ISO 14001:2026 Environmental management systems, requirements with guidance for use

Environmental management, 2026 edition

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

ISO 14001 is the internationally recognized standard for environmental management systems. A new edition was published on 15 April 2026 and supersedes ISO 14001:2015. An assessment against this standard is carried out by an accredited certification body and, if successful, leads to a valid certificate. This checklist prepares you for that assessment and does not replace the audit.

Company	Date	Prepared by

4 Context of the organization 8

4.1-a **The internal and external issues that are relevant to the purpose of the organization and that affect its ability to achieve the intended outcomes of the environmental management system are determined and reviewed at regular intervals.**

What proves it: A context analysis is enough, often a single-page table or a section in the management manual. Evidence is the dated analysis document, the version history and a management review minute in which the context was confirmed or adjusted.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.1-b **The external issues include the environmental conditions that affect the organization or that are affected by it. These explicitly cover climate change, pollution levels, biodiversity, the state of ecosystems and the availability of natural resources.**

What proves it: Keep a dedicated column or section for environmental conditions in the context analysis, with one line per issue and an assessment of whether it is relevant to the business. For a software company, short and honest statements are sufficient, for example data centre locations in water-scarce regions, the electricity mix and the resource demand of hardware.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.1-c **The relevance of climate change is explicitly assessed, both with regard to physical and transition risks for the organization and with regard to the climate impact of its own activities. The result of the assessment is documented with a rationale, even where the conclusion is that it is not relevant.**

What proves it: A short section covering two directions is enough. First, the effect of climate change on us, for example heat periods in the server room or the outage of a cloud region. Second, our effect on the climate, for example electricity, cloud emissions and business travel. What matters is a traceable rationale, not its length.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.2-a **The interested parties relevant to the environmental management system are determined, together with their environmental needs and expectations, including expectations related to climate change.**

What proves it: A stakeholder list with the columns party, expectation, source and relevance. Typical parties for a software company are customers with ESG questionnaires, the landlord, waste disposal partners, cloud providers, employees and authorities. Completed customer questionnaires are good evidence that expectations have been collected.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.2-b **It is decided and recorded which of these needs and expectations become compliance obligations of the organization.**

What proves it: Add a binding yes or no column to the stakeholder list and transfer the binding entries into the compliance obligations register under 6.1.3. This makes the link between an expectation and an obligation traceable during the audit.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.3-a **The scope of the environmental management system is defined and states the boundaries, the sites included, the activities, products and services, as well as the organization's authority and ability to exercise control and influence.** Document

What proves it: A scope statement of a few sentences is enough, for example development, sales and operation of software at site X including home office workplaces. Name the boundaries concretely so that it is clear in the audit what is inside and what is outside.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.3-b **When determining the scope, the context, the compliance obligations, the organizational units and the life cycle perspective are considered. The scope is available as documented information and is made available to interested parties.** Document

What proves it: Add a sentence to the scope statement confirming that upstream and downstream stages such as hardware procurement, operation in third-party data centres and disposal are considered. Publishing it on the website or providing it on request satisfies the availability requirement.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.4 **The environmental management system is genuinely in operation as a coherent system of named processes. The processes and their interactions are known, and the system is maintained and further developed so that the intended environmental performance can be achieved.**

What proves it: A process map or a simple overview showing which processes belong to the system and who owns them. For small organizations, a table with process name, owner and a reference to the corresponding work instruction is sufficient.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5 Leadership 6

5.1-a **Top management takes accountability for the effectiveness of the environmental management system and provides the resources required for it.**

What proves it: Evidence includes management review minutes with decisions, approved budgets for environmental measures and a signed commitment statement. In small organizations the owner or managing director is the evidence in person, what counts is documented involvement in decisions.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.1-b **The requirements of the environmental management system are integrated into the business processes and the strategic direction, and top management actively promotes an environmental culture across all functions.**

