WORKSHEET 4.6

Objective Evidence of Improvement

Subchapter 4.6 · case in the book: Mendoza

Take the largest saving your property claims and ask one question of it. If everybody who worked on it left tomorrow, could a stranger reach the same conclusion from what is written down? Not a stranger who trusts you: one who does not know you, reading the file. If the answer depends on what somebody would explain to them, then what the property holds is a belief, and a belief is not what this standard asks a certification body to find.

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
Apply the stranger test to your largest claim before anybody else does.		
Find the second line of evidence for it; in most properties it already exists.		
Size the claim to the evidence, and say plainly what is unexplained.		
Keep the test design page for each measure, with its result added.		
As auditor, ask the four questions with their named documents: degree days, occupancy, leases, revision record.		
Ask what the figure would have been without any baseline revision.		
Check the base load alongside any normalised figure.		
Write the six lines: compared, periods, boundary, adjustments, instruments, corroboration.		
Say unsupported rather than untrue, and mean it.		

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
«The improvement is twelve per cent and here is how we calculated it.»	The question is not whether the calculation is right but whether a stranger could reach it from what is written.	
«The manufacturer's figures show the saving.»	They show what a fitting does. The assumed hours are the part a hotel's management system actually changes.	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
«The rest of the improvement came from awareness.»	The residual has been attributed to the one line that cannot be measured, which is how such figures usually arise.	
«You are saying our irrigation change did not work.»	No. Nothing exists by which anybody could establish that it did, which is a different statement and a different remedy.	
«The normalised figure improved.»	And the base load? Two independent lines agreeing is stronger than either alone, and it costs an afternoon.	
«We revised the baseline for good reasons.»	Probably. What would the figure have been without the revision?	
«A small hotel cannot produce measured evidence.»	Then the claim should be sized to the evidence. Evidence is required to be proportionate, not laboratory-grade.	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Offering a conclusion and an explanation where evidence is required.		
Presenting a manufacturer's calculation as a measured result.		
Attributing an unexplained residual to awareness or behaviour.		
Never putting two independent lines of evidence side by side.		
Raising the four artefacts as suspicions instead of asking them as questions.		
Failing to ask what the figure would have been without a baseline revision.		
Recording a conclusion without recording its basis.		
Telling a property a measure did not work when the finding is that nothing establishes that it did.		
Requiring measurement-grade evidence from a property whose claim is modest and whose instrumentation is one meter.		

Operative synthesis

› **Objective evidence is data that supports the existence of something and can be verified by somebody else, and the last four words carry the whole requirement. A property demonstrates improvement when a person who has never met anybody in the building can reach the same conclusion from what is written down. Confidence, seniority and a good explanation in a meeting are not substitutes, and no auditor is entitled to accept them.**

- **Evidence has a strength order and both sides of the table benefit from holding it. A measured comparison on an isolated boundary with a method dated before the change. A whole-property comparison corroborated by an independent line. The same comparison without corroboration, which works only where the effect exceeds the property's own noise. An engineering calculation, which establishes a change and not a result. A manufacturer's statement, which is about a product. And a competent person's belief, which is not evidence at all.**
- **Corroboration is the most powerful instrument available and it is free. Two independent measurements of overlapping quantities, agreeing, produce a conclusion that survives an argument about either. A heat meter and a fuel bill. A sub-meter step and a reconciliation residual. A normalised figure and a base load. Where they disagree, the disagreement is the most productive hour in the audit.**
- **The four artefacts are tests and not accusations: a milder year, a grown denominator, a moved boundary, a revised baseline, each with a document that answers it in an hour. And the asymmetry holds throughout: the property demonstrates, the team does not disprove, and unsupported is not untrue. In Mendoza two measures of four were supported, the demonstrable improvement was nine rather than twelve, the certificate was recommended, and the coordinator left with six lines he has used ever since.**
- **The next subchapter takes what happens when the evidence is not there. A nonconformity in this standard can rarely be closed with a procedure and a training record, because the thing that has to change is a number, and the correction that satisfies an auditor is the one the meter can see.**

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 4.6. 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.