OSHAlytics

How to Reduce Corrective Action Close Time by 60%

Proven strategies for accelerating corrective action resolution across your safety program.

Resource Guide | 2026 Edition

For Safety Directors, EHS Managers, and Compliance Leaders

oshalytics.com | info@oshalytics.com

Table of Contents

0 Introduction

Why Corrective Actions Get Stuck

Every workplace safety program identifies hazards. The best ones fix them. The gap between identifying a hazard and verifying that it has been resolved — that gap is where incidents happen, where OSHA citations are born, and where safety programs quietly fail.

Corrective action close time — the number of days from when a finding is assigned to when it is verified as resolved — is one of the most reliable leading indicators of safety program effectiveness.[1] Organizations that track this metric closely and actively drive it down see measurable reductions in repeat incidents, citation exposure, and workers' compensation costs.

Yet for most organizations, corrective actions accumulate. They are assigned to "the team," deadlines pass without consequence, and the backlog grows. Inspections keep identifying the same hazards. Workers stop reporting because they see nothing gets fixed. And when OSHA arrives, the overdue corrective action log is exactly the kind of evidence that turns a simple inspection into a willful violation.

> INDUSTRY BENCHMARK: A target of 90%+ of corrective actions closed within their assigned deadline is widely cited as the performance threshold for high-functioning EHS programs. Most organizations are well below that. The gap is rarely a resources problem — it is a systems and accountability problem.

This guide identifies the five root causes behind slow corrective action closure, delivers seven proven strategies to cut close time by 60% or more, and provides the frameworks, metrics, and tools to make fast resolution a permanent operating condition — not a short-term push.

1. OSHA — Using Leading Indicators to Improve Safety and Health Outcomes, https://www.osha.gov/leading-indicators

1 The True Cost of Slow Corrective Actions

OSHA's View of Open Corrective Actions

When an OSHA compliance officer reviews your corrective action records, they are looking for one thing: evidence that your program actually closes the loop. Open corrective actions — especially overdue ones — tell a specific story that works against you in three ways:

- Prior knowledge of a hazard: An open corrective action from a previous inspection is documented proof you knew a hazard existed. If an incident occurs related to that hazard before it was closed, OSHA can cite a willful violation, carrying penalties up to $165,514 per item.[2]
- Failure to abate: If OSHA issued a citation and the abatement deadline passes without closure, failure-to-abate penalties accumulate at up to $16,550 per day.[3]
- Program ineffectiveness: A large backlog of overdue corrective actions signals to an inspector that your safety program identifies hazards but doesn't actually resolve them — which undermines every other element of your program.

The Hidden Business Costs

The regulatory exposure is real, but the operational costs of slow corrective action closure are often larger. Every day a hazard stays open is a day workers are exposed to it — and exposure creates incidents.

Cost Category	How Slow Closure Drives It
Direct injury costs	OSHA estimates employers pay $2–$3 in indirect costs for every $1 in direct injury costs. A single serious injury easily exceeds $40,000–$60,000 in direct costs alone.
Repeat incident costs	When corrective actions address symptoms rather than root causes, the same incident recurs. Each recurrence carries the same investigation, claim, and downtime cost.
Workers' compensation EMR impact	A high Experience Modification Rate (EMR) directly increases insurance premiums and can disqualify a company from certain contracts requiring EMR ≤ 1.0.
OSHA citation penalties	Serious violations: up to $16,550 each. Willful or repeat: up to $165,514 each. Instance-by-instance policy means each employee exposure can be a separate citation.
Productivity and morale	Workers who submit hazard reports and see no action stop reporting. Near-miss reporting rates — the most valuable leading indicator — drop when closure rates are poor.

Benchmarking Your Current Close Time

Before you can improve, you need a baseline. Calculate these three numbers from your current corrective action data:

- Average time to close: Sum of days from assignment to verified closure for all closed corrective actions ÷ total number of closed actions. Break this down by severity (critical, serious, minor).
- On-time closure rate: Number of corrective actions closed by their deadline ÷ total corrective actions assigned × 100. Target: 90%+.
- Overdue backlog: Count of all open corrective actions past their assigned deadline today. Any number greater than zero is your immediate priority.

