

Working Material 1.4

Defining the Scope of the Management System

ISO 14001:2026 · Material date: 25 October 2026

This sheet puts the working parts of subchapter 1.4 into editable form: the Verification Pact, the review questions, the common mistakes as a self-check and the Operative Synthesis as an action plan. The empty columns are for your property. The reasoning behind each row is in the book.

GUIDING QUESTION

A scope statement can be drawn along legal boundaries or along the boundaries the public actually sees. When a resort's marina is operated by a different company under the same name and the same waterfront, which boundary does the standard actually require — and which one does a guest with a camera recognise?

Verification Pact: Market Claims Against the Standard

The first three columns are copied from the book. In the last one, note whether this claim circulates in your property — in a proposal, a brochure, a supplier's pitch or your own documents — and what you now hold instead.

What is claimed	Binding?	What actually holds	In our property
A leased or concessioned operation is automatically outside the scope of the parent organisation's system	No	Clause 4.3 requires considering authority and ability to influence, not only direct legal control — a concession relationship can create exactly this kind of influence	
Scope can be drawn purely along corporate or legal boundaries	No	The clause requires considering organisational units, functions, and physical boundaries together, not legal structure alone	
Excluding a high-impact activity is legitimate as long as the exclusion is disclosed	No	Annex A explains that scope should not be used to exclude an activity that has or can have a significant environmental aspect within the organisation's control or influence; disclosure does not cure an exclusion the 4.3 considerations cannot justify	
A narrower scope always makes certification more defensible	No	A scope that misleads interested parties about what is actually covered creates exposure the Annex A guidance specifically warns against, independent of audit defensibility	
Influence without direct control does not need to be considered when defining scope	No	The clause names influence explicitly, alongside control, as a basis the scope should consider	
Once a scope statement is certified, its accuracy is no longer in question	No	Scope is maintained as documented information; when activities, boundaries, or the organisation's control and influence change, the determination needs revisiting	

A Checklist for the Next Scope Review

Answer each question with Yes, Partly, No or N.A., and name the evidence: a record, a date, a person, a place someone can go and look. An answer without evidence is an opinion.

Question	Why it matters	Answer	Evidence
Does any excluded activity share our brand, signage, or physical infrastructure?	Shared identity is what defeats legal separation in public perception, as it did at Split		
Do we hold lease, licence, or contractual terms that could require the excluded party to change how it operates?	This is the practical test for influence, independent of direct ownership		
Could this activity, if it failed badly, have a significant environmental aspect?	Annex A warns against using scope to exclude exactly this category of activity where the organisation can control or influence it; where it cannot, supplier control under 8.1 is the relevant route		
Would a guest or journalist understand this activity as separate from us?	The perception test that legal boundaries alone cannot satisfy		
Has this exclusion been actively decided, or simply never reconsidered since the system was first built?	Many narrow scopes, like Split's, persist through inattention rather than deliberate choice		

Common Mistakes — Self-Check

Tick every mistake you recognise in your own property today, and write next to it where you saw it. A ticked box is not a nonconformity; it is a place to look before an auditor or an incident does.

☐	Mistake (from the book)	Where we see it
☐	Drawing scope along legal or corporate boundaries alone, without considering influence.	
☐	Excluding a high-impact activity because it reduces audit cost or complexity.	
☐	Treating disclosure of an exclusion as sufficient, regardless of whether the exclusion itself is defensible under the standard.	
☐	Writing a scope statement in legally precise language a guest or journalist could never verify against what they actually see on the property.	
☐	Failing to reassess scope when a new lease, concession, or franchise arrangement is added to the property.	
☐	Assuming a separately branded concession is automatically outside scope without testing shared infrastructure or physical adjacency.	
☐	Treating the influence test as optional once direct legal control is absent.	
☐	Leaving scope decisions to a single property or a single consultant, with no group-level review where a portfolio exists.	
☐	Believing a scope statement's accuracy, once certified, does not need revisiting.	

☐	Mistake (from the book)	Where we see it
☐	Underestimating how completely public perception ignores corporate structure when assigning responsibility for a visible incident.	

Operative Synthesis — Action Plan

The three horizons and their actions are copied from the book. Owner and due date are yours to fill: an action without both is a wish.

Horizon	Action from the book	Owner	Due date
Act on immediately	List every leased, concessioned, or franchised operation sharing the property's branding, waterfront, grounds, or guest-facing infrastructure, and apply the guest-perception test to each: if it produced a serious incident tomorrow, would the public understand it as separate from the certified organisation?		
Plan for	Rewrite the scope statement in language a guest could actually verify against what they see on the property, not only in language a legal team would recognise; and add an environmental alignment clause to every new lease or concession agreement, resolving the scope question before the relationship begins rather than after an incident forces the question.		
Monitor going forward	Track every new leased or concessioned operation added to the property against the influence test at the point it is added, not at the next scheduled scope review — the gap at Split existed for three years partly because nothing prompted a reassessment between certification cycles.		

WHAT THIS SHEET IS NOT

ISO 14001 does not prescribe this form. No clause asks for this worksheet, its columns or a register of market claims; the standard sets requirements and leaves the means to the organisation. This sheet is a working aid drawn from the book: use it, change it or set it aside. Where it touches a requirement, the text of ISO 14001:2026 is the authority, not this page — and nothing on it replaces your own reading of that text.

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 1a — ISO 14001:2026, subchapter 1.4. Edizioni Effedore 2026. © 2026 Francesco Dore. Free to adapt for use in your own property. enbooks.effedore.com