

ISO 45001:2018 + Amd 1:2024 Occupational health and safety management systems

Occupational safety as a management system

91 requirements. This standard can be certified against by an accredited body. As of 07/2026.

ISO 45001 can be certified against by an accredited body. What gets certified is the organisation for a defined scope, not a person and not a product. A certificate shows that the management system conforms to the standard. It does not show legal compliance and it replaces no duty towards an authority or an accident insurer. This list is a working aid for self-assessment and preparation, not a proof. The 2018 edition applies together with Amendment 1:2024 (climate action). A revision has been out for international ballot since June 2026.

Company	Date	Prepared by
---------	------	-------------

4 Context of the Organization8

4.1-a The internal and external issues that bear on the purpose of the organization and affect its ability to achieve the intended outcomes of the occupational health and safety management system have been determined and are reviewed again at defined intervals.

What proves it: A context analysis carrying a date and a version status is enough, often a single page table with the columns issue, internal or external, and effect on health and safety. Typical issues are order peaks and shift pressure, the age and language profile of the workforce, the condition of buildings and machinery, shortage of skilled staff, and customer expectations regarding occupational safety. The analysis document plus a minute from the management review confirming or adjusting the context serve as evidence. A small company handles this in a one hour annual round with management, the safety representative and two people from production.

OpenIn progressMetNot applicable

Evidence / justification

4.1-b It has been explicitly assessed whether climate change is a relevant context issue for the organization. The assessment is available with its reasoning, even where it concludes that there is no material relevance.

What proves it: A dedicated paragraph or a dedicated row in the context analysis in which the question is answered and the answer is justified. For health and safety the points to look at are heat exposure in halls, on roofs and in vehicles, UV exposure outdoors, heavy rain and storms on construction sites and in logistics, failure of cooling, ventilation or power, and shifting insect and infection risks. Two or three honest sentences per point are enough. Where the issue is found relevant, it has to reappear later in the hazard identification and risk assessment, otherwise the chain breaks.

OpenIn progressMetNot applicable

Evidence / justification

4.2-a The interested parties with a bearing on occupational health and safety have been determined. Workers themselves are captured as an interested party, as are persons who are not in an employment relationship but perform work under the control of the organization.

What proves it: A dated list or table of interested parties. Alongside your own workers it typically names temporary agency staff, apprentices, contractors and their personnel, suppliers with access to the site, visitors, neighbours, customers, regulators, the accident insurance body, the occupational physician and, where one exists, the worker representative body. Whoever works on the site on a regular basis belongs on the list, regardless of who pays their wages. Bodies and roles required by national law, for example under ArbSchG and DGUV Vorschrift 1, are good candidates for this list, although the standard itself does not prescribe them at this point.

OpenIn progressMetNot applicable

Evidence / justification

4.2-b For each interested party, the relevant needs and expectations have been determined. It is clarified and recorded which of them are legal requirements and which the organization voluntarily adopts as a binding obligation.

What proves it: Add two further columns to the same table: expectation and binding status, with the values legal requirement, voluntarily adopted, or not binding. The rows marked as binding become the source for the register of legal requirements and other requirements maintained under clause 6.1.3, so that the same information is not held twice and in conflicting versions. A column kept cleanly here saves a great deal of searching during the audit.

OpenIn progressMetNot applicable

Evidence / justification

4.2-c

It has been checked whether interested parties place expectations on the organization that are connected with climate change. Any such expectations are taken into account in the determination of needs.

What proves it: A note in the interested parties table answering the question yes or no for each party. For health and safety these are, for example, worker expectations regarding heat protection, drinking water and adjusted working hours, customer requirements for working conditions on construction sites during extreme weather, and insurer conditions relating to weather risks. If the check comes out negative across the board, state the reason in one sentence, which is expressly permitted.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.3-a

The scope of the occupational health and safety management system is available as documented information. It states the boundaries of the system and its applicability, and it takes the determined context issues and the needs of interested parties into account.

What proves it: One or two pages, or a dedicated section in the manual, with a date, a version status and a release. The text names sites with their addresses, organizational units, types of activity, and forms of work away from company premises such as installation work, field service, mobile work and work from home. Leaving the boundaries vague only postpones the argument to the day of the audit.

Document

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.3-b

The scope covers all activities, products and services that are under the control or influence of the organization and that can affect its occupational health and safety performance. Activities or groups of persons are not excluded in order to keep hazards outside the system. The scope is available to interested parties.

What proves it: A comparison of the scope against actual operations: site list, organizational chart, list of contractors with access, and list of work locations away from the premises. Every exclusion needs a sound justification, and the reason may never be that a risk sits there. Availability is quickly achieved in a small company: a notice on the board, a file in the shared drive, or a paragraph on the website.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.4-a

The occupational health and safety management system is established, is maintained and is continually improved. The processes needed and their interactions have been determined, and participation of workers is built into these processes.

What proves it: A process map or a plain list of processes with owners, plus a mapping of which process covers which clause of the standard. Evidence of effectiveness comes from the running records of daily operations, for example risk assessments, training records, walkthrough reports and near miss reports. A binder full of handsome documents without such traces from everyday work shows exactly the opposite of what is required here.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5 Leadership Accountability and Worker Participation

8

5.1-a

Top management holds overall accountability for protecting workers from work related injury and ill health, cannot delegate that accountability, and provides the people, the time and the resources that the OH&S management system requires.

