where the evidence lives	Seen?
Have clauses 4 to 10 been laid side by side for the standards the house applies, with additions per topic noted?	One sheet per clause, with a line for what each topic adds	☐
Is there one scope paragraph covering everything the system includes (4.3)?	The scope paragraph at the foot of the context sheet	☐
Does one policy carry the commitment to applicable requirements and to improvement for every topic (5.2)?	The five-sentence policy, dated and posted	☐
Are the legal duties on one list of applicable requirements, each with its source and person responsible?	The obligations list, kept beside the framework	☐
Is there one risk list with a topic column, and one management review date a year (6.1, 9.3)?	The risk list; the review record	☐

> *What this sheet is not: no management-system standard prescribes this form, and filling it shows conformity with nothing. It is a working aid drawn from the book; the standards’ own texts govern the real case, and legal duties are established with competent local expertise. Independent material; not affiliated with or endorsed by ISO or any certification, accreditation or scheme-owning body. The standards’ own texts prevail; legal duties must be confirmed locally.*