Working aid, not legal advice. The risk assessment under sections 5 and 6 ArbSchG must be worked out by every business itself. As of 13.07.2026.

German risk assessment (Gefährdungsbeurteilung) under the Occupational Safety Act and the GDA guideline (as of 05.12.2025)

A legal duty for every employer in Germany, from the first employee onwards

68 requirements. There is no accredited certificate for this standard. As of 07/2026.

What this document is: a working aid that mirrors the structure of a risk assessment under the German Occupational Safety Act (Arbeitsschutzgesetz) and the GDA guideline (as of 05.12.2025). Legal position as of 13.07.2026. What it is not: not legal advice, not a finished result, and not a proof towards an authority. A completed form does not replace your own assessment. The risk assessment is a legal duty for every employer (sections 5 and 6 ArbSchG), to be carried out and documented from the first employee onwards. The state labour inspectorates and the accident insurance institutions examine the result. Every business must work out its own assessment: what counts is the actual hazard situation on site, not the completeness of this list. The hazard factors listed here are expressly examples and not exhaustive. Where the necessary expertise is missing, expert advice must be obtained.

Company	Date	Prepared by

1 Legal framework and responsibility — 8

1.1 **The company has a Gefährdungsbeurteilung (risk assessment) as soon as it employs at least one person, and the underlying documents exist. The former relief for small companies was removed on 25.10.2013. The only exceptions are the areas named in section 1 paragraph 2 ArbSchG, such as domestic staff in private households, maritime shipping and operations under the Bundesberggesetz.** Document

What proves it: The risk assessment documents themselves, each carrying a date. Form and scope are free, and where the hazard situation is comparable, combined entries are sufficient. A small company proves this with a few completed sheets or one table per activity. The documents must contain: the result of the assessment, the measures decided with a due date and a responsible person, the implementation and the check of effectiveness, and the date of creation or update (section 5 and section 6 ArbSchG).

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

1.2 **It is clear inside the company that responsibility for the risk assessment rests with the employer, even when other people prepare or carry it out in a technical capacity. Delegation moves tasks, not responsibility.**

What proves it: A short written statement of who takes on which task in occupational safety: one page in the organisation manual, an org chart with roles, or a note from management. In a small company a signed sheet is enough, naming the roles and recording that management remains responsible (section 3 and section 13 ArbSchG).

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

1.3 **Where occupational safety duties are transferred to employees, this was done in writing, to reliable and technically competent people, with a named area of duty and named powers. The people concerned know what their transfer of duties contains.** Document

What proves it: The signed transfer of duties (Pflichtenübertragung) for each person, with date, area of duty and the power to decide and to spend (section 13 paragraph 2 ArbSchG). A small company fills in a template sheet once and files it with the personnel record. Without such a document the duty stays with management in legal terms, and verbal arrangements change nothing about that.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

1.4 **The people who carry out the assessment are technically competent for it. Where that competence is missing in the company, competent advice has been obtained, for example from the company doctor (Betriebsarzt), the occupational safety specialist (Fachkraft für Arbeitssicherheit), the accident insurance institution (Unfallversicherungsträger) or an external consultant.**

What proves it: Qualification and training records of the people involved, consulting reports, file notes or invoices from external advice. A small company records in the assessment form who took part, with which qualification and on which date. Competence is judged per activity, and hazardous substances or mental strain can require different advice than work equipment.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

1.5 **A company doctor (Betriebsarzt) and an occupational safety specialist (Fachkraft für Arbeitssicherheit) are appointed, regardless of company size, and they are genuinely involved in the risk assessment. They do not have to write the assessment themselves, but their support and advice must not be bypassed.** Document

What proves it: The written appointments under ASiG or the contract with an external service provider, plus walkthrough reports, advisory minutes or countersignatures in the assessment as evidence of involvement (section 3 paragraph 1 number 1 letter g and section 6 number 1 letter e ASiG). Small companies often use a support model offered by their accident insurance institution, and in that case the support record belongs in the file as well.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

1.6 **Where a works council (Betriebsrat) exists, it is involved in how the risk assessment is set up. Whether an assessment is done follows from the law and is not subject to co-determination, but how it is done is: method, assessment criteria, selection of workplaces and activities, the rhythm of updates, and the commissioning of external parties.**

What proves it: A works agreement (Betriebsvereinbarung) on the risk assessment, meeting minutes or resolutions showing that procedure and criteria were agreed (section 87 paragraph 1 number 7 BetrVG). If there is no works council, this point does not apply. Noting that briefly helps, so that the gap is not later read as an omission.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

1.7 **With more than 20 employees there is an occupational safety committee (Arbeitsschutzausschuss) that meets at least quarterly, and safety representatives (Sicherheitsbeauftragte) are appointed. Results and open points of the risk assessment are dealt with there.**

What proves it: Minutes of the occupational safety committee with date, participants and resolutions (section 11 ASiG), plus the appointments of the safety representatives (section 22 SGB VII). Brief minutes are enough, and they also serve as evidence that the assessment is kept up to date.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

1.8 **Particular groups of people are considered separately in the assessment: young people, pregnant and breastfeeding women, temporary agency workers, interns, people new to the job, people with disabilities, and employees without sufficient German language skills. Mental strain is assessed per activity, not per person.**

What proves it: A dedicated section or a column per activity in the working form (part 2), stating the group concerned and the additional measure, for example employment restrictions, adapted instruction, or documents in language the person understands. For temporary agency work this includes passing the hazard information on to the staffing agency. A small company records this with one line per case.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

Working aid, not legal advice. The risk assessment under sections 5 and 6 ArbSchG must be worked out by every business itself. As of 13.07.2026.