What proves it: Typical evidence is management review minutes with decisions attributable to named individuals, an approved budget for OH&S measures and protective equipment, and a dated commitment statement signed by top management. In a small company the owner is the evidence: a short dated meeting note stating the decision, the budget and the due date is enough, provided it is kept up to date. Statutory duties under national occupational safety law apply independently and are not replaced here.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.1-b	OH&S is integrated into the business processes and the strategic direction, leadership fosters a culture in which incidents, near misses, hazards and improvement ideas are reported without fear of reprisal, and it supports any existing OH&S committees as well as middle managers in their role.	
What proves it: Evidence includes OH&S criteria in investment, project and procurement decisions, a written assurance that reporting carries no disadvantage, anonymous or low threshold reporting channels including their evaluation, minutes of the OH&S committee, and OH&S items in the objectives agreed with managers. A small company demonstrates this with a standing agenda item in the team meeting and a simple reporting log.		
Open In progress Met Not applicable		
Evidence / justification		
5.2-a	An OH&S policy approved by top management exists that commits to safe and healthy working conditions, aims at the prevention of injury and ill health as well as the elimination of hazards and the reduction of risks, commits to fulfilling applicable legal and other requirements, provides the framework for the OH&S objectives, anchors continual improvement of the system, and explicitly commits to consultation and participation of workers and their representatives.	Document
What proves it: The evidence is the approved policy document itself, one or two pages, with date, version and the signature of top management. In practice it is checked with a mapping table: one row per commitment listed above, one column with the reference to the paragraph that carries it. A policy that offers only generalities and does not literally carry these commitments will be noticed in the audit.		
Open In progress Met Not applicable		
Evidence / justification		
5.2-b	The OH&S policy is communicated within the organization, is available to workers in an understandable form, is made available to relevant interested parties, and is reviewed for its continuing suitability.	
What proves it: Evidence includes the posting on the notice board or intranet with a screenshot and date, its inclusion in the induction material with a signature list, publication on the website or handover to contractors, and a management review minute in which the policy was confirmed or adjusted. Where the workforce speaks several languages, the translated versions belong to the evidence as well.		
Open In progress Met Not applicable		
Evidence / justification		
5.3-a	Responsibilities and authorities for the roles within the OH&S management system are assigned, are communicated to those concerned at all levels, and are maintained as documented information, while every worker takes responsibility for those OH&S aspects that lie within their own sphere of control.	Document
What proves it: Evidence is a role matrix or an organization chart showing the OH&S roles, job or task descriptions including the OH&S part, and written appointments countersigned by the appointee. A small company manages with a one page table: role, name, task, authority, effective since. The standard explicitly requires documented information here. Formal appointments required by national law, such as a safety specialist, an occupational physician or first aiders, are additional legal duties and serve as evidence at the same time.		
Open In progress Met Not applicable		
Evidence / justification		
5.4-a	Non managerial workers are consulted before decisions are taken, namely on the needs of interested parties, on the OH&S policy, on the allocation of roles and authorities, on the way legal and other requirements are fulfilled, on the OH&S objectives, on the requirements for procurement, contractors and outsourced processes, on what is monitored, measured and evaluated, and on the planning and conduct of the audit programme and on continual improvement.	
What proves it: Evidence includes minutes of the OH&S committee or the team meeting that show workers were heard before the decision was taken, statements from the worker representatives, results of surveys with feedback given back to the workforce, and a simple mapping table: topic, date of consultation, participants, outcome, decision. Without a works council, a documented staff assembly or a short written hearing is enough; what matters is that it happened before the decision.		
Open In progress Met Not applicable		
Evidence / justification		

5.4-b

Non managerial workers actively participate: in determining the mechanisms for consultation and participation, in hazard identification and the assessment of risks and opportunities, in determining the actions to eliminate hazards and reduce risks, in determining the competence and training required, in determining what is communicated and how, in the control measures and their effective implementation, and in the investigation of incidents and nonconformities and in the corrective actions derived from them.

What proves it: Evidence is attendance lists and signatures on the risk assessments for the respective workplaces, walkthrough records naming the workers involved, incident investigation reports naming participants from the area concerned, training needs analyses with feedback from those affected, and improvement suggestions with documented handling. A rule of thumb for the check: the risk assessments must name the people who actually work at that workplace.

Open

In progress

Met

Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.4-c

The obstacles and barriers to consultation and participation are identified and are removed or reduced as far as possible, and workers receive the time, training and support needed for it as well as timely access to clear, understandable and relevant information about the OH&S management system.

What proves it: Evidence is a short list of the barriers identified and the countermeasures taken, for example language barriers, difficulties with reading and writing, shift patterns, agency work or the fear of reprisal, together with translations and pictorial instructions, release from work during paid working time shown in the shift plan, training records for safety representatives, and an accessible location where policy, risk assessments and indicators are kept. A small company evidences access with a folder in a fixed place known to everyone and a short note on who was briefed and when.

Open

In progress

Met

Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6 Planning

21

6.1.1-a

Planning of the occupational health and safety management system builds on the issues from the organizational context, the needs of interested parties and the defined scope. From these, the risks and opportunities are derived that matter for achieving the intended outcomes, for preventing or reducing undesired effects and for continual improvement.

What proves it: A planning table with four columns: source (context issue, interested party, boundary of the scope), the risk or opportunity derived from it, the reasoning, and the person accountable. Changing climatic conditions such as heat periods, heavy rainfall or cold belong here as soon as they have been identified in the context (Amendment 1:2024). A small organization keeps this on a single sheet and works through it once a year.

