

PERMIT SYSTEM AUDIT CHECKLIST

Periodic audit of the permit system — not of an individual permit

RETAIN AT PERMIT CONTROL POINT

KD-SYS-AU-021 Rev A0

HSG250 requires the permit-to-work system to be audited regularly by competent people, preferably external to the site. The questions below are built around HSE's own stated failure modes, including the Piper Alpha finding on cross-referencing and the observation that suspended permits were kept in the safety office rather than the control room.

1 AUDIT DETAILS

AUDIT REFERENCE	DATE OF AUDIT	SITE / PROJECT	AUDITED BY (NAME, ROLE, INDEPENDENCE)

2 SYSTEM DESIGN

For each question: answer Y, N or N/A, record the evidence you actually saw, and note any action required.

Is there a written permit to work procedure, and is it current?

Are the types of work requiring a permit clearly identified?

Are the roles — issuing, authorising, area, isolating, performing — defined?

Is it clear who may authorise particular jobs, and what the limits of their authority are?

Are permit forms standardised, legible, and at least 8pt type?

Does every permit form provide for cross-referencing other permits and certificates?

3 OPERATION — SAMPLE AT LEAST FIVE LIVE AND FIVE CANCELLED PERMITS

Was a permit issued for every job that required one?

Is the scope on each permit specific, with stated limitations?

Was each permit seen by a second person before issue?

Does each permit carry a specific expiry, rather than being open-ended?

Are cross-references to simultaneous permits completed, and are they accurate?

Is the display copy actually displayed at the work site?

Is the control copy held at the permit control point?

Are suspended permits held at the control point, NOT in the safety office?

Is the condition the plant was left in recorded on every suspension?

PERMIT SYSTEM AUDIT CHECKLIST

continued

RETAIN AT PERMIT CONTROL POINT

KD-SYS-AU-021 Rev A0

Is hand-back completed, including acknowledgement by operational staff?

Are cancellations recorded in the register?

Do isolation certificates match the isolations actually in place on site?

4 COMPETENCE AND TRAINING

Does every permit issuer hold a current written appointment?

Has competence been assessed, covering practical and thinking skills as well as knowledge?

Is training in the issue, use and closure of permits recorded?

Is the authorisation scope matrix current and consistent with the appointments?

5 FINDINGS AND ACTIONS

NO.	FINDING	SEVERITY	ACTION REQUIRED	OWNER	DUE

6 AUDIT SIGN-OFF

I certify that this audit was carried out as recorded, that the permits sampled are as identified, and that the findings are as stated.

PRINTED NAME	ROLE AND INDEPENDENCE	COMPANY	SIGNATURE	DATE	TIME

R REVISION HISTORY

Every revision of this document, and every review that found nothing to change. The revision on the front of this sheet is the one you are holding — check kubitdocs.com for the current one before use.

Rev	Date	Class	What changed	Authorised by
D0	2026-08-07	first-issue	First issue.	— not yet approved —
D1	2026-08-10	review	Reviewed - no change to the content. Legislation position reviewed against Product Legislation Register KD-REG-01 Rev R01.3 and the August 2026 horizon scan; cutoff moved to 10 August 2026.	— not yet approved —
A0	2026-08-27	review	Approved for issue by the author. Content unchanged from D1; the draft status strip is removed. No independent third-party review has been carried out.	Author — director, UK principal contractor, SMSTS. Not an independent review.

Class: first-issue · material (the law, a control, a field or the scope changed — past buyers are notified) · editorial (wording or layout only) · review (checked, nothing changed) · withdrawal. Revision prefix D = draft, not approved and not for sale; A = approved for issue by the person named, on the date shown.