2 Step 1: Define work areas and activities 4

2.1 **A complete, dated list of all work areas and of every activity carried out in them exists. It reflects the business as it actually operates, so it also covers secondary sites, storage, workshop, office, outdoor areas, shifts and changing places of work, and it is the reference basis for all further steps of the Gefährdungsbeurteilung (risk assessment).**

What proves it: A table with the columns work area, activity, employees affected, revision date. Useful for cross-checking are the staff list, the duty or shift roster, job descriptions and the floor plan of the workplace: anyone who appears there but is missing from the activity list marks the gap. A small business gets by with a single page; what matters is that it carries a date and that nobody was forgotten.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

2.2 **Besides the routine daily work, tasks that occur rarely or irregularly are recorded as activities in their own right, in particular servicing and maintenance, cleaning, setting up and retooling, clearing faults, incoming and outgoing deliveries including ramp and forklift traffic, and work outside normal operating hours. It is precisely in these exceptional situations that protective devices are often disabled, which is why such tasks must not simply be folded into the routine activity.**

What proves it: In the activity list these tasks appear as separate rows, not as an appendix to normal operation. They can be derived from maintenance and cleaning schedules, fault and repair reports, delivery notes and service contracts. A practical route for a small business: note down for one week everything that was done outside the usual routine; that produces the missing rows.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

2.3 **Activities that do not take place on the company's own premises or are not performed by the core workforce are recorded as well: home office and mobile work, field service, installation and service work at customer sites, lone working without visual or voice contact, and work carried out on the company site by contractors, temporary agency workers and interns. For contractors it is settled who coordinates the work on site and how mutual hazards are avoided.**

What proves it: Evidence comes from the activity list itself plus the accompanying documents: an agreement or internal rule on mobile work, deployment and tour schedules, a rule on lone working, the hire contracts for temporary agency staff, works and service contracts, the visitor or contractor sign in at reception, and a short written designation of the coordinating person. For a small business one sheet per contractor is enough, showing the contact person, work area, period and date of the briefing.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

2.4 **Where several workstations have been grouped together, the reason why the working conditions are of the same kind is stated, so that assessing one workstation is sufficient (section 5 subsection 2 ArbSchG). Grouping is not applied where equipment, work equipment, surroundings or the sequence of work genuinely differ, or where particular groups of people are involved, for example young workers, pregnant and breastfeeding women, people with disabilities, new entrants to the job, temporary agency workers and employees without sufficient German language skills.**

What proves it: The activity list carries a column showing the groups that were formed, plus one short sentence per group explaining where the similarity lies, for example identical machine, same work equipment, same room, same sequence of work. Deviations get a row of their own. Where a works council exists, the selection and grouping of workstations has to be agreed with it (section 87 subsection 1 number 7 BetrVG), which can be evidenced through meeting minutes or a works agreement.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

3 Step 2: Identify the hazards 5

3.1 **The hazards have been identified systematically along a fixed grid for every activity defined in Step 1, not from memory and not only where something had already caught someone's eye. The grid of eleven hazard factors in Part 2 of this document has been worked through activity by activity, and the factors with no finding are recorded as checked and not applicable.** Document

What proves it: Evidenced by the working form from Part 2, filled in per work area or activity, in which every hazard factor carries a mark: found or not applicable. An empty field is not evidence, it later looks like a gap. A small business needs no software for this: one printout of the form per activity, with date and name, is enough as a basis.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

3.2 **The six sources of hazard listed in section 5 (3) ArbSchG are fully covered: the workplace and the work station, physical, chemical and biological effects, work equipment, working and manufacturing processes including work sequences and working time, qualification and instruction, and mental workload at work. Mental workload has been looked at in relation to the activity, that is on the basis of the working conditions, and not as an assessment of individual people. The list in the law is not exhaustive, so further hazards recognisable in the business are recorded as well.** Document

What proves it: Evidenced by a mapping overview showing where each of the six sources can be found again in the identification, plus the records on mental workload: characteristic areas such as work content, work organisation, social relations, working environment and working time, with the date and the workloads identified. Without evidence on mental workload the identification is visibly incomplete.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

3.3 **The identification rests on a walk-through on site and not on desk records alone. The work was observed as it actually takes place, including the states alongside normal operation: setting up, cleaning, maintaining, clearing faults, starting up and shutting down, work outside the usual hours, and work at changing or external locations.**

What proves it: Evidenced by a walk-through record with date, the area covered, the participants and the points found on site, ideally supplemented by photos of the critical spots. In a small business a single form with date, route of the round, observations and signature is enough; what matters is that it stays visible who saw what and when.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

3.4 **The employees who carry out the activity have been asked about the hazards, and what they reported has been recorded. Particular groups of people are explicitly included: young workers, pregnant and breastfeeding women, temporary agency workers, interns, people new to the job, people with disabilities, and employees without sufficient German language skills. The Betriebsarzt (occupational physician) and the Fachkraft fuer Arbeitssicherheit (occupational safety specialist) have been involved; where a works council exists, it takes part in the how of the identification, that is in the method, the criteria and the selection of work stations, under section 87 (1) no. 7 BetrVG.**

What proves it: Evidenced by notes of the conversations or completed short questionnaires with date and area, by memos or statements from the Betriebsarzt and the Fachkraft fuer Arbeitssicherheit, by minutes of the Arbeitsschutzausschuss (occupational safety committee) where there are more than 20 employees, and, where one exists, by the involvement of the works council. Small businesses handle this with one question at the work station and three lines of notes per activity: what gets in the way, what has nearly gone wrong once, what gets worked around.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