What proves it: Demonstrable through environmental criteria in procurement, project or bidding processes, through objectives with an environmental link and through leadership communication such as team meetings, intranet posts or onboarding slides. Screenshots and minutes are sufficient.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.2-a **An environmental policy is established that is appropriate to the purpose and context of the organization and that includes commitments to the protection of the environment, to the fulfilment of its compliance obligations and to continual improvement of the environmental management system.** Document

What proves it: A one-page policy document with a date and the signature of top management. Make it concrete for a software company, for example reducing energy consumption, extending the service life of hardware and selecting cloud services against emission criteria.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.2-b **The environmental policy is available as documented information, is communicated within the organization and is made available to interested parties.** Document

What proves it: Storage in the intranet or wiki with a version status, a notice in the office, confirmation during onboarding and publication on the website. A distribution record or a read receipt is enough evidence of internal communication.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.3-a **Responsibilities and authorities for the relevant roles within the environmental management system are assigned and communicated within the organization.**

What proves it: A role overview or organizational chart with named responsibilities, for example environmental officer, owner for hardware and disposal, owner for travel. In small teams roles may be combined, but they must be assigned in writing.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.3-b **It is defined who reports on the performance of the environmental management system to top management and who ensures that the system conforms to the requirements of the standard.**

What proves it: A role description with the reporting line plus the actual reports, for example a quarterly report or the input package for the management review. The report itself is the strongest evidence that the reporting line is being lived.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6 Planning 16

6.1.1-a **A planning process is in place that considers the context, the needs of interested parties and the scope, and that determines which risks and opportunities related to environmental aspects, compliance obligations and other issues need to be addressed.**

What proves it: A linked planning folder in which the context analysis, the aspects evaluation, the compliance obligations register and the action plan cross-reference each other. A well maintained spreadsheet with cross-references fully replaces an expensive tool.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.1-b **The results of planning are available as documented information, in particular on risks and opportunities, environmental aspects and compliance obligations.** Document

What proves it: Three maintained registers with a version status and the date of the last review are enough: the aspects register, the compliance obligations register and the risk and opportunity register. A change history in the document header shows the auditor that they are current.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.2-a **The environmental aspects of the activities, products and services within the scope are determined, taking into account a life cycle perspective as well as planned developments and potential emergency situations.** Document

What proves it: An aspects register with the items typical for software and service businesses: electricity consumption of the office and end devices, the hardware life cycle and electronic waste, emissions of the cloud services used as an indirect aspect, business travel and commuting, paper and consumables.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.2-b **Criteria for evaluating environmental aspects are defined and documented so that the rating is traceable and repeatable.** Document

What proves it: A short description of the criteria next to the register, for example scale of the impact, frequency, degree of control and legal relevance, each on a scale from 1 to 3 with a threshold for significance. Set the criteria before the evaluation, do not adjust them afterwards to fit the result.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.2-c **Using the defined criteria, the significant environmental aspects are determined and retained as documented information.** Document

What proves it: Add a significant yes or no column to the aspects register, with the score and a rationale. For a software company these are typically cloud emissions, electricity consumption and electronic waste. These aspects must reappear in objectives, operational controls and monitoring.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.2-d **Information about the significant environmental aspects is communicated among the relevant levels and functions of the organization.**

What proves it: Minutes of a team meeting, onboarding material or a wiki page with a read receipt. It is enough if employees can name, in conversation, which environmental topics matter most in the business.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.3-a **The compliance obligations related to the environmental aspects are determined, are accessible, and it is defined how they apply to the organization.** Document

What proves it: A compliance obligations register covering legal requirements and voluntary commitments. For office and IT businesses this typically means WEEE and take-back duties, battery legislation, waste and commercial waste regulations, lease conditions and customer commitments from ESG questionnaires. Record the source, the reference and the internal owner on every line.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.3-b **The compliance obligations are taken into account when establishing, implementing and maintaining the environmental management system, and they are reviewed for currency at defined intervals.** Document

What proves it: An annual review note in the register is enough, supported by a subscription to a legal information service or a chamber of commerce newsletter. Small organizations can tie the update to their tax adviser, their waste contractor or an external consultant and record that arrangement in the register.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.4-a **The risks and opportunities arising from significant environmental aspects, compliance obligations, the context including climate change and potential emergency situations are determined and documented.** Document

