

Working Material 2.10

Water Stewardship in a Water-Intensive Industry

ISO 14001:2026 · Material date: 25 October 2026

This sheet puts the working parts of subchapter 2.10 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 hotel group builds sophisticated energy monitoring because energy was the dominant risk at every property it has ever operated before. What happens when it opens its first property in a city where water, not energy, is the resource genuinely running short?

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
Energy is inherently the primary environmental concern for any hospitality environmental management system	No	Significance is determined by an organisation's own specific context; in water-stressed regions, water may represent the more material risk	
A monitoring template proven effective at one property transfers appropriately to any new property regardless of context	No	Clause 6.1.2's significance determination must reflect each specific context; a template is a starting point for analysis, not a substitute for it	
An organisation's general environmental management sophistication is evidence that every significant aspect receives proportionate attention	No	Sophistication can be genuinely high in one area while genuinely inadequate in another, as Perth's energy-water contrast demonstrates directly	
A context analysis correctly identifying a resource as significant satisfies the standard's requirements regarding that resource	Not on its own	Clauses 6.1.5 and 6.2.1 require significant aspects to be taken into account in planning action and setting objectives; a separate objective is not automatically required, but identification with no corresponding objective, control or monitoring leaves the aspect unmanaged	
A single master meter, reviewed monthly, provides adequate monitoring for any resource regardless of its significance level	No	Monitoring adequacy should be proportionate to significance; a resource identified as the property's primary material risk warrants monitoring granularity comparable to what a lower-risk resource elsewhere receives	

What is claimed	Binding?	What actually holds	In our property
Regional water scarcity is a public policy and utility concern separate from an individual property's own environmental management responsibilities	No	Where regional scarcity makes a resource the property's own most significant environmental aspect, the standard's requirements apply to it with the same force as any other significant aspect	

A Checklist for the Next Monitoring Investment 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 our monitoring investment across major resources match our own context analysis's significance ranking, or does it follow a template developed elsewhere?	The exact mismatch this entire case turns on		
If our best-monitored resource and our most significant resource are not the same, why not?	A genuine answer should exist; if none does, the gap is likely unexamined rather than deliberate		
Would an anomaly in our most significant resource be caught within days, or only when a monthly invoice happens to look unusual?	This is the practical test Perth's own gap would have failed for months		
Has this property's monitoring approach been independently verified against its own context, or inherited from a template proven elsewhere?	Organisational expertise built in one market carries no automatic relevance to a different one		
Does our organisation's reputation for sophistication in one area create false confidence about attention elsewhere?	Perth's own strong energy reputation is precisely what delayed scrutiny of its water gap		

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
☐	Applying a monitoring template developed for one regional context to a new property without verifying it matches that property's own specific significance profile.	
☐	Allowing an organisation's general environmental management sophistication in one area to create false confidence about proportionate attention elsewhere.	
☐	Correctly identifying a resource as significant in a context analysis without connecting that identification to actual monitoring investment.	
☐	Assuming energy is inherently the dominant environmental concern regardless of a property's own specific regional water context.	
☐	Relying on a single aggregate meter for a resource whose significance would warrant granular, zone-level monitoring.	

☐	Mistake (from the book)	Where we see it
☐	Treating regional water scarcity as a public utility concern separate from the property's own environmental management responsibility.	
☐	Responding to a discovered loss by fixing the specific instance without examining the broader monitoring gap that allowed it to go undetected.	
☐	Failing to require an explicit significance comparison across resources before finalising monitoring investment at a new property.	
☐	Assuming a resource's lower monitoring investment reflects a deliberate significance judgement rather than an unexamined inherited default.	
☐	Treating organisational expertise built in one market as automatically transferable to a genuinely different one without reverification.	

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	Compare the property's own significance ranking of its major environmental aspects directly against its actual monitoring sophistication for each, and flag any resource ranked highly in significance but monitored with materially less rigor than a lower-ranked resource receives.		
Plan for	Install monitoring granularity proportionate to each resource's genuine significance, not to whatever template the organisation has used successfully elsewhere; and require an explicit resource significance comparison at every new property before finalising monitoring investment.		
Monitor going forward	Review the alignment between significance ranking and monitoring investment periodically, treating any growing mismatch as an early warning worth acting on before it produces an undetected loss of the kind this case describes.		

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 2.10. Edizioni Effedore 2026. © 2026 Francesco Dore. Free to adapt for use in your own property. enbooks.effedore.com