Open

In progress

Met

Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.1-b

The determination of risks and opportunities draws on the hazards identified, the risks assessed, the opportunities recognized and the legal and other requirements. Planned changes to the organization, to processes, activities or to the management system, whether permanent or temporary, are assessed for their effect on health and safety before they are implemented.

What proves it: A cross-reference list showing each change (new machine, new shift pattern, refurbishment, agency labour, seasonal peak) together with the date of the assessment and the date of implementation, so that it is visible that the assessment came first. A small organization uses a field on the purchasing or investment form that cannot move on without a sign-off.

Open

In progress

Met

Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.1-c

The determined risks and opportunities are available as documented information, as are the processes and actions needed to determine and address them, to the extent necessary to have confidence that they were carried out as planned.

Document

What proves it: A risk and opportunity register with revision status and version, plus a short description of the method by which risks and opportunities are identified, evaluated and addressed. Traceability comes from the date, the owner and the completion note on each line, not from the length of the document.

Open

In progress

Met

Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.2.1-a Hazard identification runs as an ongoing, proactive process and not only in reaction to an event. Workers and, where they exist, their representatives take part in it and are consulted.

What proves it: A procedure description with triggers and frequency (routine walkthrough, new activity, near miss, change), plus walkthrough records naming the workers involved. A small organization evidences participation through the attendance list of the walkthrough and an open reporting channel for hazards whose entries are recorded with dates.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.2.1-b Identification considers work organization and social factors, including workload, working hours and shift patterns, tone of interaction, harassment and leadership behaviour, as well as routine and non-routine activities.

What proves it: A hazard overview in which psychosocial load and work organization have lines of their own and technical hazards are not the only entries. Data sources include anonymous short surveys, sickness absence and overtime analyses, and notes from conversations. German occupational safety law requires psychosocial load to be considered anyway; whoever already records it there simply points to the same record at this point.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.2.1-c Also considered are infrastructure, equipment, materials, substances and the physical conditions of the workplace, the design of work areas and workflows, human factors, and how the work is actually performed in everyday practice.

What proves it: An asset and equipment inventory, a hazardous substances inventory with safety data sheets, measured values for noise, lighting, climate or vibration, plus observation notes from the workplace recording where actual practice departs from the written instruction. The comparison of intended against actual is the real evidence.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.2.1-d Past incidents inside the organization and at comparable organizations are taken into account, along with potential emergency situations and all persons who have access to a workplace or are affected by the activities, including visitors, contractors, workers of other organizations and people in the neighbourhood. New knowledge about hazards leads to a fresh review.

What proves it: Incident and near-miss analysis, a list of the assumed emergency scenarios, an arrangement covering contractors and visitors, and notes on new knowledge from manufacturer information, technical publications or guidance from the accident insurance institution, each with the review note derived from it.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.2.2-a Methods and criteria are defined for assessing occupational health and safety risks that suit the scope, nature and timing of the assessment and are proactive rather than reactive. Methods and criteria are available and retained as documented information.

[Document](#)

What proves it: A description of the evaluation method with the levels for likelihood and severity, the thresholds that trigger action, and the rule for when action is taken immediately. A small organization gets by with a three by three matrix; what matters is that the same criteria apply across all areas and that the version carries a date.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.2.2-b The identified hazards are assessed against these criteria, with the effectiveness of the controls already in place feeding into the evaluation and the remaining risk being stated.

What proves it: An assessment sheet per work area or activity with columns for hazard, existing control, evaluation with the control in place, need for action and date. The assessment is only evidenced if it is visible what the rating rests on, not by a tick mark alone.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.2.2-c Beyond the risks to health and safety, the risks to the management system itself are assessed as well, for instance those arising from the operating context, from scarce resources, from staff turnover or from outsourced activities.

What proves it: A separate section in the risk register for system risks, for example loss of the only competent person, a vacant role, no budget for protective technology, or dependence on a single service provider, each with an evaluation and the way it is handled. These lines are clearly distinct from workplace hazards.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.2.3-a Opportunities to improve health and safety are identified and assessed, in particular ways to eliminate hazards and reduce risks and to adapt work, work organization, working time and the working environment to the workers.

What proves it: An opportunity list with the source (improvement suggestion, walkthrough, planned investment, refurbishment) and the expected effect on the burden carried by workers. Anyone already running a suggestion scheme or an improvement board marks the entries with a health and safety link there and carries them into the same list.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.2.3-b Opportunities to improve the management system itself are identified as well, for instance in the visible support of top management, in the investigation of incidents, in the formats used for worker participation, or in a reporting culture free of fear of reprisal.

What proves it: Notes from the management review, an audit or a safety meeting in which such ideas are captured as an opportunity and given an owner and a due date. An opportunity without a due date remains an intention and does not serve as evidence.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.3-a A defined approach exists to determine the legal and other requirements applicable to health and safety, to have access to them, to establish what they mean for the organization, and to take them into account when establishing, implementing, maintaining and continually improving the system.

What proves it: A short procedure naming the source and the frequency of review, for example a newsletter from the accident insurance institution, a specialist information service, a trade association circular, or an external health and safety practitioner. Other requirements include customer specifications, works agreements, group rules or voluntary commitments. A small organization records source, review frequency and owner in three lines.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.3-b The legal and other requirements are available as documented information and are updated as soon as requirements or the operation change.

