WORKSHEET 1.5

Scope and the Boundary Problem

Subchapter 1.5 · case in the book: Muscat

GUIDING QUESTION

Your certificate carries one address. How many places do your people have to be, for work, that are not at that address, and who decided they were outside?

This worksheet turns the tools of the subchapter into a form you can fill in. The texts come from the book; the empty columns are for your own property. Adapt it before use: an unadapted checklist is exactly what the book warns against.

Practical application: what to do in your property

Step (from the book)	Done?	What we found / owner
List the places, not the premises. Every location where your people have to be for work: transport, accommodation, outlets at other addresses, desks in other people's buildings, stores, shared plant, and the venues your events team works in. Compare with your scope statement.		
For each place, mark control or influence. Where it is influence, identify the lever, which is almost always a contract that is renewed on a known date. The renewal is when influence becomes available, and it is the only moment at which it is cheap.		
Take a deliberate position on staff accommodation and write down the reasoning. Necessity rather than ownership is the test proposed here; whichever way the property decides, the decision and its grounds belong in the record, because this is the boundary that will be examined first when something happens.		
Decide, resource, declare, in that order. Before widening the scope, establish who will identify hazards there, who will consult the people who work there, and how incidents will reach your register. A scope statement that outruns those three arrangements creates a finding rather than a protection.		
Rewrite the statement in operational language. It should name activities and locations, and a reader should be able to answer from it whether a given place is in. If your own duty manager cannot, neither can an insurer at seven in the morning.		
Revisit it when the operation moves. A new outlet, a new transport contract, a new accommodation block or a new concession changes the scope whether or not anybody amends the sentence.		

These steps are the book's method, not requirements of ISO 45001. Evidence can take whatever form suits the property; a separate document is needed only where an applicable requirement, or the property's own system, makes it necessary.

Verification Pact: what is believed, tested against the standard

What the property took to be true	What actually holds	Our position
"Our scope is the hotel. That is the address on the certificate."	The clause asks for boundaries determined in the light of the work-related activities performed, not for the premises. A hotel whose people work in six places has a scope with six places in it.	

What the property took to be true	What actually holds	Our position
“A narrow scope is the prudent choice.”	The scope must include activities within the organisation’s control or influence that can affect its OH&S performance. Narrowing it does not reduce exposure by an hour; it removes the exposure from the system that exists to manage it.	
“Staff accommodation is housing. It is not a workplace.”	A workplace is a place under the control of the organisation where a person needs to be or to go for work purposes. Where housing is a condition of the work rather than an optional benefit, the three conditions are met and the property must take a considered position.	
“The bus belongs to the transport company, so it is theirs.”	Control and influence are named together. The property chooses the operator, sets the schedule and renews the contract, and influence exercised through a contract is still influence.	
“If we put more inside the scope we take on more liability.”	What is inside must be managed, which is a real commitment and the reason to decide, resource and then declare. But an activity is inside because of what it is and who controls it, not because of what the statement says.	
“The scope was set when we certified. It is not something we revisit.”	It is determined in the light of the issues, the interested parties and the activities performed, all of which move. A scope that has survived a new outlet, a new bus contract and a new accommodation block unchanged is describing a property that no longer exists.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Writing the scope as an address. It answers where the hotel is, and the clause asks where the work is.		
Drawing the boundary by omission. Nobody excluded the buses; the buses were simply never in a sentence, and an omission cannot be defended to anybody who asks.		
Believing that a narrow scope reduces exposure. It reduces what the system manages, not what happens, and the certificate then says more to a reader than the property meant it to.		
Reading control and forgetting influence. The arrangements a hotel relies on most (transport, housing, concessions, outsourcing) sit almost entirely on the influence side, and their lever is a contract with a renewal date.		
Deciding the accommodation question by not asking it. Either position can be defended; never having considered it cannot.		
Widening the scope as a gesture. Everything inside has to be managed, and a declaration that outruns the arrangements produces a finding where an honest exclusion would not have.		

Operative synthesis

› **Scope in this standard is not the limiting device it legitimately is in a quality system.** It must include the activities within the organisation’s control or influence that can affect health and

safety performance, which means the dangerous part cannot be placed outside it. The determination follows the work-related activities performed, not the premises, and a hotel exports its work continuously, into buses, staff accommodation, outlets at other addresses, airport desks and other people's venues.

- Control and influence are two standards of reach named together, and almost every hard boundary in hospitality sits on the influence side, where the lever is a contract and the moment is its renewal. The hardest case is staff accommodation, and the test proposed here is necessity rather than ownership: housing that the work requires is a working condition. Either answer can be defended; the position that cannot is never having asked. And because everything inside the scope must actually be managed, the order is always decide, resource, declare.
- **The scope statement was twenty-three words long and named one address.** The hotel's people had to be, for work, in seven places; and the two who were hurt that morning had been in none of them, because they had been on the road between two.
- **Boundaries settled, the chapter turns to the person who has to hold them.** What the standard requires of top management here is more demanding than in either of the other two standards in this series, and the reason is that the thing at stake cannot be delegated to a function.

Action plan for our property

Action	Owner	Due	How we will know it worked

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 3a «The Helm», subchapter 1.5. Edizioni Effedore, 2026. Clause references are paraphrased; this sheet does not reproduce the text of ISO 45001. It is not legal advice: health and safety law is that of the place where the property operates.