90%+ Corrective action closure rate target
% closed by assigned deadline

24 hrs Critical finding close time target
From identification to interim control

72 hrs Serious finding close time target
From identification to resolution

30 days Minor finding close time target
Standard close window

2. OSHA — Recommended Practices for Safety and Health Programs (OSHA 3885), https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OSHA3885.pdf
3. OSHA — Civil Penalties — OSHA Penalty Schedule, https://www.osha.gov/penalties

2 The Five Root Causes of Slow Closure

Before applying solutions, understand the actual reasons corrective actions stay open. These five causes account for the majority of overdue items in most safety programs.

Cause 1: Unclear Ownership

The most common root cause is also the simplest: the corrective action was not assigned to a specific named individual. When a finding is assigned to "the maintenance team," "operations," or "all supervisors," no one person has accountability. Shared responsibility becomes no responsibility.

- Every corrective action must have one named owner — a specific person, not a department or role
- The owner is responsible for either completing the action themselves or coordinating resources to do so — and for updating status
- The assigning safety manager retains oversight but not primary responsibility

Cause 2: No Severity-Based Deadlines

When every corrective action has the same deadline — or no deadline at all — the urgency of a critical electrical hazard is treated the same as a housekeeping issue. Prioritization disappears and high-severity items get pushed to the bottom of busy supervisors' lists.

A tiered deadline system based on severity rating is the foundational structure of every high-performing corrective action program. Without it, everything is equally important, which means nothing is.

Cause 3: Addressing Symptoms, Not Root Causes

The most expensive form of slow closure is the corrective action that gets closed quickly — and then reopened three months later when the same hazard recurs. Temporary fixes that address the visible symptom without identifying the underlying cause produce a revolving door of repeated findings.[4]

- A spill cleaned up without asking why the spill occurred will happen again
- A guard replaced without investigating why it was removed will be removed again
- A procedure violation corrected without training investigation will recur

> RESEARCH FINDING: Organizations that treat corrective and preventive action as a single connected loop — from issue identification through verified closure — build programs that hold up over time. Those that treat them as separate activities tend to struggle with repeat incidents.

Cause 4: No Escalation System

Without a formal escalation path, overdue corrective actions stay overdue. When a supervisor misses a deadline, the item ages silently in the backlog with no visibility to leadership. There is no consequence and no urgency to act. An escalation system converts silence into action.

Cause 5: Paper-Based and Fragmented Tracking

Paper inspection forms and spreadsheet-based corrective action logs create three structural problems that directly slow closure: findings don't automatically generate assignments, there is no reminder system, and leadership has no real-time visibility into the backlog. A corrective action that exists on a clipboard in a site trailer has no path to escalation, no automated deadline tracking, and no way to alert the owner that their deadline is approaching.[5]

4. OSHA — Safety and Health Program Implementation Checklist — Hazard Prevention and Control, https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/SHP_Implementation_Checklist.pdf
5. OSHA — Recommended Practices for Safety and Health Programs (OSHA 3885), https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OSHA3885.pdf

3 Seven Strategies to Cut Close Time by 60%

Each strategy below directly addresses one or more of the five root causes identified in Chapter 2. Implemented together, they create the conditions for sustained, significant reduction in corrective action close time.

1

Assign One Owner, Not a Team

For every corrective action, identify a single named person who is accountable for its resolution. This individual is responsible for either completing the work or coordinating the resources needed. Their name, their deadline. No exceptions. Where a corrective action spans multiple departments, assign a lead owner who coordinates the others and remains accountable for overall closure.

2

Implement Severity-Based SLAs

Define explicit service-level agreements (SLAs) for each severity tier. These are not guidelines — they are organizational commitments. When a finding is classified as critical, the 24-hour SLA activates immediately. SLAs are the mechanism that converts urgency into accountability.

3

Require Root Cause Before Assignment

Before assigning a corrective action, require at minimum a documented answer to the question: what caused this finding? Even a basic 5-Why analysis takes 15 minutes and prevents the most expensive failure mode in corrective action management: the fix that doesn't fix the problem. Assign both a corrective action (fix the current issue) and a preventive action (address the root cause) for every serious or critical finding.

