WORKSHEET 1.8

Hazard Identification as a Continuous Act

Subchapter 1.8 · case in the book: Chiang Mai

GUIDING QUESTION

Which team in your hotel has never had an accident? Now ask what that team is exposed to, because a process built on what has already happened will never find them.

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
Write the trigger list before touching the assessment. Purchase or replacement of equipment, change of chemical or supplier, refurbishment, a new activity, a change in shift pattern, the start of a season, and any hazard reported by anybody. Seven lines, and they convert an annual event into a running process.		
Find the teams with no incidents and go and look at what they do. A clean record is a question rather than an answer, and in a hotel it usually marks chronic exposure rather than safety.		
Separate health from safety deliberately when you look. Ask what people breathe, hear, lift, carry, touch and how long they stand, none of which will ever appear in an accident register, and all of which are inside the standard's subject.		
Assess the change at the moment of the decision, not afterwards. The hour to ask what this changes about the work is the hour before the order is placed, and it is the cheapest hour in this volume. What happens after the change is controlled belongs to 2.3.		
List your non-routine situations by name (the get-out, the festival, the film crew, the burst riser, the class) and assess them as the recurring features they are rather than as surprises. A hotel's exceptions are scheduled.		
Build the route from spoken to recorded. Whatever mechanism 1.7 established, its output has to land in the hazard process rather than in a purchase system, and somebody has to own that landing.		

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
"We carry out a full risk assessment every year. That is our hazard identification."	The requirement is a process that is ongoing and proactive. An annual document is an event on a calendar, and between anniversaries the instrument is not running.	

What the property took to be true	What actually holds	Our position
“The assessment covers what actually happens here: it is built on our own records.”	A process built from what has occurred is retrospective by construction. The clause requires past incidents to be taken into account, alongside changes, non-routine situations and new knowledge, none of which are in the record.	
“The grounds team has never had an accident, so they are our lowest risk.”	The standard’s subject is injury and ill health. Chronic exposure produces no events at all, and an empty accident record is exactly what conceals it.	
“The new hobs are safer than the gas they replaced, so there is nothing to assess.”	Changes, actual or proposed, are among the things the process must take into account. A change that reduces one hazard and creates three others is still a change.	
“Nothing has changed on the grounds in eleven years, so the assessment still holds.”	Changes in knowledge of and information about hazards are themselves a trigger. A hazard picture can go out of date while the property stands still.	
“The cooking class is a guest activity, not an operation.”	Non-routine activities and situations are named expressly, and people with access to the workplace, including visitors, are within the identification, as 1.3 established.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Treating the annual assessment as the process. It is an event, and the clause requires something that runs.		
Building the picture from the accident register. It answers where harm has landed, which the map in 1.2 does better, and it is silent about everything that has not happened yet.		
Reading a clean record as low risk. In a hotel it usually identifies the team whose harm is chronic, undated and invisible to every instrument in the building.		
Skipping the assessment when a change is an improvement. Safer than what it replaced is not the same as assessed, and improvements introduce hazards of their own.		
Letting a hazard travel as a purchase request. It will be answered with a box, correctly, by somebody who was never told what it was for.		
Confusing proactive with exhaustive. Four hundred undifferentiated lines is an archive, and the ranking that makes it usable is a separate requirement.		

Operative synthesis

› **Hazard identification is required to be ongoing and proactive, and neither word describes an annual document.** Ongoing means the process is triggered by events rather than by a date, and the clause supplies the triggers: changes made or proposed, non-routine situations, past incidents including those at other organisations, potential emergencies, and changes in what is known about hazards, the last of which can date a hotel’s assessment while nothing on the premises moves.

- **Proactive means the process must find what has not yet hurt anybody, which is precisely what a register cannot do.** Two categories are invisible to a retrospective instrument: hazards created by change, and chronic exposure, which produces no events ever. The standard's subject is injury and ill health, and the second half of that phrase is where a hotel's grounds team, night team, stewards and laundry live. The diagnostic fits in a sentence: find the team with no accidents and go and see what they are breathing.
- **Eleven years without a single accident, and nine people standing in it eight hours a day for ten weeks a year.** The document could not see them, because the document was built out of things that had already gone wrong.
- Identifying a hazard, however, is not yet deciding what to do about it, and the standard treats the assessment of risk, and of the opportunities that sit alongside it, as a requirement of its own. Which is where the resort discovered that it had been assessing one of the two for eleven years and had never once been asked about the other.

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 1.8. 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.