Six Sigma Kaizen

ISO 14001 IMPLEMENTATION HUB

Volume 2 • Guide 2 of 6

Clause 6: Planning

The Analytical Engine of the EMS: Aspects, Compliance, Risk, and Objectives in Practitioner Depth

---

Clause-by-Clause Practitioner's Guide • ISO 14001:2015

Clause 6.1.1 Risks and Opportunities • Clause 6.1.2 Aspects and Impacts • Clause 6.1.3 Compliance Obligations • Clause 6.2 Environmental Objectives

How to Use This Guide

This is Guide 2.2 in Volume 2 of the ISO 14001 Implementation Hub. It covers Clause 6 — the planning requirements of ISO 14001:2015 — at the analytical depth required to implement these elements correctly, defend them under registrar scrutiny, maintain them through the certification cycle, and use them as genuine management tools rather than compliance artifacts.

Clause 6 contains four sub-clauses that together form the analytical and planning foundation of the EMS. Clause 6.1.1 addresses risks and opportunities. Clause 6.1.2 requires environmental aspects and impacts assessment — the most technically distinctive element of the standard. Clause 6.1.3 requires determination and tracking of compliance obligations. Clause 6.2 requires establishment and planning of environmental objectives. These four elements are deeply interconnected: the aspects register feeds the objectives; the compliance obligations register defines the compliance floor below which objectives are not an option; the risk register captures the threats and opportunities that shape which aspects deserve the most management attention.

Clause 6.1.1 — Risks and Opportunities

Standard Requirement

ISO 14001:2015, Clause 6.1.1: "The organization shall establish, implement and maintain the process(es) needed to determine the risks and opportunities that need to be addressed to: a) give assurance that the environmental management system can achieve its intended outcome(s); b) prevent, or reduce, undesired effects, including the potential for external environmental conditions to affect the organization; c) achieve continual improvement. The organization shall determine the risks and opportunities related to its environmental aspects (see 6.1.2), compliance obligations (see 6.1.3) and other issues and requirements identified in Clauses 4.1 and 4.2. The organization shall maintain documented information of its risks and opportunities. The organization shall maintain documented information of the process(es) needed to determine and address its risks and opportunities, to the extent necessary to have confidence that the processes are carried out as planned."

Risk and Opportunity Analysis in the EMS Context

The EMS risk and opportunity register is often the least developed Clause 6 element in first-certification EMS implementations — not because it is difficult to build, but because its relationship to the other Clause 6 elements is frequently misunderstood. Practitioners with ISO 9001 experience bring a quality risk register approach that does not fully translate. The EMS risk and opportunity analysis has a distinct scope and a distinct analytical purpose.

What Is Within Scope of the EMS Risk Register?

The EMS risk register addresses risks and opportunities that affect the organization's ability to achieve its EMS intended outcomes — not risks to the business generally. ISO 14001:2015 specifies three source categories for the risk analysis:

- Risks and opportunities related to environmental aspects (Clause 6.1.2): The aspects register identifies what the organization's operations do to the environment. The risk register considers what could go wrong with the controls for those aspects, what opportunities exist to reduce those aspects' impact, and what the consequence would be of control failure. Example at Cascade: Risk R-01 — the spray booth exhaust fan is a single-point-of-failure for VOC emission control; fan failure during production creates immediate permit exceedance risk.
- Risks and opportunities related to compliance obligations (Clause 6.1.3): The compliance obligations register identifies what laws and permits govern the organization. The risk register considers what compliance risks are present — which obligations are most difficult to meet consistently, which have the highest consequence of failure, and what opportunities exist to achieve compliance more reliably or efficiently. Example at Cascade: Risk R-02 — PSCAA's publicly signaled intent to tighten VOC limits in the next permit cycle creates a compliance risk that operational practices currently meeting current limits may not meet future limits without process change.
- Risks and opportunities from context analysis and interested party review (Clauses 4.1 and 4.2): The context analysis identifies external and internal issues. Many of these issues carry risks or opportunities for the EMS. Example at Cascade: Opportunity O-01 — the growing customer demand for GHG data and sustainability disclosure creates a market opportunity to differentiate on environmental performance; the EMS provides the data infrastructure to respond to this demand more efficiently than competitors without management systems.