3.5 **The experience already present in the business has been evaluated and has not been left unused: occupational accidents, near misses, first aid entries, recurring faults and damage, reports and complaints from employees, and points raised in earlier walk-throughs, in inspection reports and by inspectors of the authority or of the accident insurance institution. The near miss in which nothing happened has also been treated as an indication of a hazard.**

What proves it: Evidenced by the Verbandbuch (first aid logbook) or other first aid records, copies of the accident reports, a simple collection of reported near misses, and by maintenance and fault reports. The evidence for this point is a short evaluation memo recording which incidents of the last period were reviewed and which hazard was carried over from them into the identification. Without that memo it stays open whether the incidents were merely filed away or actually used.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4 Step 3: Evaluating the hazards 4

4.1 **For every hazard identified in step 2, the Gefährdungsbeurteilung (risk assessment) rates how severe a possible harm could be and how likely it is to occur. The rating scale is uniform across the company, identical for every work area, and described once, so that a later update can build on the same system. Mental workload under section 5 paragraph 3 number 6 ArbSchG is rated by activity, not by individual person. Where a works council exists, the chosen method has been agreed with it, because the how of the assessment is subject to co-determination under section 87 paragraph 1 number 7 BetrVG.** Document

What proves it: The evidence is the assessment sheet itself: one row per hazard showing severity of harm, likelihood of occurrence and the resulting rating, plus a short preamble explaining the levels used. A small company needs no software: a table with three levels per axis (low, medium, high), defined once and reused at every update. Where co-determination applies, the minutes or the works agreement on the method serve as proof that it was agreed.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.2 **The rating does not rest on gut feeling but on a comparison with the applicable legal provisions and the current technical rule sets, for example the workplace rules (ArbStättV rule set), the technical rules on industrial safety (BetrSichV), on hazardous substances (GefStoffV) and on biological agents (BioStoffV), as well as the rule set of the accident insurance institution (DGUV). The state of the art in technology, occupational medicine and hygiene is taken into account (section 4 number 3 ArbSchG). Where the company departs from a rule, it is recorded by which other means the same level of protection is reached.**

What proves it: The evidence is a short list of the rules used per work area, with number and edition date, for example the workplace rule on escape routes, the technical rule on the risk assessment of work equipment, or the safety data sheet of a substance in use. A small company will sensibly use the sector guidance of its accident insurance institution and note title and edition in the assessment; where it departs from a rule, two sentences on the equivalent solution, written directly in the row of the affected hazard, are enough.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.3 **The rating is recorded so that a knowledgeable third party who does not know the company can follow it without any spoken explanation: the activity considered, the group of people affected, the assumptions applied, the outcome of the rating and the date are all visible. Special groups such as young workers, pregnant and breastfeeding women, temporary agency workers, interns, new entrants to the profession, people with disabilities and employees without sufficient German language skills are, where present in the company, made explicitly visible as such in the rating. Documentation is required from the first employee onwards (section 6 paragraph 1 ArbSchG); its extent follows from the nature of the activities and the number of employees, and where the hazard situation is the same, summarised entries are sufficient.** Document

What proves it: The evidence is the assessment document in its current version, carrying the date of creation and the names of the competent people involved. Practical test for a small company: hand the document to someone who does not know the workplace, for example the occupational safety specialist (Fachkraft für Arbeitssicherheit) or the company doctor, and have them check whether they understand, without asking questions, why a hazard was rated the way it was. The labour inspectorate and the accident insurance institution ask for exactly this document; the accident insurance institution additionally relies on its own right to information under section 3 paragraph 4 DGUV Vorschrift 1.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.4 **Even where the rating shows no need for action, an explicit and reasoned finding is on record. An empty row or a missing mention is not a result: the document shows that the hazard was examined and found to be sufficiently controlled, and on what basis. These findings carry a date just like the other results, and they are examined again whenever operating conditions change (section 3 paragraph 1 sentence 3 ArbSchG, section 3 DGUV Vorschrift 1).** Document

What proves it: The evidence is the result column of the assessment, in which the unremarkable points also carry an entry, for example a note that the existing safeguard meets the applicable rule and that no additional measure is therefore needed, with the date and initials of the person assessing. For a small company a column with two fields is enough: no action needed, because, or measure required, see step 4. Without this finding it later becomes impossible to tell whether a point was examined or simply forgotten, and this is precisely where an assessment fails during an inspection by the authorities.

- [ ] Open
- [ ] In progress
- [ ] Met
- [ ] Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5 Step 4: Defining measures 5

5.1 **For every hazard judged to require action, at least one measure is defined, and the definition follows the order of precedence set out in section 4 ArbSchG: first it is checked whether the hazard can be removed at source, then come technical, then organisational, then person related measures. Where a higher level was rejected, the reason is recorded.**

What proves it: A list of measures with one column for the level of effect of each measure (source, technical, organisational, person related) and one field for the justification when a higher level is ruled out, for example because the process cannot be run any other way in technical terms. The list is tied to the hazard identification from part 2, so that every hazard entered there has its own row. A small company solves this with two additional columns in the same table that already holds the hazards; a separate system is not needed.

- [ ] Open
- [ ] In progress
- [ ] Met
- [ ] Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.2 **Personal protective equipment is planned only where a residual hazard remains after the higher ranking levels have been exhausted, and not as the first or the only answer. The equipment used fits the specific hazard, is made available, and the occasions for wearing it as well as any necessary limits on wearing time are laid down.**

What proves it: For each activity, one entry stating which protective equipment is worn, which residual hazard it acts against, and why technical or organisational measures do not cover the hazard fully. Evidence consists of purchase records, issue lists with date and signature, and the manufacturer information on the protection level. Without the note on the residual hazard, the equipment reads like a shortcut around the order of precedence.

