WORKSHEET 4.11

Integration with the Environmental Standard

Subchapter 4.11 · case in the book: Aarhus

Find your internal audit programme and read it with one question in mind: has anybody ever audited the energy review, the significant energy uses and their relevant variables, the baseline, the data collection plan and the method by which improvement is verified? In a property that reached the energy standard through an environmental system already in place, the answer is almost always no, and the programme will still say energy in its title.

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
Count the hours in the combined audit plan against each standard's specific requirements.		
Rebuild the internal audit programme from both clause lists, not by retitling.		
Keep the aspects register and the significant energy uses register separate and linked.		
Give every significant energy use its relevant variables, current performance and named persons.		
Report emissions and consumption as two figures, and say which movements you produced.		
Read the two scope statements and the two boundaries side by side once a year.		
Annotate the shared clauses with what the energy standard adds inside each.		
Record and close findings in the register of the system whose requirement they breach.		
Ask at quotation which standards each member of the audit team is qualified in.		
Check that no energy type inside the boundary has been left outside the system.		

These steps are the book's method, not requirements of ISO 50001. 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 is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
«One system, so one audit.»	One visit, one plan, one team, and two scopes, two sets of requirements and two certificates with their own cycles and expiry dates.	
«Energy is one of our environmental aspects, so it is covered.»	That makes it something you manage. It does not produce an energy review, significant energy uses with their variables, a baseline, indicators or a verification method.	
«Our carbon fell thirty-one per cent, so energy performance improved.»	Your supplier decarbonised the network. Emissions are what a unit costs the atmosphere; energy performance is how many units you used. Yours went up.	
«The environmental objective covers the requirement.»	An objective achieved is not a demonstrated improvement attributable to you, and the environmental standard asks for no baseline and no normalisation.	
«Integration saved us two and a half audit days.»	It saves the duplication that genuinely exists. Count the hours in the plan against the energy review, the baseline and the verification; if they are thin, the saving came out of the audit.	
«One internal audit programme covers both.»	Only if it audits both. A programme inherited from an environmental system and retitled has usually never touched a single energy-specific requirement.	
«The same scope sentence describes both certificates.»	The environmental scope may follow influence and the energy boundary follows operational control. A let restaurant can be inside one and outside the other.	
«The finding is closed, for both systems.»	It is closed where the requirement lives. A nonconformity against the energy system filed in the environmental register will be reported closed at a visit where nobody is looking.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Treating one integrated system as one set of requirements.		
Satisfying the shared clauses in the shape of whichever standard came first.		

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Assuming energy is covered because it appears in the aspects register.		
Merging the aspects register and the significant energy uses register.		
Reporting a carbon figure as evidence of energy performance.		
Offering an achieved environmental objective as a demonstration of improvement.		
Accepting a combined audit plan without counting the hours per standard.		
Filing a finding against the energy system in the environmental register.		
Describing two certificates with two different boundaries in one sentence.		
Keeping two entirely separate systems, paying twice and integrating nothing.		

Operative synthesis

- **Integration is real where the two standards share a structure (context, policy, competence, communication, documented information, internal audit, management review, corrective action) and a property that builds those once has genuinely built them once. What integration never does is merge the requirements. The environmental standard asks for a life cycle view of aspects, compliance obligations and their evaluation, and emergency arrangements. The energy standard asks for an energy review, significant energy uses with their relevant variables, a baseline, indicators, a data collection plan, design and procurement criteria, and a demonstrated improvement. Neither produces the other as a by-product.**
- **The characteristic failure of an integrated system is not neglect but shape. The shared clauses get satisfied in the form of whichever standard arrived first, and the requirements the second standard adds inside those clauses become invisible, because the clause already has a tick beside it. An internal audit programme retitled rather than rebuilt is the commonest instance, and it can run for years in a certified property without anybody internally examining the analytical core of the energy system.**
- **Emissions and energy performance are different quantities, and in a year like this one they can move in opposite directions. What a unit of energy costs the atmosphere depends on where it came from; energy performance is how many units the building used. A utility that decarbonises a network improves the environmental performance of every building attached to it and the energy performance of none of them. Both are real improvements, they belong to different systems, and reporting them as one is a claim the property's own meters contradict.**
- **The combined audit is one visit and two sets of conclusions, with duration determined per standard, reductions justified by the integration that actually exists, and competence held in each. The property's contribution is arithmetical: read the plan, count the hours against the requirements that live in only one of the two standards, and ask about it a fortnight before rather than a fortnight after.**
- **In Aarhus the two auditors arrived in the same car and produced a finding neither had gone looking for: fourteen months of a certified energy management system whose energy review, significant energy uses, baseline and verification method had never been internally audited by**

anybody, discovered by an environmental auditor sampling a programme that had the word energy in its title. The rebuilt programme found a seven-day ventilation schedule serving a four-day booking pattern in its first outing. The property now knows which part of its thirty-one per cent it earned, which is the more valuable thing, and it is about to need it: the next subchapter follows the certificate out of the building, to the rating agencies, the lenders and the valuers, who ask for exactly that separation and are not always told that it exists.

Action plan for our property

Action	Owner	Due	How we will know it worked

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 4b «The Lens», subchapter 4.11. Edizioni Effedore, 2026. Clause references are paraphrased; this sheet does not reproduce the text of ISO 50001, ISO 50003 or ISO/IEC 17021-1. It is not legal advice: energy law is that of the place where the property operates.