[Document](#)

What proves it: A legal register or requirements list with the reference, the link to the organization (activity, plant, substance) and the date of the last review. Typical entries in the German setting are the occupational safety act, the workplace ordinance, the industrial safety ordinance, the hazardous substances ordinance and the applicable DGUV rules. The standard requires the register; which legal provisions appear in it follows from the operation.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.4-a Actions are planned for the determined risks and opportunities, for the legal and other requirements and for dealing with emergency situations, with a visible link to the line in the register from which they originate.

What proves it: An action plan carrying a reference number to the risk or opportunity entry, an owner, a due date and a status. An action with no origin cannot be attributed; a risk line with no action remains untreated. This link makes both visible at once.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.4-b When selecting actions, the hierarchy of controls is applied: first eliminate the hazard, then substitute, then engineering controls and reorganization of the work, then administrative controls including instruction and training, and only last personal protective equipment.

What proves it: A column in the action plan naming the level of the hierarchy that was chosen, plus a short justification of why a higher level was not feasible. If actions pile up at the lowest level, this very column shows it. It is the most effective part of the form.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.4-c The planned actions are integrated into the processes of the management system and into the other business processes, and it is defined how their effectiveness is evaluated.

What proves it: Evidence of integration through the investment request, maintenance plan, purchasing process, training plan or shift handover in which the action appears, plus the effectiveness check with date and result, for example a repeat measurement, a follow-up walkthrough or a question put to the workers at the workplace.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.2.1-a Health and safety objectives are set for the relevant functions and levels that maintain and continually improve the management system. They take account of the results of the risk and opportunity assessment, the legal and other requirements, and the results of consultation with workers.

What proves it: A list of objectives stating the level or area and a note on which risk line, which requirement or which worker input the objective came from. Minutes of the meeting in which the objectives were discussed with the workers or their representatives.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.2.1-b The objectives are consistent with the health and safety policy, are measurable or at least capable of being evaluated in a traceable way, are monitored, communicated to the workers, and updated as needed.

What proves it: For each objective a metric or a clearly described criterion for achievement, together with the place where it is monitored (metrics sheet, notice board, meeting) and the way it is communicated. An objective such as more safety cannot be evaluated; an objective such as noise level at workstation three below 80 dB(A) by the end of the quarter can.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.2.2-a For each objective it is planned what will be done, what resources are required, who is responsible, when it is to be completed, how the result will be evaluated including the metrics used for monitoring, and how the actions will be integrated into the business processes.

What proves it: An objectives plan with the six columns action, resources, owner, due date, evaluation criterion and point of integration. A small organization keeps this as one table with three to five objectives and discusses it in the same round in which the order book is discussed.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.2.2-b The objectives and the plans to achieve them are available and retained as documented information, so that their status can be traced at any time.

[Document](#)

What proves it: A dated and versioned issue of the objectives plan, together with the earlier issues showing the status reached. The record over several years is the evidence that objectives were pursued and not merely written down once.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7 Support: Resources, Competence, Awareness, Communication and Documented Information

16

7.1-1 The resources the occupational health and safety management system needs in order to be established, operated, maintained and improved have been determined and are genuinely available. This includes people and their working time, budget, infrastructure, work equipment and technical facilities.

What proves it: Resource plan or a budget line for occupational health and safety, headcount and time shares of the people responsible, an investment list for protective equipment and technology. A small company can evidence this with a one page overview: who spends how many hours per month, what annual budget applies, which purchases are planned, together with top management approval.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1-2 Missing resources that become visible through the system, for example from risk assessment, incidents or reports by workers, are escalated to top management and decided there instead of being left unresolved at the working level.

What proves it: Action list with a column for the resources needed and the decision status, minutes of the management round with approvals or justified rejections. A small company can handle this with a fixed agenda item in the monthly meeting whose outcome is briefly minuted.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.2-1 For all workers whose activity affects health and safety performance, it is defined which capabilities they must bring in order to recognise hazards and work safely. This includes external personnel working under the control of the organization.

What proves it: Role or workplace profiles setting out the required qualifications, experience and instruction, linked to the hazards of the workplace. Small companies keep a competence matrix: rows are people, columns are activities and authorisations such as forklift, electrical work, first aid.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.2-2 Where the required capabilities are missing, actions are taken, for example training, on the job coaching, reassignment to a different activity or engaging suitably capable people, and the effectiveness of those actions is checked.

What proves it: Training plan with a target versus actual comparison drawn from the competence matrix, effectiveness check through a learning assessment, a practical demonstration at the workplace or observation by the supervisor. A note where an activity remains blocked until the competence is in place.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.2-3 Evidence of the capabilities held is available as documented information and is kept current, so that it can be shown at any time who is permitted to carry out which activity.
[Document](#)

What proves it: Certificates, qualifications, driving and operating authorisations, instruction records with date, content and signature, brought together in a personnel or competence file. Note: legal requirements such as national occupational safety law and the statutory accident insurance rules call for their own, partly recurring records of instruction and fitness. Those records can be reused here, but they do not replace the mapping to the standard.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.3-1 Workers are aware of the occupational health and safety policy, the objectives derived from it and their own contribution to the effectiveness of the system, including the benefits of improved health and safety performance.

What proves it: Notice board or intranet page carrying the policy and the objectives, agenda and attendance list of the team or safety meeting in which both were explained. Sample questions during the internal audit or a walkthrough show whether the knowledge has actually landed.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.3-2 Workers are aware of the hazards, occupational health and safety risks and defined controls that apply to them, and of the consequences if they do not follow the requirements.