- [ ] Open
- [ ] In progress
- [ ] Met
- [ ] Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.3 **The measures defined take account of the state of the art as well as established findings from occupational medicine, hygiene and ergonomics. Where relevant state rules or rules of the accident insurance institutions (Berufsgenossenschaften) exist, it is evident that they were used.**

What proves it: For each measure, note the source it rests on, with title and edition, for example a Technische Regel für Betriebssicherheit (technical rule for industrial safety), a Technische Regel für Gefahrstoffe (technical rule for hazardous substances), an Arbeitsstättenregel (workplace rule) or a DGUV Regel. In addition, manufacturer operating instructions and advisory notes from the occupational physician or the occupational safety specialist. A small company keeps this as a short reference column in the list of measures; that is enough to show that the decision was not made by gut feeling.

- [ ] Open
- [ ] In progress
- [ ] Met
- [ ] Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.4 **Every measure carries a deadline and a responsible person named by name. Both are part of the documentation required by section 6 ArbSchG. Where employer duties are delegated to other persons, the delegation exists in writing as required by section 13 subsection 2 ArbSchG and names the task, the powers and the area; overall responsibility remains with the employer.** Document

What proves it: A list of measures with the columns measure, responsible person by name, target date and status. Role titles without a name and wording such as promptly or ongoing are not sufficient, because no later review of effectiveness can be tied to them. Where duties are delegated, file the signed delegation of duties with its date. Where the company has several parts, also note which area the delegation applies to.

- [ ] Open
- [ ] In progress
- [ ] Met
- [ ] Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.5 **Every measure that touches the behaviour of employees comes with an instruction session under section 12 ArbSchG. It takes place before the activity is taken up, when the field of work changes, when new work equipment or procedures are introduced, and repeatedly at regular intervals. Content and language are tailored to the employees, expressly including young workers, people new to the job, temporary agency workers and employees without sufficient German language skills. Delivery is evidenced as part of implementing the measure.** Document

What proves it: A record of instruction with date, topic, reference to the measure that triggered it, name of the person giving the instruction and signatures of the participants. For temporary agency workers, also record the activity related instruction given in the user company; instruction by the staffing agency does not replace it. A small company uses a one page form per occasion; a single folder is enough as filing.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6 Step 5: Carrying out the measures 3

6.1 **For every measure that has been decided on, it is recorded that the measure was actually put into effect, with the date of implementation and the person who confirms it. A decision, a purchase order or an assignment given to a service provider does not yet count as implementation.** Document

What proves it: The list of measures belonging to the Gefährdungsbeurteilung (risk assessment) gains two extra columns: completed on and confirmed by. Evidence comes from the paperwork that arises during implementation anyway: delivery note or invoice for the new extraction unit, installation or maintenance report, inspection report after the rebuild, photo of the railing once fitted, signature list from the instruction session, issue receipt for the protective equipment. A small company needs no software for this: a spreadsheet is enough, the documents sit in a binder and the tab number is noted in the row. The legal anchor is section 6 subsection 1 ArbSchG, where carrying out the measures is one of the four minimum items the documentation has to contain.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.2 **Deadlines and responsible persons are tracked: there is a recurring point in time at which the status of the open measures is reviewed, and overrun deadlines are visible instead of quietly running on. If a measure is late, it is decided and recorded how things continue: a new deadline with a reason, a different measure, or a decision by the employer.**

What proves it: The evidence is the continuously updated list of measures with a status column (open, in progress, done) and a due date column in which overdue rows are visibly flagged and not deleted. Added to this is the record of the review itself: minutes of the occupational safety committee (required above 20 employees, section 11 ASiG, at least once per quarter), a walkthrough report drawn up with the occupational safety specialist and the company doctor, or a short note with date and participants. In a small company a recurring calendar entry, for example quarterly, is enough, plus one line per review: date, what is still open, what has been rescheduled, why. Responsibility for implementation stays with the employer even where duties have been delegated in writing under section 13 subsection 2 ArbSchG, which is why a delay has to reach the employer.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.3 **Where implementation drags on, for instance because of delivery times, construction work or procurement, an effective protective measure is defined for the interim period, the employees know about it, and its end is tied to the final measure. The period until the permanent solution is in place does not remain unprotected.** Document

What proves it: The interim measure appears as its own row in the list of measures, with its own responsible person, a start date and a note stating until when or until what it applies. Evidence includes the notice or the operating instruction covering the interim arrangement, the instruction record with signatures of the affected employees (section 12 ArbSchG), the issue receipt for the protective equipment worn in the meantime, photos of the barrier, or the amended shift plan. Important for the assessment: interim measures usually sit further down the hierarchy of section 4 ArbSchG, for example personal protective equipment instead of a technical solution. They are permissible to close the gap, they do not replace the actual measure and therefore carry an end date. In a small company a dated notice at the workplace plus the matching signature list is enough.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

Working aid, not legal advice. The risk assessment under sections 5 and 6 ArbSchG must be worked out by every business itself. As of 13.07.2026.