Risk vs. Environmental Aspect — The Confusion That Generates Findings

The most common Clause 6.1.1 implementation error is populating the risk register with environmental aspects — treating "VOC emissions from spray booth operations" as an EMS risk. VOC emissions are an environmental aspect (Clause 6.1.2). The EMS risk register should contain the risks to the EMS's ability to manage those aspects effectively, not the aspects themselves.

Environmental Aspect (6.1.2)	EMS Risk (6.1.1) Associated with That Aspect	EMS Opportunity (6.1.1) Associated with That Aspect
VOC emissions from solvent-borne coating operations — significant aspect CA-A-001	R-01: Single-point-of-failure spray booth exhaust fan; failure during production creates immediate uncontrolled VOC release and permit exceedance. R-02: PSCAA permit limit tightening anticipated in next renewal cycle — current operational practices may not achieve compliance with tighter limits without process change.	O-01: Transition to higher-solids coating formulations could reduce VOC content per unit of coating applied by 25 to 35%, directly reducing emission rates below current permit limits and providing buffer against anticipated tightening.
Hazardous waste generation — spent solvents, significant aspect CA-A-003	R-03: Solvent waste is sent to a single licensed TSDF; if that facility loses its permit or changes its acceptance criteria, Cascade would need to identify an alternative disposal route under time pressure, creating regulatory accumulation time risk.	O-02: Solvent recovery and recirculation technology could reduce spent solvent generation by 40 to 60%, reducing RCRA LQG burden and disposal costs while improving the environmental performance profile for customer reporting.
Wastewater discharge — pre-treatment system, significant aspect CA-A-002	R-04: The wastewater pre-treatment system relies on a single treatment train; equipment failure during production would create an immediate discharge compliance risk requiring process shutdown.	O-03: Upgraded monitoring instrumentation with automatic discharge shutoff on pH or metals exceedance would eliminate the risk of an undetected treatment failure reaching the sewer system, reducing compliance risk and regulatory relationship exposure.

Cascade EMS Risk and Opportunity Register — Post-Certification Entries

The following entries from Cascade's EMS Risk Register (MPC-EMS-RSK-001, Rev. 3) reflect the register state at the Year 1 surveillance audit — 12 months post-certification. Five entries are shown: three risks and two opportunities. The register uses additive scoring (Likelihood 1-3, Impact 1-3, combined score 2-9; high priority at 7-9, medium at 4-6, low at 2-3).

ID	Risk / Opportunity	Likely.	Impact	Score	Planned Action / Status
R-01	Single spray booth exhaust fan system — fan failure during production creates uncontrolled VOC release and immediate PSCAA permit exceedance risk	2	3	**6 — MED**	Year 2 capital plan includes installation of backup exhaust fan monitoring with automatic production-stop interlock on fan failure. Target Month 18. Interim control: daily fan operational check added to pre-operation inspection (MPC-EMS-WI-001). Status: In Progress.
R-02	PSCAA permit renewal in Month 30 — public signals of tighter VOC limits for coating operations in the Puget Sound airshed; current operations may not meet anticipated revised limits without process change	3	3	**9 — HIGH**	Environmental objective EO-01 (VOC reduction) directly addresses this risk. Year 2 objective targets 25% VOC reduction from baseline — intended to achieve compliance margin ahead of anticipated tighter limits. Marcus Webb enrolled in PSCAA permit renewal stakeholder process to monitor regulatory development. Status: Active — tracking through objective EO-01.
R-03	Single TSDF for spent solvent disposal — facility closure or permit change would require emergency alternative disposal under RCRA accumulation time constraints	1	3	**4 — MED**	Purchasing Manager to qualify one alternative licensed TSDF by Month 20 — not for immediate use, but pre-qualified for emergency activation. Status: In Progress.
O-01	High-solids coating formulation transition — available lower-VOC formulations tested by engineering; estimate 30% reduction in VOC per unit applied; no quality performance compromise identified in trials	3 — Confirmed	3	**HIGH**	Capital investment approved (Year 2): high-solids-compatible spray equipment for Lines 2 and 3. Implementation Month 19-20. Expected VOC reduction: 28% from current baseline on affected lines. Also directly addresses R-02 (permit renewal risk). Status: In Progress — equipment ordered.
O-02	Customer sustainability reporting — three OEM customers now requesting annual GHG and environmental performance data; EMS provides data infrastructure;	3 — Confirmed	2	**MED**	Jennifer Ramos approved development of a one-page annual Environmental Performance Summary for distribution to all customers. Marcus Webb to prepare first summary by Month 15. Format: GHG inventory, permit compliance status, objective

