

A Core TRIOS	
1	Does the EVENT describe something that has happened to an OBJECT
2	Is the OBJECT described as it was before it got changed by the AGENT
3	Does the AGENT describe an: action, force, condition, state, situation, or some driving mechanism that had the potential to change the condition of the OBJECT to that described in the EVENT.
4	Does each trio start with an AGENT and OBJECT and finish with an EVENT.
5	Does the final core diagram contain more than one trio.
6	Do the descriptions of AGENT, OBJECT, and EVENT comply with the test – EVENT due to AGENT acting upon OBJECT.
7	Does time progress from left to right
8	Are multiple end EVENTS used correctly.
9	Does each EVENT only relate to a single OBJECT.
10	Are all EVENTS that follow an effective barrier described as "potential EVENT"
11	Does the string of trios adequately explain what has happened.
12	Do any of the diagram extremities need further explanation - should more trios be added.
B BARRIERS	
1	Have all the intended BARRIERS been identified
2	Have any missing BARRIERS been identified i.e. does it appear that the task will be conducted with associated risks at ALARP.
3	Are the BARRIERS correctly placed within the tree i.e. control BARRIERS for AGENTS, defence BARRIERS for OBJECTs, and upstream of the EVENT they are designed to prevent.
4	Are BARRIERS described such that, had they been effective, they would have prevented the next EVENT from occurring.
5	Are EVENTS described in sufficient detail to enable BARRIERS to be shown in the correct place i.e. does an EVENT need to be broken down into another trio.
6	Are BARRIERS described in company documents or identified by a subject matter expert.
7	Are narrative symbols used to explain potential EVENTS that are due to good luck rather than an effective barrier.
C IMMEDIATE CAUSES	
1	Has the person who carried out the unsafe act been identified in the description
2	Are the ICs unsafe acts (rather than an unsafe conditions)
3	Is it clear that the ICs led to the failure of their respective barriers.
4	Is the category of unsafe act obvious when considering the ICs and PCs together – if it is not i.e. the perpetrator of the unsafe act did exactly what they were supposed to do then consider reclassifying the barrier from failed to inadequate.
5	Is there only one IC per barrier (one IC can defeat more than one barrier)
D PRECONDITIONS	
1	Does the PC describe a condition that influenced the behaviour of the person committing the unsafe act

2	Does the diagram have any PCs that are not relevant to the ICs (they can be included in the report but do not show on diagram).
3	Are the PCs compatible with the category of human error described in the IC
E UNDERLYING CAUSES	
1	For a failed barrier, does the UC identify the system (business/management control) that is flawed
2	For an inadequate barrier, does the UC identify the system (business activity/barrier definition) that is flawed
3	For a missing barrier, does the UC identify the system (risk management/planning) that is flawed
4	Does the UC refer to a single system (rather than multiple systems)
5	Does the UC identify how the system is less than adequate
6	Is the UC a valid reason for its associated PC(s)
7	Has each UC been assigned the correct BRF or CCS (company's classification system).
F REMEDIAL ACTIONS	
1	Does each failed, missing, and inadequate barrier have a remedial action (or an explanation as to why not).
2	Does each UC have a remedial action (or an explanation as to why not).
3	Are there no remedial actions assigned to ICs
4	Remedial actions may be applied to PCs but they are likely to be short lived if nothing is done about the underlying causes.
5	Are the remedial actions specific
6	Are the remedial actions measurable
7	Are the remedial actions appropriate
8	Are the remedial actions realistic
9	Are the remedial actions timely
10	Should remedial actions for BARRIERS be completed prior to activity restarting
11	Will there be a follow-up to confirm remedial actions have been carried out and do in fact achieve what they were supposed to achieve.
G OVERALL DIAGRAM	
1	Have narrative symbols been used to good affect
2	Are the PCs sufficient to fully explain the IC – or should there be more.
3	Are the UCs sufficient to fully explain the PCs
4	Have the tree elements been arranged to assist the report reader - an uncluttered layout
5	Does the tree comply with the logic rules
6	Does the tree provide a good summary of what is written in the report or, are there important points missed off the diagram.
7	Does the tree have a title, date and, revision number.