What proves it: A risk and opportunity register with the source of the risk, the evaluation and the decision. Typical entries for software businesses are the outage of a cloud region due to extreme weather, rising carbon pricing on electricity, reputational risk during customer audits and the opportunity of reduced travel and longer hardware use.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.5-a **Actions are planned to address the significant environmental aspects, the compliance obligations and the identified risks and opportunities, and it is defined how these actions are integrated into the processes of the environmental management system or into other business processes.**

What proves it: An action plan with the columns action, owner, due date, status and the link to the aspect or risk. A ticket board with an environment label is acceptable evidence and easy to check in the audit, provided that due dates and owners are visible.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.5-b **It is defined how the effectiveness of the planned actions is evaluated, and the evaluation demonstrably takes place.**

What proves it: One success criterion per action, with a number and a target date, for example electricity consumption per workplace reduced by 10 percent. Document the evaluation in the action plan or in the management review, including cases where a target was missed.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.2.1-a **Environmental objectives are established for the relevant functions and levels. They take the significant environmental aspects and compliance obligations into account, are consistent with the environmental policy, are measurable or otherwise capable of evaluation, are monitored, are communicated and are updated as needed.**

What proves it: A list of objectives with a baseline value, a target value and a target date. Practical examples for software businesses are the share of renewable electricity in the office, the average service life of laptops in years, the share of business trips made by rail and paper consumption per head.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.2.1-b **The environmental objectives are available as documented information.** Document

What proves it: Keep the list of objectives as a separate versioned document or as a fixed section of the environmental programme. Record the date of approval by top management so that its binding character is visible.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.2.2 **For each environmental objective it is planned what will be done, what resources are required, who is responsible, when it is to be completed and how the results are evaluated, including the indicators used to monitor progress.**

What proves it: An environmental programme as a table with exactly these columns. Name the indicator and the measurement method explicitly, for example kilowatt hours from the annual utility invoice or the number of decommissioned devices from the asset inventory.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.3-a **When the organization determines the need for changes to the environmental management system, these changes are planned, evaluated and carried out in a controlled manner. This requirement is new compared with the 2015 edition.**

What proves it: A short change routine is enough, for example a checklist for relocation, new sites, a new data centre region, larger hardware purchases, new service providers or rapid headcount growth. The evidence is the completed change record with an approval.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.3-b **For planned changes, the purpose of the change and its potential consequences, the integrity of the environmental management system, the resources available and the assignment of responsibilities and authorities are considered.**

What proves it: Keep the change record with four fields: purpose, impact on environmental aspects and compliance obligations, resources required and owner. One example of a change actually carried out, such as switching cloud provider, is the best evidence in the audit.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7 Support 11

7.1 **The resources needed for the establishment, implementation, maintenance and continual improvement of the environmental management system are determined and provided.**

What proves it: Demonstrable through budget lines for environmental measures, allocated working time for the environmental officer, procurement of measuring equipment or software and the engagement of external support. A decision recorded in the management review is enough as evidence.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.2-a **The competence needed by persons doing work under the organization's control that affects its environmental performance or its ability to fulfil compliance obligations is determined and ensured.**

What proves it: A competence matrix with the role, the competence needed and the current status. Relevant items include knowledge of electronic waste and disposal routes, of emergency behaviour and of selecting cloud services against emission criteria.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.2-b **Appropriate documented information is retained as evidence of competence. Where competence gaps exist, actions are taken and their effectiveness is evaluated.** Document

What proves it: Training records, attendance lists, certificates or a signed briefing sheet. For small teams an annual briefing with the date, the topics covered and the signatures of the participants is sufficient.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.3 **Persons working under the organization's control are aware of the environmental policy, of the significant environmental aspects relevant to them, of their contribution to the effectiveness of the system and of the implications of not conforming to requirements.**