4

Apply Interim Controls on Day One

For any finding that cannot be permanently resolved within 24 hours, require interim controls to be documented and implemented immediately. An interim control is any temporary measure that reduces worker exposure to the hazard while the permanent fix is developed. Barricades, warning signs, temporary procedures, enhanced PPE requirements, or work suspension are all valid interim controls. Document the interim measure and include it in the corrective action record.

5

Build an Automated Escalation Ladder

Define a three-tier escalation sequence for all overdue corrective actions. This sequence should trigger automatically — ideally through your safety management software — without requiring a human to manually identify and chase overdue items. When escalation is automated, nothing falls through the cracks regardless of workload or personnel changes.

6

Require Evidence-Based Closure

A corrective action is not closed when the owner says it is closed. It is closed when documented evidence confirms the hazard has been resolved and the root cause addressed. Require photo evidence of the corrected condition, a verification inspection by someone other than the owner, and a documented effectiveness check scheduled 30–60 days after closure to confirm the fix held.

7

Use Data to Eliminate Repeat Findings

Track your repeat findings rate — the percentage of corrective actions that reopen because the same hazard recurred. Any hazard that appears in three or more inspection cycles is a systemic issue requiring a different type of corrective action: an engineering control, a policy revision, a training redesign, or an operational change. Repeat findings cannot be corrected by the same type of action that already failed twice.

The Severity-Based SLA Reference Table

Severity	Examples	Deadline	Default Owner	Escalation Trigger
Critical	Imminent danger, life-threatening hazard, electrical exposure, fall risk >6 ft	Interim control: immediate Permanent fix: 24 hours	Safety Director + Location Manager	Auto-escalate to VP/Owner at 12 hours
Serious	Significant injury potential, OSHA-citable condition, recurring hazard	72 hours	Area Supervisor	Auto-escalate to Safety Director at 48 hours
Moderate	Potential for minor injury, housekeeping, compliance documentation gap	14 days	Supervisor or Lead	Auto-escalate at 10 days
Minor / Observation	Best practice improvement, low-risk condition, informational finding	30 days	Supervisor or Designee	Flag in monthly review if open

The Three-Tier Escalation Ladder

Escalation Tier	Action
Tier 1 (Day of deadline)	Automated reminder to assigned owner and direct supervisor. Corrective action flagged as “past due” in dashboard.
Tier 2 (+48 hours overdue)	Automated notification to department manager and Safety Director. Item appears in weekly review agenda automatically.
Tier 3 (+5 days overdue)	Notification to senior leadership (VP Operations, Plant Manager, or Owner). Item designated as “critical backlog” requiring executive resolution.

6. OSHA — Safety and Health Program Implementation Checklist — Hazard Prevention and Control, https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/SHP_Implementation_Checklist.pdf
7. OSHA — Safety and Health Program Implementation Checklist, https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/SHP_Implementation_Checklist.pdf

4 Building an Accountability System That Works

Defining Roles Across the Corrective Action Lifecycle

Accountability is not assigned at the moment of closure — it is defined at the moment of assignment and maintained through every stage of the lifecycle. Every person in the organization with a role in safety needs to understand what they are responsible for in the corrective action process.

Role	Responsibilities	Documentation Owned
Inspector / Observer	Identifies the finding. Classifies severity. Documents with photo evidence and specific location. Recommends corrective action type. Submits within 24 hours of the inspection.	Inspection report, photo documentation, finding description
Safety Director / EHS Manager	Reviews all findings. Confirms severity classification. Assigns named owner and deadline per SLA. Tracks overdue items. Escalates per the escalation ladder. Verifies closure and effectiveness.	Assignment records, escalation log, closure verification
Area Supervisor / Foreman	Receives assignment. Implements interim controls immediately for serious and critical items. Completes or coordinates the permanent fix. Submits photographic closure evidence by the deadline.	Interim control documentation, closure evidence, status updates
Department Manager	Receives Tier 2 escalation notifications. Removes resource barriers that are blocking closure. Reviews corrective action performance for their area in the weekly safety meeting.	Escalation response documentation
Senior Leadership	Receives Tier 3 escalation notifications. Personally drives resolution of critical backlog items. Reviews corrective action KPIs monthly as part of safety performance scorecard.	Monthly KPI review, Tier 3 escalation responses

The Weekly Corrective Action Review

A structured weekly review is the single most effective management practice for maintaining corrective action momentum. This meeting should take no more than 20 minutes when run against a real-time dashboard. Its purpose is not to discuss why items are late — it is to make decisions that remove barriers to closure.