7 Step 6: Check effectiveness 4

7.1 **For every measure that has been put in place, checking its effectiveness is a separate act with its own date, kept apart from the note that the measure was carried out. A tick in the box for implementation does not count as a check.** Document

What proves it: Keep two separate columns in the list of measures: implemented on, effectiveness checked on, plus the result of the check in one sentence. The two dates will normally differ, because a measure can only show in day to day operation whether it holds up. A small company can handle this without machinery: a table or a dated, signed note on the measures sheet is enough. Legal basis: section 3 subsection 1 and section 6 subsection 1 ArbSchG, where the result of the check is one of the minimum items the records must contain.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.2 **For every measure it is defined how its effect is to be recognised: which measured value, which observation, which feedback from the employees. The evidence shows the reduced hazard, not merely the purchase or the instruction.**

What proves it: Depending on the hazard: measurement record (for example noise, lighting, air, hazardous substance concentration), before and after documentation of the workplace, a short walkthrough note, evaluation of accident and near miss reports, and for mental strain a renewed task related review in the team. A delivery note, an invoice or a training attendance list documents that something was done, not that it worked. In a small company a written sentence from the responsible person plus the feedback of the people who actually work at that workplace is enough. The test criterion and the means of testing belong in the column next to the measure as early as step 4, when the measure is defined.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.3 **For every effectiveness check it is stated who carries it out, and that person has the required expertise. The Betriebsarzt (company doctor) and the Fachkraft für Arbeitssicherheit (occupational safety specialist) are involved; responsibility stays with the employer, even where tasks are delegated.** Document

What proves it: Name and function in the list of measures, and where tasks are delegated the written transfer of duties under section 13 subsection 2 ArbSchG. Involvement of the Betriebsarzt and the Fachkraft für Arbeitssicherheit is shown by an advisory note, a walkthrough record or, from more than 20 employees onwards, the minutes of the Arbeitsschutzausschuss (occupational safety committee, section 11 ASiG). Small companies using an external safety service keep the feedback as a short note or e-mail filed with the measure. Where the expertise is not available in house, expert advice must be obtained. If a Betriebsrat (works council) exists, the how of the check (method, criteria, interval) is subject to codetermination under section 87 subsection 1 number 7 BetrVG.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.4 **If the check shows that a measure does not work, or does not work well enough, the finding is recorded and the case goes back into the definition of measures: an additional or a different measure following the order of precedence in section 4 ArbSchG, a new deadline, a new effectiveness check. A measure that does not work is not closed as done.** Document

What proves it: In the measures sheet, one line for the finding (date, result, short reason) and below it the follow up measure with its own deadline, its own responsible person and its own check. The original line stays visible so that the course of events can be traced; overwriting it strips the record of exactly the value the authorities look for in it. This is also the point where it becomes visible whether technical solutions were sought first, then organisational ones, and only last those aimed at the individual. The same finding is the trigger for the update in step 7. Legal basis: section 3 subsection 1, section 4 and section 6 subsection 1 ArbSchG.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8 Step 7: Keeping the assessment up to date 4

8.1 **The company has named the events that trigger an update of the Gefaehrdungsbeurteilung (risk assessment) and has assigned them to a responsible person. Such events include safety relevant changes to working conditions, new or modified work equipment, procedures and activities, findings from accidents and near misses, input from occupational health care, gaps found during the effectiveness check, and a changed legal situation. It is settled how this person learns that such an event has occurred.**

What proves it: Evidence can be a short written list of the triggering events together with the name of the person in charge, for example on the cover sheet of the risk assessment, plus the reporting route: purchasing reports new machines, supervisors report new activities, accident reports arrive at the same place. In a small company a single sheet is enough, listing the events and stating that every new acquisition and every accident is reported to the owner before work starts. Legal basis: section 3 and section 5 ArbSchG, section 3 DGUV Vorschrift 1.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.2 **For every event that actually occurred it is traceable that the affected assessment was reviewed and, where necessary, changed. The documentation carries the date of the update and shows what was changed and which event was behind it. Earlier versions remain recognisable, they are not silently overwritten.** Document

What proves it: Evidence is the dated version of the risk assessment itself, extended by one change line per revision, for example a table with date, trigger, changed activity and initials. Anyone working digitally files the old file with the date in its name before saving the new one. Paper versions receive a stamp with date and signature. The date of the update is one of the four minimum entries required by section 6 ArbSchG.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.3 **Where activities involving biological agents are carried out, no more than two years pass between two reviews of the assessment. For all other hazards the ArbSchG sets no blanket repetition interval, here the assessment is updated when an event calls for it. If the company has additionally agreed on a regular review without a specific trigger, the chosen interval is recorded and is kept. Such a review is good practice, but not a legal duty.** Document

What proves it: Evidence is the dated versions of the assessment for the activities concerned. For the two year interval under BioStoffV, the gap between two update dates is enough as proof, and a recurring calendar reminder with lead time helps. Without activities involving biological agents, a short note stating that this interval does not apply is sufficient. Legal basis: BioStoffV for the two year interval, section 5 and section 6 ArbSchG otherwise.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.4 **Updating closes the loop back into the process: a changed assessment leads to adjusted measures following the order of priority in section 4 ArbSchG, each with a deadline and a responsible person, the affected employees are instructed before they take up the changed activity, and the effectiveness of the new measures is checked again. Updating does not create a second document, it brings the one existing risk assessment to the current state. Where a works council exists, it is involved in how the update is set up, that is in method, criteria and interval.**

What proves it: Evidence is the action plan inside the updated assessment, in which the new items appear with date, deadline and responsible person, the instruction record with date and signatures of the affected employees, and the entry for the renewed effectiveness check. Where a works council exists: minutes or a works agreement on method and interval. In small companies one line in the existing action plan plus the signature list of the short instruction at the machine is enough. Legal basis: section 3, section 4 and section 12 ArbSchG, section 87 paragraph 1 number 7 BetrVG.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

Working aid, not legal advice. The risk assessment under sections 5 and 6 ArbSchG must be worked out by every business itself. As of 13.07.2026.