What proves it: Workplace specific instruction based on the risk assessment, operating instructions posted at the workplace, short talks before the start of a shift with a note in the shift log. Small companies post a one page operating instruction visibly at each workplace and have the instruction signed off once a year and on every change.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.3-3 Workers know that they can report incidents and hazards, that they may remove themselves from a work situation presenting an imminent and serious danger, and that they need not fear any disadvantage for doing so.

What proves it: A written rule on self protection and the reporting route, communicated in instruction sessions and on the notice board, plus a statement by top management that reports and removing oneself from danger carry no disadvantages. Additionally evidenced by reports that were processed without sanction.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.4-1 For communication on occupational health and safety it is defined what is communicated, when, with whom and through which channel, and who is responsible for it.

What proves it: Communication matrix or communication plan with the columns topic, trigger or frequency, audience, channel and owner. A small company gets by with half a page naming the notice board, the shift meeting and the reporting route for hazards.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.4-2 When communication is designed, the diversity of the workforce and how well the message is actually understood are taken into account, for example language, literacy, disability, gender and culture, and the views of external interested parties are considered.

What proves it: Multilingual or pictogram based notices and operating instructions, evidence of translation for the language groups present in the company, feedback from the team or the safety committee on understandability. Achievable at small scale through picture based instruction and a short check during the session asking whether the content was understood.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.4-3 Internally, the management system and its changes are communicated across all levels and functions, and the communication enables workers to contribute to continual improvement.

What proves it: Minutes of safety meetings and of the health and safety committee, notices and circular emails on changes, improvement suggestions from the workforce with visible follow up. An improvement board with cards and status makes the feedback channel visible without any software.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.4-4 External communication on occupational health and safety topics takes place as foreseen in the communication plan and in the compliance obligations, in particular towards contractors, visitors, authorities and neighbours.

Document

What proves it: Safety briefing for visitors and contractors with confirmation, notifications to authorities or the accident insurance institution with date and recipient, correspondence on external enquiries. Note: reporting and notification duties under occupational safety law and the statutory accident insurance rules exist independently of the standard, and the corresponding records serve as evidence here.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.5-1	The management system contains the documented information required by the standard as well as the further documents and records that the organization itself has determined to be necessary for effectiveness.				Document	
	What proves it: Document register or system overview listing all applicable documents and records and mapping them to the clauses of the standard. A small company keeps this as a single table with document name, purpose, owner, storage location and revision status.					
	Open	In progress	Met	Not applicable		
	Evidence / justification					
7.5-2	When documents are created and updated, identification, description, format and media are appropriate, and suitability and adequacy are reviewed before release.					
	What proves it: A uniform document header with title, number, version, date, author and approver, with an identifiable release through a signature or a system status. Small companies achieve the same with a fixed file naming convention and an approval note on page one.					
	Open	In progress	Met	Not applicable		
	Evidence / justification					
7.5-3	Documented information is available and suitable where it is needed, and is adequately protected, for example against loss of confidentiality, improper use or loss of integrity.					
	What proves it: Access rules with read and write rights, valid operating instructions posted directly at the workplace, a backup concept for digital storage, a locked file for health data. Evidenced by a sample walkthrough showing that only valid versions are posted at the workplace.					
	Open	In progress	Met	Not applicable		
	Evidence / justification					
7.5-4	Distribution, access, retrieval, retention, version control and disposal of documented information are governed, obsolete versions are withdrawn from circulation, and documents of external origin that are necessary for the system are controlled as well.					
	What proves it: Change history per document, distribution list, retention periods per record type, marked or archived superseded versions, plus a list of external documents such as safety data sheets, operating manuals and regulations with their revision status and source. Access by workers and their representatives to the documents relevant to them has to be ensured.					
	Open	In progress	Met	Not applicable		
	Evidence / justification					
8 Operational Control, Procurement and Emergencies						14
8.1.1-a	Processes are established and effective in practice for those activities that can give rise to hazards, traceable criteria exist for when an activity may be started, continued or stopped, and records show that the work was actually carried out as planned.					Document
	What proves it: Work instructions and operating instructions per activity, release and stop criteria, shift handover and inspection records, signed permits to work for hot work, confined space entry or work at height. In many jurisdictions these records largely overlap with statutory operating instructions for hazardous substances and work equipment, but the standard requires them in their own right. A small organisation manages with a single page of instructions per critical activity plus a countersigned daily record.					
	Open	In progress	Met	Not applicable		
	Evidence / justification					
8.1.1-b	Workplaces, work equipment and work processes are adapted to the people who use them rather than the other way round, and physical as well as mental limits of capacity are taken into account.					
	What proves it: Results of ergonomics walkthroughs with date and responsible person, before and after evidence of adaptations that were implemented such as lifting aids, height adjustable workstations, job rotation plans or break arrangements, together with worker feedback from the consultation under 5.4. A small organisation captures this as a short list: observation, adaptation, date, who checked it.					
	Open	In progress	Met	Not applicable		
	Evidence / justification					

8.1.1-c At sites and construction projects where several companies work at the same time, the occupational health and safety relevant parts of the organisation's own management system are coordinated with the other companies involved, so that the hazards each creates for the others are controlled.

What proves it: Written coordination agreement, minutes of joint site or construction meetings, a named coordinating person, a shared overview of interface hazards and rules for shared areas, access routes and cranes. A small organisation handles this with a short coordination record signed by both parties before work starts.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1.2-a An approach is in place that actually eliminates the hazards identified in the hazard identification or reduces the associated risks, and it also applies to new, changed or only temporarily performed activities.