Weekly review agenda:

1. Overdue items (5 minutes): Review every item past its SLA deadline. Assign a specific resolution action or escalate. No item leaves the meeting without a clear next step and an updated deadline.

2. Critical findings (3 minutes): Confirm all critical findings from the past 7 days have interim controls in place and permanent fix timelines confirmed.
3. Trend watch (5 minutes): Identify any finding category appearing in 3+ consecutive inspections. Flag for root cause analysis and systemic corrective action.
4. Upcoming deadlines (3 minutes): Preview items due in the next 7 days. Confirm owners are aware and on track.
5. Closed this week (2 minutes): Acknowledge closures. Verify evidence was submitted. Note any items requiring effectiveness follow-up.

Connecting Actions to Inspections and Incidents

Corrective actions should not exist in isolation. Every finding from an inspection, near-miss report, or incident investigation should flow automatically into the same corrective action system. Siloed systems — where inspection findings, incident corrective actions, and audit items live in different spreadsheets — create three separate backlogs with no unified visibility and no way to identify cross-cutting patterns.[8]

- Inspections → corrective actions: Every inspection finding automatically generates a corrective action record with the finding description, photo, severity, and inspector pre-populated
- Near-miss reports → corrective actions: Near-miss investigations identify hazardous conditions that require corrective action before an injury occurs
- Incident investigations → corrective actions: Root cause analysis findings drive both corrective actions (fix the condition) and preventive actions (prevent recurrence) that feed into the same tracking system
- Audit findings → corrective actions: Internal and external audit non-conformances require the same structured assignment, deadline, and closure process as inspection findings

8. OSHA — Recommended Practices for Safety and Health Programs — Program Evaluation and Improvement, https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OSHA3885.pdf

5 Measuring What Matters

The Five Corrective Action KPIs

Tracking the right metrics converts your corrective action program from a reactive paper trail into a proactive management tool. These five KPIs give you complete visibility into performance, accountability gaps, and systemic hazard patterns.[9]

KPI	Definition	Breakdown	Target
Average Time to Close	Mean days from assignment to verified closure	By severity tier. Trend over 12 months.	Critical: <1 day Serious: <3 days Minor: <21 days
On-Time Closure Rate	% of corrective actions closed by their SLA deadline	By severity, department, and location.	90%+ overall
Overdue Backlog Count	Number of open corrective actions past their deadline	By age bucket: 1–7 days, 8–30 days, 30+ days.	Zero; any count is an immediate action item
Repeat Findings Rate	% of corrective actions reopened for the same finding location/category	By inspection category and work area.	<10%; consistently declining
Effectiveness Verification Rate	% of closed corrective actions with a documented 30-day effectiveness check	Overall and by finding severity.	100% for critical and serious findings

Setting Baselines and Targets

Before setting targets, establish your current baseline. Pull 90 days of historical corrective action data and calculate each of the five KPIs. The baseline is not a judgment — it is your starting point.

- Month 1–3: Focus on on-time closure rate and overdue backlog. Implement the SLA framework and ownership model. Target: zero new overdue items entering the backlog.
- Month 4–6: Drive average close time down by eliminating the structural barriers (missing root cause analysis, no interim controls). Target: 20% reduction in average close time vs. baseline.
- Month 7–12: Focus on repeat findings rate. Target: 40–60% reduction in repeat findings through systemic corrective actions that address root causes.
- Ongoing: Maintain 90%+ on-time closure rate. Use repeat findings data to drive continuous improvement in program design.

Using Trend Data to Prevent Incidents

The highest value from corrective action data doesn't come from looking backward at what was closed — it comes from looking forward at what patterns predict. Three trend signals that consistently precede incident increases:[10]

- Declining near-miss reporting rate: When workers stop reporting, hazards go unobserved and corrective actions stop being generated for real hazards. A drop in near-miss reports is one of the most reliable leading indicators of an impending recordable incident.
- Rising repeat findings rate: The same hazard appearing in multiple inspection cycles means corrective actions are not addressing root causes. Every repeated finding is a hazard that will eventually cause an incident.
- Growing overdue backlog: A corrective action backlog that grows faster than it closes means the organization's capacity to resolve hazards is less than the rate at which hazards are being identified. This gap drives incident rates upward predictably over a 60–180 day window.