9 Documentation under section 6 ArbSchG 6

9.1 **The results of the Gefährdungsbeurteilung (risk assessment) are documented, starting with the first employee. The former relief for companies with ten or fewer employees was removed on 25.10.2013 and is not relied upon. The only areas excluded are those that section 1 paragraph 2 ArbSchG takes out of the scope of the act.** Document

What proves it: The evidence is the documents themselves, sorted by work area or activity. A small company needs no system for this: one table per activity, as a printout in a folder or as a file on the company computer, is enough. What matters is that a page exists for every activity carried out in the company and that no activity is missing.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.2 **Every assessment contains the four minimum entries required by section 6 paragraph 1 ArbSchG: the result of the assessment, the protective measures decided on with a due date and a responsible person, the implementation of the measures together with a check of how effective they were, and the date on which the assessment was drawn up or updated.** Document

What proves it: Spot check two or three existing assessments: are all four entries actually filled in, or do the due date, the responsible person and the effectiveness check stay empty. Four columns in the form are sufficient. The working form in part 2 carries these entries along for each hazard factor, so the minimum entries arise on their own while filling it in.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.3 **No particular form of documentation is prescribed; paper and electronic records are equally valid. The extent of the documents matches the nature of the activities and the number of employees. Where the hazard situation is the same, combined entries have been used for several workplaces, and it is clear which workplaces the combined entry covers.**

What proves it: This can be shown by the combined assessment itself: it names the workplaces or activities it covers explicitly, instead of referring to the company in general terms. Where a workplace differs from the group, for example through a different work equipment item or a different environment, a separate entry exists for it. For a small company this means: one assessment for all identical assembly stations, but a second one for forklift operation.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.4 **The documentation accompanies the whole process and is not a trailing eighth step. Every update, whether triggered by an event or by a deadline, shows up as a new date and as entries that have visibly changed. The company has one risk assessment; the requirements from BetrSichV, GefStoffV, BioStoffV and ArbStättV are taken up within it and are not kept in parallel as separate documents.**

What proves it: The evidence is the version status or a change line at the head of each assessment: changed on, by whom, for what reason. A small company handles this with a single line above the table. Anyone keeping several folders, for example hazardous substances separate from work equipment, should check whether the same activity is assessed in contradictory ways across them.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.5 **The documents are available on site and can be presented without delay, on request, to the occupational safety authority of the federal state and to the accident insurance institution; both inspect independently of one another. Towards the accident insurance institution there is in addition a separate duty to provide information under section 3 paragraph 4 DGUV Vorschrift 1. Superseded versions remain findable for as long as earlier states still need to be traced, for example after an accident.** Document

What proves it: The evidence is a named storage location and the fact that at least two people know it: a folder or directory accessible to management, the Fachkraft für Arbeitssicherheit (occupational safety specialist), the company doctor and the works council. Practical test: can the assessment for any randomly picked activity be produced within a few minutes. Under section 21 paragraph 1a ArbSchG, from calendar year 2026 the state authorities must inspect at least 5 percent of companies each year; the selection is risk based.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.6 **Those responsible are aware of the sanctions: a missing or undocumented risk assessment can be fined directly under the ordinances, without any prior order from an authority. This applies to work equipment (section 22 paragraph 1 BetrSichV), workplaces (section 9 paragraph 1 ArbStättV) and biological agents (section 20 BioStoffV), in each case via section 25 paragraph 1 number 1 ArbSchG with a range of up to 5,000 euros, and to hazardous substances (section 22 GefStoffV via section 26 Chemikaliengesetz) with a range of up to 50,000 euros. The ArbSchG itself only penalises the disregard of an enforceable order (section 22 paragraph 3 in conjunction with section 25 paragraph 1 number 2 letter a, up to 30,000 euros); in cases of persistent repetition or intentional endangerment of life and health, section 26 ArbSchG provides for imprisonment of up to one year.**

What proves it: No separate document needs to be created for this; the point is evidenced through 9.1 to 9.5. Since nearly every company uses work equipment and maintains a workplace, BetrSichV and ArbStättV normally apply without further question. Concrete test: does a dated assessment exist for every item of work equipment in use and for the work rooms. These are exactly the two points asked for first during an inspection.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10 Special regulations with their own assessment duty 10

10.1 **For all activities involving hazardous substances, the expert assessment under section 6 GefStoffV is in place: the substances used are recorded, the substitution check has been carried out, the result is dated and is fed into the single company-wide Gefährdungsbeurteilung (risk assessment).** Document

What proves it: Evidence: a hazardous substances register with current safety data sheets, a short note on the substitution check for each substance, the operating instructions. On the most common mix-up: the GefStoffV sets no three year interval for the assessment itself. The three years in section 7 paragraph 7 apply solely to checking the function and effectiveness of the technical protective measures, for example an extraction system. As a principle for this whole chapter: there is only one risk assessment in a company. The special regulations make it more specific, they do not require separate documents, a dedicated register or chapter per regulation is enough. Small company: a maintained table with product name, purpose of use, quantity and date of the safety data sheet is enough as a basis.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.2 **For activities involving biological agents, the assessment under section 4 BioStoffV is in place, it was drawn up before the activity started, it is reviewed at least every second year and it forms part of the overall risk assessment.** Document

What proves it: This is the only fixed repetition interval among these regulations: at least every second year, plus without delay whenever there is a trigger, such as a new procedure, a new agent or a changed infection situation. Evidence: a dated assessment per activity with the assigned protection level, plus the operating instruction. Small company: put a two year reminder in the calendar, then the deadline cannot pass unnoticed.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.3 **For the work equipment in use, the assessment under section 3 BetrSichV is in place before the equipment is used, and the type, scope and intervals of the recurring inspections are laid down in it.** Document