What proves it: Action plan arising from the risk assessment with owner, due date and completion note, linked to the entries from 6.1.2, plus evidence of implementation: invoice and acceptance of the guarding, photo documentation, release after modification. Open items with a due date are not a shortcoming, but items that vanished without a note are.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1.2-b A fixed hierarchy of controls is applied when protective measures are selected: first remove the hazard entirely, then substitute with something less hazardous, then apply engineering controls and redesign the work, then apply administrative controls and training, and only as the last step use personal protective equipment.

What proves it: The action list notes for each measure which level of the hierarchy it belongs to, and wherever a lower level was chosen the justification is recorded alongside it, explaining why a higher level was not technically or economically feasible. Issue records for personal protective equipment on their own are not evidence, they only document the last level.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1.3-a Planned changes to workplaces, plant, procedures, substances, working hours or the organisation are assessed for their effects on safety and health before they are implemented, and this also applies to temporary changes and to changes in legal requirements or in the state of knowledge.

What proves it: Change request or change form with a field for the occupational health and safety assessment, release by a named person before implementation, updated risk assessment carrying a new date. A small organisation uses a single page: what is changing, which new hazards arise, which measure applies, who authorises it.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1.3-b After changes, the unintended side effects are reviewed, and where they turn out to be adverse, action is taken to remove them.

What proves it: Follow up review or effectiveness check a few weeks after implementation, recorded in the change record, complemented by feedback from the workers affected and by incidents or near misses that have occurred in the affected area since the change.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1.4.1-a Procurement of products and services is controlled so that purchased goods and services do not undermine the requirements of the occupational health and safety management system.

What proves it: Procurement rule or release step showing who checks the occupational health and safety requirements before the order is placed, together with orders and specifications stating the required properties, declarations of conformity and safety data sheets. In a small organisation a short procurement rule plus the filed data sheets for every substance in use is sufficient.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1.4.1-b Before new work equipment, plant or hazardous substances enter the organisation and are put to use, the hazards arising from them have been identified and the necessary measures defined.

What proves it: Incoming goods or commissioning check with a note on the occupational health and safety assessment, training record for the new work equipment, addition of the new substance to the hazardous substance register and update of the risk assessment before first use, not afterwards.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1.4.2-a It is agreed with contractors which hazards their activities create for the organisation's own workers and which hazards from the organisation's operations act on the contractors' workers, and the resulting measures are settled before work begins.

What proves it: Contractor briefing and safety induction with signature list, handover of the site rules, joint walkthrough before work starts, permits to work for hazardous activities and a point of contact on each side. A small organisation uses a one page contractor rule that is signed before the first assignment.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1.4.2-b Contractors are selected against criteria in which occupational health and safety features explicitly, and these criteria are anchored in the contracts or purchase orders.

What proves it: Criteria list or supplier evaluation including occupational health and safety criteria, contract or order clauses on qualification, training, protective equipment and the duty to report incidents, evidence such as proof of competence or clearance certificates. In addition, an evaluation after the assignment so that the next selection can draw on it.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1.4.3-a Outsourced functions and processes are determined, the type and extent of control over them is defined, and responsibility for occupational health and safety visibly remains with the organisation despite the outsourcing.

What proves it: List of outsourced processes stating how tightly each one is controlled, contract or statement of work carrying the occupational health and safety requirements and the reporting duty, plus evidence that the control is actually exercised: audit at the service provider, walkthrough, evaluated indicators or incident reports from the provider.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.2-a The potential emergency situations are identified, a planned response is prepared for each one including first aid, and the corresponding plans are available as documented information.[Document](#)

What proves it: Emergency or alarm plan per scenario, escape and rescue plan, list of first aiders and fire response helpers with the expiry date of their training, emergency contacts, locations of first aid material and firefighting equipment. In many jurisdictions this overlaps with statutory health and safety duties, but the standard requires the plans in their own right. Small organisations keep this to a notice board plus one page per scenario.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.2-b The planned response is tested and exercised at regular intervals, it is revised after exercises and after actual emergencies, and everyone concerned knows their role: workers, contractors, visitors, emergency services and authorities receive the information they need.

What proves it: Exercise records from evacuation or alarm drills with date, participants, observations and the changes derived from them, training records covering emergency behaviour, notices for visitors and contractors, coordination with the fire brigade or ambulance service where special risks exist. A small organisation runs one evacuation drill a year and records half a page of evaluation.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9 Performance evaluation