9. OSHA — Using Leading Indicators to Improve Safety and Health Outcomes (Publication 3909), https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OSHA3909.pdf
10. OSHA — Using Leading Indicators to Improve Safety and Health Outcomes, https://www.osha.gov/leading-indicators

6 The Role of Technology

What Digital Tools Change

Technology doesn't fix a broken accountability culture — but it removes every structural barrier that makes good accountability hard to sustain. The single biggest difference between a paper-based corrective action system and a digital one is this: in a digital system, every finding automatically generates a tracked action, every deadline triggers an automatic notification, and every overdue item is visible to leadership in real time. None of that requires a human to remember.

Features That Directly Reduce Close Time

Feature	How It Works	Close Time Impact
Automatic action generation	Findings from inspections, incidents, and near-misses automatically create corrective action records — no manual re-entry, no items lost in translation between paper and system.	Eliminates the gap between finding and assignment
Named owner assignment with SLA enforcement	System enforces one named owner per action and applies the severity-based SLA at the moment of assignment. Due date calculated automatically.	Closes the 'shared responsibility' gap
Automated reminders and escalation	Deadline approaching → owner notified. Deadline missed → Tier 1 escalation triggers. +48 hours → Tier 2. System-driven, not person-driven.	Eliminates silent overdue accumulation
Mobile photo evidence submission	Field workers submit photo evidence of completed corrective actions from the job site without returning to an office or filling out paper forms. Closure is documented at the point of resolution.	Removes administrative delay in closure documentation
Real-time dashboard visibility	Leadership sees overdue counts, average close times, and repeat findings rates by location and department without requesting reports from anyone.	Converts data into management action
Effectiveness verification tracking	System schedules a 30-day effectiveness check at closure and notifies the verifying party. Not closeable permanently until verification is documented.	Ensures fixes hold and don't reopen
Cross-module integration	Inspections, incidents, audits, and near-miss reports all feed into the same corrective action tracking system. One backlog, one dashboard, one accountability system.	Eliminates siloed backlogs and blind spots

Implementation Without Disruption

Moving to a digital corrective action system doesn't require replacing every process at once. A phased approach builds adoption and delivers measurable improvement in the first 30 days:

1. Start with new findings only. Migrate paper-based open items over time, but immediately begin tracking all new findings digitally. This gives you clean data from day one without the burden of a full historical migration.
2. Train owners first. Before rollout, ensure every person who will receive corrective action assignments knows how to update status, submit photo evidence, and request deadline extensions through the system.
3. Activate the dashboard in week one. Leadership visibility is the primary behavior-change mechanism. When supervisors know their overdue items are visible to their manager in real time, close rates improve immediately — often before any training has been completed.
4. Review metrics in the first weekly meeting. Use real data from the new system in the first weekly corrective action review. Even one week of data makes the meeting more concrete and drives faster adoption.

> MARKET CONTEXT: The safety inspection software market is growing at 14.78% annually, driven by organizations that have already seen measurable reductions in incident rates and compliance costs from digital safety management. The competitive advantage of fast corrective action closure extends beyond compliance — it directly impacts EMR, insurance premiums, and contract eligibility.

11. OSHA — Recommended Practices for Safety and Health Programs (OSHA 3885), https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OSHA3885.pdf
12. OSHA — Safety and Health Program Implementation Checklist — Corrective Action Requirements, https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/SHP_Implementation_Checklist.pdf

Appendix

Corrective Action Program Self-Assessment

Score your current corrective action program against these 40 items. Any unchecked item is a specific improvement opportunity.