What proves it: A CE marking expressly does not release you from the assessment, it says nothing about the specific use, the installation site and the qualification of the operators in your company. Evidence: a list of the work equipment, the inspection plan with the intervals set under paragraph 6, the inspection reports, the operating instructions. Small company: a list with the columns work equipment, last inspection, next inspection, inspecting person serves the purpose.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.4 **The assessment of the workplace under section 3 ArbStättV is in place, it was documented before the activity started and it also covers the display screen workstations.** Document

What proves it: The separate display screen regulation was merged into the ArbStättV in 2016. Display screen work therefore needs no separate document, it needs its own section inside this assessment. Evidence: a walkthrough record covering traffic routes, lighting, escape and rescue routes, indoor climate and sanitary rooms, plus the evaluation of the display screen workstations. Small company: a dated walkthrough with a checklist and photos, supplemented by the measures decided, each with a deadline and a responsible person.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

Working aid, not legal advice. The risk assessment under sections 5 and 6 ArbSchG must be worked out by every business itself. As of 13.07.2026.

10.5 Wherever noise or vibration occurs, the expert assessment under section 3 of the Lärm- und Vibrations-Arbeitsschutzverordnung (LärmVibrationsArbSchV) is in place, the exposure has been determined and the result is fed into the overall risk assessment.

Document

What proves it: What is required is an expert determination of the exposure by measurement or by a justified calculation, an estimate by ear does not carry. Evidence: a measurement record or a calculation based on the emission values of the manufacturer, the classification against the trigger values and the exposure limit values, the measures derived from this and the occupational health provision. Small company: the occupational safety specialist or the accident insurance institution supports the determination, often the manufacturer data of the machines are enough as a starting point.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.6 For activities in electromagnetic fields, the assessment under section 3 EMFV is in place, it was drawn up before the activity started and it is up to date.

Document

What proves it: In practice this affects welding systems, induction heating, transmitting and testing equipment, magnetic resonance scanners. The regulation calls for particular attention to employees at increased risk, for example people with active or passive implants and pregnant women. Evidence: a list of the installations with the field strength data of the manufacturers, defined safety distances, access rules and marking. A company without such installations ticks Not applicable here and needs no further evidence.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.7 For artificial optical radiation, the expert assessment under section 3 OStrV is in place before the activity starts and it forms part of the overall risk assessment.

Document

What proves it: This means lasers, UV sources, strong emitters and the welding arc, not daylight. Evidence: an equipment list with the laser class or risk group, the manufacturer data, the protective measures laid down and the areas that are cordoned off. Where lasers of class 3R, 3B or 4 are used, the written appointment of a qualified laser safety officer belongs with it. Small company: the class and risk group data are stated in the operating manual, they are the entry point into the assessment.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.8 For manual handling of loads, the assessment under section 2 paragraph 2 LasthandhabV is in place, the criteria of the annex have been evaluated and the measures have been derived from them.

Document

What proves it: The regulation brings its own catalogue of criteria in the annex: characteristics of the load, physical demand, condition of the workplace, nature of the task. There is no statutory kilogram limit, what counts is the interplay of the criteria. Evidence: a completed Leitmerkmalmethode (key indicator method) of the Bundesanstalt für Arbeitsschutz und Arbeitsmedizin for each activity, plus the measures such as lifting aids, transport equipment or changed storage heights. The results belong in the one risk assessment, the duty to document follows from section 6 ArbSchG, the LasthandhabV does not require a standalone document.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.9 For every activity in the company, the assessment of the hazards for pregnant and breastfeeding women under section 10 MuSchG is in place independently of any trigger, regardless of whether women are currently employed on those activities.

Document

What proves it: The most common mistake is to assess only once a pregnancy has been reported. The activity based assessment comes first, only after it follow the specific assessment for the individual woman and the discussion that has to be offered under section 10 paragraph 2. Evidence: a result per activity stating whether an unjustifiable hazard exists and whether a protective measure, a redesign of the work, a change of workplace or a company level ban on employment applies, plus the documentation and the information to all employees under section 14 MuSchG. Small company: one column in the existing activity list is enough, provided it is filled in and dated.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.10 **Before young people start work, the assessment under section 28a JArbSchG is in place, it is updated whenever the working conditions change substantially and it is fed into the overall risk assessment.** Document

What proves it: This also covers interns and apprentices under 18 years of age, and therefore almost every training company. What has to be considered is the smaller store of experience and the safety awareness that is not yet settled, together with the activities that are prohibited and those permitted only with restrictions under section 22 JArbSchG. Evidence: an assessment per work location, dated before the first working day, plus the instruction under section 29 JArbSchG, which takes place before employment begins and has to be repeated at least every six months, signed by the young person.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

11 Further regulations without a dedicated assessment section 3

11.1 **Every item of personal protective equipment issued in the company can be traced back to a specific hazard identified in the Gefährdungsbeurteilung (risk assessment). Section 2 paragraph 1 of the PSA-Benutzungsverordnung (regulation on the use of personal protective equipment) does not call for a separate assessment, it bases the selection of the equipment on the hazards that have already been identified. Wherever protective equipment is worn, the matching hazard appears in the risk assessment, and wherever a hazard is controlled by protective equipment alone, it has first been checked whether technical or organisational measures can remove it (order of precedence under section 4 ArbSchG).**

What proves it: The evidence is the risk assessment itself: in the measures column of the affected activity, the equipment is named specifically, not just described as protective equipment, so for example safety glasses with side shields or cut resistant gloves. In addition, the issue list or receipt signed by the wearer and the manufacturer information for the equipment purchased. A small company handles this with a single table: activity, hazard, selected equipment, who received it, date.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