What proves it: Onboarding material with an environmental chapter, an annual briefing, notices and intranet posts. Auditors check this in conversation, so employees should be able to describe the policy in their own words and name at least one significant aspect.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.4.1 **Internal and external communication relevant to the environmental management system is planned. It is defined what is communicated, when, with whom and how, and the environmental information communicated is reliable and consistent with the system.**

What proves it: A one-page communication matrix with the columns topic, recipient, channel, frequency and owner. It covers internal and external communication together and is quick to check in the audit.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.4.2 **Relevant information about the environmental management system, including changes, is communicated internally among the various levels and functions. The communication channels enable employees to submit suggestions for improvement.**

What proves it: Minutes of team meetings, intranet posts and a suggestion channel such as a mailbox, a chat channel or a ticket label. The evidence is the suggestions received and their processing status.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.4.3 **Environmental information is communicated externally in accordance with the established communication process and with the compliance obligations.**

What proves it: Completed customer sustainability questionnaires, notifications to authorities or waste contractors and statements on the website. Store incoming external enquiries and the corresponding answers in a shared folder.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.5.1 **The environmental management system includes the documented information required by the standard as well as the information the organization has itself determined to be necessary for the effectiveness of the system.** Document

What proves it: A document overview that maps each clause of the standard to the corresponding document. This list is also the fastest entry point for the auditor and reveals gaps early.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.5.2 **When creating and updating documented information, appropriate identification, format and media are ensured, together with review and approval for suitability and adequacy.** Document

What proves it: A document header with title, version, date, author and approver. A wiki or a Git repository with a version history and review satisfies this as well, provided approvals are traceable.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.5.3-a **Documented information is controlled. It is available where it is needed and is adequately protected against loss of confidentiality, improper use and loss of integrity.**

What proves it: An access concept for the document repository, permissions in the wiki or on the drive, and a managed backup with a documented restore test. This also protects against the emergency case of losing a storage medium.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.5.3-b **Storage, retention periods, change control and disposal of documented information are defined. Documents of external origin that are necessary for the system are identified and controlled.**

What proves it: A short rule setting retention periods per document type, for example disposal records and audit reports. Store external documents such as disposal certificates, data sheets or the sustainability reports of the cloud provider in a dedicated folder with the source and the date.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8 Operation 11

8.1-a **The processes needed to meet the requirements of the environmental management system and to implement the planned actions are planned, implemented, controlled and maintained. Operating criteria are established for these processes.**

What proves it: Work instructions for the environmentally relevant activities, typically for software businesses: hardware procurement, decommissioning and disposal, travel policy and energy use in the office. Operating criteria are concrete specifications, for example a minimum service life of four years for a laptop.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1-b **The processes are controlled from a life cycle perspective, so that environmental requirements are considered already during procurement and development as well as for use, end-of-life treatment and disposal.**

What proves it: A procurement policy with environmental criteria, for example energy efficiency, repairability, manufacturer take-back and refurbished devices as the preferred option. Evidence is purchase orders showing the criteria applied and the disposal records at the end of the devices' life.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1-c **Externally provided processes, products and services that are relevant to the environmental management system are controlled or influenced to an appropriate degree. The type and extent of control are defined.**

What proves it: A supplier list with environmental relevance and the type of control. For a software company the relevant external parties are the cloud and hosting provider, the IT waste contractor, the data centre and the building operator. Archive the providers' sustainability reports and emission figures as evidence.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1-d **The relevant environmental requirements are communicated to external providers, including contractors.**

What proves it: An environmental clause in purchase orders, framework contracts or the supplier code of conduct, together with the communication actually sent. With large cloud providers, where there is no leverage, the workable route is a documented selection decision based on emission and efficiency criteria rather than a contractual demand.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1-e **The need to provide information about potential significant environmental impacts associated with transportation, delivery, use, end-of-life treatment and disposal of the products and services has been considered.**

What proves it: For software this is the question of whether customers receive figures on the energy demand or the emissions of operation. The evidence can be a short reasoned decision, supplemented by voluntary information such as guidance on efficient settings or figures in the customer questionnaire.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1-f **Documented information is maintained to the extent necessary to have confidence that the processes have been carried out as planned.** Document