Ownership and Assignment

[ ] Every corrective action is assigned to one named individual — not a team or department

[ ] Owner is responsible for both completing the action and updating status

[ ] Assignment is made within 24 hours of finding identification

[ ] The assigning safety manager has oversight visibility of all open items

Severity Classification and Deadlines

[ ] All findings are classified by severity at the time of identification

[ ] Written SLA deadlines are defined for each severity tier

[ ] Critical findings require interim controls within the same shift

[ ] SLA deadlines are communicated to owners at time of assignment

[ ] Deadlines are system-enforced, not just policy

Root Cause Analysis

[ ] Serious and critical findings require documented root cause analysis before assignment

[ ] Root cause analysis uses a structured method (5-Why, fishbone, or equivalent)

[ ] Corrective actions address the root cause, not just the visible symptom

[ ] Preventive actions are assigned for systemic root causes

[ ] Root cause categories are tracked to identify program-level patterns

Escalation System

[ ] A written escalation policy exists with defined tiers and triggers

[ ] Escalation notifications are automated — not dependent on manual identification

[ ] Tier 1 escalation reaches the direct supervisor on the day of deadline

[ ] Tier 2 escalation reaches the department manager within 48 hours of overdue

[ ] Tier 3 escalation reaches senior leadership within 5 days of overdue

Closure and Verification

[ ] Corrective actions require photo evidence of the resolved condition

[ ] Closure is verified by someone other than the action owner

[ ] Critical and serious actions require a documented effectiveness check at 30 days

[ ] Actions cannot be closed without evidence submission in the tracking system

[ ] Re-opened actions (recurrences) are tracked separately as a KPI

Tracking and Visibility

[ ] All findings from inspections, incidents, near-misses, and audits feed into one system

[ ] Real-time dashboard shows overdue counts, average close time, and backlog by area

[ ] Leadership has direct visibility without requesting reports

[ ] Historical corrective action data is searchable by location, category, and date

[ ] Repeat findings rate is calculated and reviewed monthly

Accountability Culture

[ ] Weekly corrective action review meeting is on the calendar and runs consistently

[ ] Corrective action KPIs are included in leadership's monthly safety scorecard

[ ] Workers see evidence that their hazard reports result in completed actions

[ ] Near-miss reporting rate is tracked as a leading indicator

[ ] Supervisors are held accountable for their area's on-time closure rate

Metrics and Continuous Improvement

[ ] Average time to close is tracked by severity tier, trending over 12 months

[ ] On-time closure rate has a defined target (90%+) with monthly review

[ ] Overdue backlog count is reviewed in every weekly safety meeting

[ ] Repeat findings rate is tracked and used to trigger systemic corrective actions

[ ] Effectiveness verification rate is tracked for critical and serious findings

Sources

1. OSHA — Using Leading Indicators to Improve Safety and Health Outcomes. https://www.osha.gov/leading-indicators
2. OSHA — Recommended Practices for Safety and Health Programs (OSHA 3885). https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OSHA3885.pdf
3. OSHA — Civil Penalties — OSHA Penalty Schedule. https://www.osha.gov/penalties
4. OSHA — Safety and Health Program Implementation Checklist — Hazard Prevention and Control. https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/SHP_Implementation_Checklist.pdf
5. OSHA — Recommended Practices for Safety and Health Programs (OSHA 3885). https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OSHA3885.pdf
6. OSHA — Safety and Health Program Implementation Checklist — Hazard Prevention and Control. https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/SHP_Implementation_Checklist.pdf
7. OSHA — Safety and Health Program Implementation Checklist. https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/SHP_Implementation_Checklist.pdf
8. OSHA — Recommended Practices for Safety and Health Programs — Program Evaluation and Improvement. https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OSHA3885.pdf
9. OSHA — Using Leading Indicators to Improve Safety and Health Outcomes (Publication 3909). https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OSHA3909.pdf
10. OSHA — Using Leading Indicators to Improve Safety and Health Outcomes. https://www.osha.gov/leading-indicators
11. OSHA — Recommended Practices for Safety and Health Programs (OSHA 3885). https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OSHA3885.pdf
12. OSHA — Safety and Health Program Implementation Checklist — Corrective Action Requirements. https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/SHP_Implementation_Checklist.pdf

Close Corrective Actions Faster with OSHAlytics

OSHAlytics connects inspections, corrective actions, and document control in one platform — with automated assignments, SLA tracking, and real-time dashboards that keep every finding moving toward closure.

oshalytics.com

info@oshalytics.com | Book a Demo