17

9.1.1-a	It is set out in writing what the organization monitors and measures with regard to occupational health and safety. The scope covers at least: fulfilment of legal requirements and other requirements, the activities and operations connected with the identified hazards, risks and opportunities, progress towards the OH&S objectives, and the effectiveness of the operational controls, including those that apply to contractors and outsourced activities. What proves it: A monitoring and measurement plan naming the source for each item, for example walkthrough records, incident and near miss reports, results of workplace exposure measurements, an inspection due date list, contractor evaluations. A small business keeps this as a single table with the columns item, source, frequency, owner. Open In progress Met Not applicable Evidence / justification	
9.1.1-b	For every item that is monitored, the method, the evaluation criteria or benchmark values and the timing are defined. Separately from that, it is defined when the collected data are analysed and evaluated. What proves it: An indicator sheet with definition, calculation method, target or threshold value and collection frequency, for example number of reported near misses per quarter, share of completed actions from the risk assessment, attendance rate for safety instruction. Mix leading indicators (reports, walkthroughs, instructions) with lagging ones (injuries, lost days), otherwise problems only become visible after the harm has occurred. Open In progress Met Not applicable Evidence / justification	
9.1.1-c	The measuring equipment in use is fit for purpose, is maintained and is calibrated or verified, so that the results can be relied upon. What proves it: Calibration certificates and verification records for gas detection and gas measuring instruments, sound level meters, anemometers, test equipment for portable electrical appliances. An organization that does not measure itself evidences this point through the test reports of the contracted service provider and that provider's proof of instrument calibration. Open In progress Met Not applicable Evidence / justification	
9.1.1-d	The results are analysed and evaluated, and the OH&S performance and the effectiveness of the management system are derived from them. The relevant results are communicated internally, expressly including to workers and, where they exist, to their representatives. What proves it: An evaluation with commentary rather than a bare list of figures, plus evidence that it was passed on: minutes of the health and safety committee, a notice on the board, a team briefing with an attendance list, an intranet entry. Without this feedback loop back to workers, the participation evidence that is typical of ISO 45001 under 5.4 is missing. Open In progress Met Not applicable Evidence / justification	
9.1.1-e	The results of monitoring, measurement, analysis and evaluation are retained as documented information, as are the records of maintenance, calibration or verification of the measuring equipment. What proves it: Filed measurement records, indicator trends and calibration certificates with date and owner. Retention periods for occupational health and exposure related records follow additionally from national law, for example from hazardous substance and occupational medicine regulations. The standard only requires the record to exist; the law determines how long it must be kept. Open In progress Met Not applicable Evidence / justification	Document

9.1.2-a A defined process exists by which the organization checks whether the legal requirements and the other requirements it has subscribed to are actually being met. The frequency and the method of this check are determined.

What proves it: A legal register or duties register with a column for review date and review method, linked to inspection intervals for equipment, occupational health surveillance dates and instruction dates. In the German context the basis includes the Occupational Safety and Health Act, the Industrial Safety Regulation and the applicable statutory accident insurance rules. Small businesses attach the review to a fixed annual date and use the checklist of the responsible accident insurance institution.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.1.2-b Deviations from legal or other requirements that are identified trigger actions, and the organization knows and understands its current status of conformity with those requirements.

What proves it: An action list with deviation, cause, action, due date and completion note. The status is evidenced when a named person can state at any time which requirement is open and why. Official conditions and orders from the regulator belong in the same list.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.1.2-c The results of the evaluation of conformity are retained as documented information.[Document](#)

What proves it: A dated compliance report or a signed off printout of the legal register with the status per requirement. One sentence per item is enough; what matters is that date, reviewer and result are visible.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.2.1-a Internal audits take place at planned intervals. They establish whether the management system conforms to the organization's own arrangements and to the requirements of the standard, and whether it is effectively implemented and maintained.

What proves it: A multi year plan with dates and the audit reports from the past cycles. An audit with no findings needs an explanation; it is not a mark of quality.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.2.1-b Over one cycle the audit scope covers all elements of the management system, in particular participation and consultation of workers, hazard identification and risk assessment, the control of contractors and procurement, emergency preparedness, and the handling of incidents.

What proves it: A coverage matrix that maps clauses of the standard or system elements against audit dates, so that gaps across the cycle become visible. Audit with an eye on practice on the shop floor: short conversations with workers at their workplace prove more than a document review in the office.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.2.2-a An audit programme is established and maintained. It governs frequency, methods, responsibilities, planning requirements and reporting, and takes account of the importance of the processes concerned, changes in the organization and the results of previous audits. When the programme is drawn up, workers or their representatives are consulted.

What proves it: The audit programme with an annual overview plus evidence of the consultation: an agenda item and an extract from the minutes of the health and safety committee, feedback from the safety delegates or from the workforce representation. This consultation is a hard requirement of the standard, not a voluntary extra. Without a works council, a small business collects the feedback in a team meeting and documents it.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.2.2-b	For each individual audit the objectives, criteria and scope are defined, and the auditors are selected so that objectivity and impartiality are preserved. What proves it: An audit plan per date with objective, criteria and scope, plus a short declaration of independence from the auditor. Nobody audits their own area of responsibility. Small businesses solve this through a peer swap between areas, through a trained employee from another site, or through an external auditor engaged by the hour. Open In progress Met Not applicable Evidence / justification	
9.2.2-c	The audit results are reported to the relevant management and are made available to the workers concerned and, where they exist, to their representatives. Nonconformities that are identified lead to actions. The implementation of the audit programme and the audit results are retained as documented information. What proves it: The audit report with a distribution list, a linked action list with owners and due dates, plus evidence that it was made known, for example a minute entry or a notice. The link to 10.2 must be visible: a finding in the report for which there is no action is spotted immediately in the certification audit. Open In progress Met Not applicable Evidence / justification	Document
9.3-a	Top management itself reviews the management system at planned intervals and judges whether it remains suitable, adequate and effective. What proves it: Invitation, attendance list and minutes showing recognisable involvement of the executive management. An annual date is usual; where change is significant or after a serious incident, sooner. In a micro organization a minuted half day session between the owner and the safety professional is enough. Open In progress Met Not applicable Evidence / justification	
9.3-b	The review looks at the status of actions from previous reviews as well as changes in the internal and external issues, in the needs of interested parties, in the legal and other requirements, and in the risks and opportunities. What proves it: A section of the minutes with the status of every old action and a short note on the changes. Since Amendment 1:2024 this expressly includes whether climate change is a relevant issue for the context, which in occupational safety typically means heat stress, UV exposure, heavy rain and storms and their consequences for outdoor workplaces and for halls without air conditioning. A documented answer of no is acceptable; the absence of the question is not. Open In progress Met Not applicable Evidence / justification	
9.3-c	The review additionally draws on the achievement of the OH&S policy and the OH&S objectives, on information about OH&S performance including incidents, nonconformities, corrective actions and monitoring results, on the status of conformity with requirements, on audit results, on the results of participation and consultation of workers, on relevant communications from interested parties, on the adequacy of resources, and on the effectiveness of the actions taken to address risks and opportunities. What proves it: An input pack attached to the minutes that names an annex for each point: objectives overview, injury and near miss statistics, action list, compliance report, audit report, minutes from the health and safety committee or team meetings, complaints and enquiries from outside, budget and headcount overview. Use a fixed agenda following these points, then no input can quietly be left out. Open In progress Met Not applicable Evidence / justification	