11.2 **For work on construction sites, it is clear which duties under the Baustellenverordnung (construction site regulation) rest with the client and what the company contributes as the employer. The Baustellenverordnung is addressed above all to the client, it requires the client to file an advance notice and to provide a health and safety plan, and it contains no assessment section of its own. The risk assessment under ArbSchG remains untouched alongside it: it continues to apply unchanged to the activities of the company's own employees and takes account of the conditions on the particular site as well as the interaction with other trades.**

What proves it: The evidence is the site specific addition to the existing risk assessment, often one page per site with the date, the building project and the points that differ there from the standard case, such as falls from height, other trades on site, traffic routes, weather. In addition, the health and safety plan handed over by the client or the client's coordinator, filed in the project records. A small company attaches this single page to the existing risk assessment and has it signed off on site by the site management or the owner.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

11.3 **Occupational health care is derived from the risk assessment. Section 3 ArbMedVV expressly presupposes the risk assessment: it shows for which activities mandatory or offered occupational health care comes into question and for whom health care on request must be made possible. This does not create a second assessment, the health care follows from the one assessment that already exists. For every activity with a hazard relevant to occupational health care, the corresponding trigger for that care is named.** Document

What proves it: The evidence is the occupational health care record under section 3 paragraph 4 ArbMedVV with the trigger and the date of each appointment, together with the certificates issued by the company doctor. Medical findings do not belong in it, the employer does not see them. In the risk assessment itself, a separate column per activity makes the trigger visible. A small company has the company doctor name the applicable triggers on the basis of the existing risk assessment and keeps the record as a simple list.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

12 Working form: hazard factors per workplace (not exhaustive) 12

Workplace

Activity

1 Mechanical hazards

How to tell it is present: unguarded moving machine parts, parts with dangerous surfaces, moving transport and work equipment, uncontrolled moving parts, falling, slipping, tripping, twisting an ankle, falling from a height.

◯ Present ◯ Not present

Hazard

Measure

Responsible | Due | Effectiveness checked on

2 Electrical hazards

How to tell it is present: electric shock, electric arcs, electrostatic charge.

◯ Present ◯ Not present

Hazard

Measure

Responsible | Due | Effectiveness checked on

3 Hazardous substances

How to tell it is present: skin contact with solids, liquids or wet work, inhalation of gases, vapours, mists or dusts including fumes, ingestion, and physico-chemical hazards such as fire, explosion or uncontrolled chemical reactions.

◯ Present ◯ Not present

Hazard

Measure

Responsible | Due | Effectiveness checked on

4 Biological agents

How to tell it is present: risk of infection from pathogenic micro-organisms such as bacteria, viruses or fungi, and sensitising or toxic effects of micro-organisms.

◯ Present ◯ Not present

Hazard

Measure

Responsible | Due | Effectiveness checked on

5 Fire and explosion hazards

How to tell it is present: flammable solids, liquids and gases, explosive atmosphere, explosive substances.

◯ Present ◯ Not present

Hazard

Measure

Responsible | Due | Effectiveness checked on

Working aid, not legal advice. The risk assessment under sections 5 and 6 ArbSchG must be worked out by every business itself. As of 13.07.2026.

6 Thermal hazards

How to tell it is present: hot media and surfaces, cold media and surfaces.

◯ Present ◯ Not present

Hazard

Measure

Responsible | Due | Effectiveness checked on

7 Hazards from specific physical effects

How to tell it is present: noise, ultrasound and infrasound, whole-body vibration, hand-arm vibration, optical radiation such as infrared, ultraviolet or laser radiation, ionising radiation, electromagnetic fields, low or high pressure.

◯ Present ◯ Not present

Hazard

Measure

Responsible | Due | Effectiveness checked on

8 Hazards from working environment conditions

How to tell it is present: climate such as heat, cold or inadequate ventilation, lighting, suffocation and drowning, inadequate escape and traffic routes or missing safety signage, insufficient room to move, unfavourable workplace layout, inadequate break and sanitary facilities.

◯ Present ◯ Not present

Hazard

Measure

Responsible | Due | Effectiveness checked on

9 Physical workload

How to tell it is present: heavy dynamic work such as manual handling of loads, one-sided dynamic work and frequently repeated movements, forced posture and static holding work, and the combination of static and dynamic work.

◯ Present ◯ Not present

Hazard

Measure

Responsible | Due | Effectiveness checked on

10 Psychological factors

How to tell it is present: a poorly designed task such as predominantly routine work, excessive or insufficient demands, a poorly designed work organisation such as high time pressure, changing or long working hours, frequent night work or an ill-considered workflow, poorly designed social conditions such as lack of contact, unfavourable leadership or conflict, and poorly designed workplace and environment conditions such as noise, climate, cramped space or poor software design. What is assessed is the activity, not the person.

◯ Present ◯ Not present

Hazard

Measure

Responsible | Due | Effectiveness checked on

11 Other hazards

How to tell it is present: from people, for example assault, from animals, for example bites, and from plants and plant products with sensitising or toxic effects.

○ Present ○ Not present

Hazard

Measure

Responsible | Due | Effectiveness checked on

weitere Further hazards that fit no category

How to tell it is present: The list in the GDA guideline is expressly not exhaustive. What counts is the actual situation at this workplace, not the completeness of this list. This is where anything belongs that the eleven factors do not capture, for example lone working, work with and on people, or a hazard that only arises from several factors interacting.

○ Present ○ Not present

Hazard

Measure

Responsible | Due | Effectiveness checked on