What proves it: Completed checklists, purchase approvals showing the environmental criterion, handover records for the waste contractor and meter readings. A few consistently kept records are worth more than many incomplete ones.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.2-a **The potential emergency situations are determined, including those with an environmental impact. The 2026 edition no longer limits the analysis to reasonably foreseeable situations but requires potential emergency situations to be considered.**

What proves it: An emergency list for office operations: fire, water damage, battery fire in laptops and power banks, loss or theft of storage media, power failure and leakage of cleaning agents or refrigerants. Include unlikely scenarios as well and give a rationale for how they are rated.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.2-b **For the identified emergency situations, processes for preparedness and response are established that include actions to prevent or mitigate adverse environmental impacts.**

What proves it: An emergency plan with the alerting chain, responsibilities and a concrete course of action per scenario. For battery fire, define the storage of lithium batteries, suitable extinguishing media and expected behaviour. For loss of storage media, define the reporting chain and encryption. For water damage, define how devices and records are secured.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.2-c **The planned emergency response is tested at regular intervals where practicable, and the testing is documented.** Document

What proves it: Minutes of the evacuation drill with the date, the participants and the observations. For scenarios that cannot realistically be exercised, such as a battery fire, a documented tabletop walkthrough is the practical route for small organizations.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.2-d **The emergency processes and the planned responses are reviewed and revised periodically, in particular after emergency situations have occurred or after tests.**

What proves it: The change history of the emergency plan with the reason for each change, plus the lessons learned note from the drill or the incident. An annual review note stating that no change was needed is also valid evidence.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.2-e **Relevant information and training on emergency preparedness are provided to the relevant interested parties, including persons working on site and external service providers.**

What proves it: Briefing records for employees, posted escape and rescue routes, and inductions for cleaning staff, maintenance firms and visitors. In rented offices, record the coordination with the landlord or building operator in writing.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9 Performance evaluation 12

9.1.1-a **It is determined what is monitored and measured, by which methods, when the monitoring takes place and when the results are analysed and evaluated.**

What proves it: An indicator overview with the indicator, the data source, the frequency and the owner. Practical for software businesses: kilowatt hours from the annual utility invoice, the number of devices purchased and decommissioned from the asset inventory, travel kilometres from expense reports and paper orders from accounting.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.1.1-b **Environmental performance is evaluated against suitable indicators, and the measuring equipment or data sources used deliver valid results.** Document

What proves it: Name the data sources and justify their reliability, for example utility invoices instead of estimated figures. If your own measuring devices are used, provide evidence of their calibration or verification. For cloud emissions, document the provider's emission reports as the source and state the methodology.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.1.1-c **Information on environmental performance is communicated internally and, where required by compliance obligations, externally. The results are available as documented information.** Document

What proves it: An indicator sheet or an environmental report per year, together with its distribution in the team and its presentation in the management review. A simple spreadsheet with a multi-year time series is enough and shows the trend better than any prose.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.1.2-a **A process for evaluating fulfilment of the compliance obligations is established. The frequency of the evaluation is defined and the evaluation is carried out.**

What proves it: Run the evaluation of compliance as an annual pass through the compliance obligations register, with a column for fulfilled yes, no or partly, plus the date, the reviewer and a reference to the evidence. Record deviations as a nonconformity under 10.2.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.1.2-b **The organization has knowledge and understanding of its compliance status with respect to its compliance obligations, and this status is supported by documented information.** Document

What proves it: The completed evaluation pass with a date is the evidence. In addition, archive supporting records for each obligation, for example disposal records for electronic waste and batteries, so that a statement of fulfilment can be substantiated in the audit.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.2.1-a **Internal audits are conducted at planned intervals and establish whether the environmental management system meets the organization's own requirements and those of the standard and whether it is effectively implemented.**

What proves it: An audit programme with dates, plus the audits actually carried out in the last period. One audit per year covering the whole system is the usual scope for small organizations, larger ones spread the topics across several dates.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.2.2-a **An audit programme is established and maintained. It defines the frequency, methods, responsibilities, planning requirements and reporting, and it takes into account the importance of the processes concerned, changes in the organization and the results of previous audits.**