9.3-d

The outputs of the review include conclusions on the continuing suitability, adequacy and effectiveness of the system as well as decisions on opportunities for improvement, on any need for change to the system, on resources, on the integration of occupational health and safety into the other business processes, and on implications for the strategic direction. The relevant outputs are communicated to workers and, where they exist, to their representatives, and they are retained as documented information.

What proves it: Minutes with clearly separated decisions: what is being changed, who implements it, by when, with what budget. Plus evidence that it was made known to the workforce, for example a notice, a circular email or an extract from the minutes. Decisions without an owner and a due date are not usable evidence.

Open

In progress

Met

Not applicable

Evidence / justification

Document

10 Improvement7

10.1

Opportunities to improve occupational health and safety are identified systematically, evaluated and turned into actions so that the intended outcomes of the management system are achieved. Findings from worker participation, monitoring, audits and the management review feed into this in a traceable way.

What proves it: A running improvement list stating the source of each idea, such as a workplace walk, a near miss, an audit finding or a suggestion from the workforce, together with owner, due date and status. A small business keeps this as one single table and works through it in the monthly meeting so that ideas do not get lost on scattered notes.

Open

In progress

Met

Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.2-a

Incidents and nonconformities are reported, taken up promptly and brought under control. Immediate actions limit the consequences for the safety and health of workers, and the unplanned condition is corrected.

What proves it: A reporting form or ticket type for incidents and nonconformities capturing time, location, persons affected, immediate action and owner. Near misses and unsafe conditions are explicitly included. Separate national legal duties exist in Germany, such as the first aid record book under DGUV Vorschrift 1 and the accident report to the statutory accident insurer, and they do not replace reporting inside the management system.

Open

In progress

Met

Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.2-b

Incidents and nonconformities are investigated with the participation of workers, and worker representatives as well as other relevant interested parties are involved. The investigation focuses on the matter itself rather than on assigning blame to individuals.

What proves it: An investigation report with an attendance list showing that workers from the area concerned and, where they exist, worker representatives took part. Without a formal body, a short record of the follow up discussion with the colleagues involved is enough, countersigned by everyone present.

Open

In progress

Met

Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.2-c

The causes of incidents and nonconformities are determined, and it is checked whether comparable cases already exist or could occur elsewhere in the organization. The view reaches beyond the person directly involved and covers work organization, technology and instruction.

What proves it: Root cause analysis in the same form, for example five whys or a cause and effect diagram, with a dedicated field for transferability to other workstations, shifts or sites. A short note per area checked is sufficient, what matters is that the check is visibly documented.

Open

In progress

Met

Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.2-d	Necessary corrective actions are defined and implemented, applying the hierarchy of controls and taking management of change into account. The assessment of hazards as well as of risks and opportunities is consulted again before the decision, the effectiveness of the actions is reviewed and the management system is adjusted where needed. What proves it: An action sheet that states, for each action, the level of the hierarchy of controls chosen, from elimination through substitution and engineering as well as administrative controls to personal protective equipment, together with the updated hazard assessment carrying a revision date. A separate follow up date for the effectiveness check, for example after three months, with a short result note closes the case robustly. Actions that rely on personal protective equipment alone need a justification why higher levels are not feasible. Open In progress Met Not applicable Evidence / justification	
10.2-e	Documented information is retained on the nature of incidents and nonconformities, on the actions taken in response including corrective actions, and on their results and effectiveness. This information is made available to workers, their representatives and other relevant interested parties. What proves it: A continuous register with a sequential number, date, description, cause, action, effectiveness check and status, plus evidence that the information was shared, such as a notice on the board, minutes of a safety instruction or an entry in the team meeting record. A register that stays empty for months looks implausible, so record small deviations and near misses consistently. Open In progress Met Not applicable Evidence / justification	Document
10.3	The suitability, adequacy and effectiveness of the occupational health and safety management system are improved continually, and the OH&S performance develops measurably. The organization promotes a culture in which hazards and near misses can be reported without disadvantage, secures the participation of workers in improvement and communicates the results. What proves it: A time series of OH&S indicators across several years, for example accident frequency, days lost, number of reported near misses and the completion rate of actions, each with the baseline value and the current value side by side. A rising number of reported near misses alongside falling accidents indicates a working reporting culture and should be explained that way. In a small business a one page annual overview is enough, presented in the team meeting and noted in the minutes. Open In progress Met Not applicable Evidence / justification	

The requirements are worded independently and do not replace the text of the standard. Only the original standard from its respective publisher is binding. This list is a working tool, not a proof of conformity and not a certification. Leanshift is not certified against any of these standards, is not a certification body and is not affiliated with ISO, IEC, DIN, IATF, IAQG or SAE. In case of doubt, the German version of this list prevails.