What proves it: A one-page audit programme with an annual grid, the subject of each date, the method and the auditor. Make the reasoning visible, for example that the new change process under 6.3 and the disposal routes come first because findings from the previous year are still open there.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.2.2-b **For each individual audit, the audit objectives, criteria and scope are defined, the auditors are selected so that objectivity and impartiality are preserved, and the results are reported to relevant management. Explicitly defining audit objectives for each audit is an addition compared with the 2015 edition.**

What proves it: An audit plan per date with the objective, criteria and scope, a declaration of the auditor's independence and an audit report with a distribution list. State the objective in your own words, for example verify the effectiveness of the disposal processes or determine the maturity of the new change process. Formulas such as check conformity with the standard are too vague. Small organizations solve impartiality through a peer swap with another area or an external auditor engaged by the hour.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.2.2-c **Documented information on the implementation of the audit programme and on the audit results is retained as evidence.** Document

What proves it: The audit programme, the audit plans and the audit reports with findings and the actions derived from them, each with a date. The link from a finding to an action must be visible, for example through an action number.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.3.1 **Top management itself reviews the environmental management system at planned intervals and judges whether it remains suitable, adequate and effective.**

What proves it: One meeting per year is enough, with an invitation, an attendance list and minutes. The participation of top management must be evident from the minutes, delegating it to the environmental officer alone is not sufficient.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.3.2 **The management review considers the required inputs, in particular the status of actions from previous reviews, changes in the context, in environmental conditions, in risks and opportunities and in compliance obligations, the achievement of the environmental objectives, environmental performance, audit results, the compliance status, relevant communications from interested parties and the adequacy of resources.**

What proves it: A fixed minutes template with one section per input prevents gaps. Create the template once and reuse it every year. This is the most common stumbling block in the audit and is solved immediately by a template.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.3.3 **The outputs of the management review include conclusions on the continuing suitability, adequacy and effectiveness of the system, decisions on opportunities for improvement, on the need for change, on resources and on the integration of environmental management into the business processes. They are available as documented information.** Document

What proves it: Minutes with clearly separated decisions, each with an owner and a due date, which are then transferred into the action plan. Without a named owner and due date, a decision counts as unsubstantiated in the audit.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10 Improvement 4

10.1 **Opportunities for improvement are determined and actions are implemented to achieve the intended outcomes of the environmental management system. The suitability, adequacy and effectiveness of the system are continually improved and environmental performance is enhanced.**

What proves it: A multi-year time series of the indicators plus a list of implemented improvements with dates. Improvement must be visible in the numbers, not only in declarations of intent, so always show the baseline value and the current value side by side.

Open In progress Met Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.2-a **When a nonconformity occurs, it is addressed and corrected. The resulting consequences are dealt with, in particular adverse environmental impacts.**

What proves it: A deviation form or a ticket type for nonconformity, with the immediate correction, the date and the owner. Incidents such as a device disposed of through the wrong route or a lost storage medium belong there as well.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.2-b **The need for action to eliminate the causes is evaluated so that the nonconformity does not recur or occur elsewhere. The corrective actions taken are implemented, their effectiveness is reviewed and the environmental management system is adjusted where necessary.**

What proves it: A root cause analysis using a simple method such as five whys, documented in the same form. An effectiveness check with its own date, for example after three months, with a note on the result, closes the case reliably.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.2-c **Documented information is retained on the nature of the nonconformities, on the actions taken in response and on the results of the corrective actions.** Document

What proves it: A running deviation register with a sequential number, date, description, cause, action, effectiveness check and status. A register that stays empty for a whole year looks implausible in the audit, so record small deviations consistently.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

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 Organization 8

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.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not 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.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not 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.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not 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.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not 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.** Document

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.

◯ 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.** Document

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

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.** Document

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

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.** Document

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

10 Improvement 7

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.** Document

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

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

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

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

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.

9.6 **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

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.

10.10 **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

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.

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

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.

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