ID	Risk / Opportunity	Likely.	Impact	Score	Planned Action / Status
	formalizing reporting could differentiate Cascade from non-certified competitors				achievement. Status: In Progress.

Clause 6.1.2 — Environmental Aspects and Impacts: Advanced Practitioner Analysis

Standard Requirement

ISO 14001:2015, Clause 6.1.2: "Within the defined scope of its environmental management system, the organization shall determine the environmental aspects of its activities, products and services that it can control and those that it can influence, and their associated environmental impacts, considering a life cycle perspective. When determining its significant environmental aspects, the organization shall take into account the criteria established by the organization. The organization shall communicate its significant environmental aspects among the various levels and functions of the organization, as appropriate. The organization shall maintain documented information of its: a) environmental aspects and their associated environmental impacts; b) criteria used to determine its significant environmental aspects; c) significant environmental aspects. The organization shall also take into account these significant environmental aspects when establishing, implementing, maintaining and continually improving its environmental management system."

The Aspect-Impact-Significance Chain: Ensuring Analytical Integrity

The aspects and impacts assessment is only as valuable as the rigor of its analytical chain. Three analytical failures frequently produce a register that satisfies the documentation requirement while failing the substance test:

Failure 1: Aspects Described at the Wrong Level of Specificity

An aspect that is too generic cannot drive specific EMS controls. "Energy use" is not an aspect that enables an operational control — it could refer to electricity in offices, natural gas in ovens, diesel in forklifts, or compressed air in spray systems. Each has different environmental impacts, different control mechanisms, and potentially different significance. An aspect that is too specific becomes operationally unmanageable — listing each individual coating recipe's VOC content as a separate aspect creates a register with hundreds of entries that cannot be monitored or controlled at the individual item level.

The right level of specificity for an aspect is the level at which an operational control can be designed and a monitoring metric can be defined. "Solvent-borne liquid coating operations — VOC emissions to atmosphere" is the right level: a single operational control procedure addresses it, a single monitoring metric (daily VOC emission log) tracks it, and a single permit condition governs it. This is the level at which the aspect should be registered.

Failure 2: Environmental Impacts Not Distinguished from Aspects

The aspect is what the organization does; the impact is what happens in the environment as a result. Many registers conflate the two, listing "air quality degradation" as both the aspect and the impact, or listing "hazardous waste disposal" as both the aspect (generation of hazardous waste) and the impact (contamination risk at disposal facility). The distinction matters because the impact description drives the significance score — an impact that is widespread, severe, and difficult to reverse is significant; an impact that is localized, minor, and reversible may not be — and the significance score drives the EMS response.

A well-described environmental impact answers three questions: What is the receiving medium (air, water, soil, human health, biodiversity)? What is the nature of the change (degradation, depletion, contamination, habitat loss)? What is the geographic and temporal extent (localized and short-term, regional and long-term, irreversible)?

Failure 3: Significance Criteria Not Documented or Not Consistently Applied

ISO 14001:2015 Clause 6.1.2 requires the organization to "establish criteria" for significance determination and to maintain documented information of those criteria. The criteria must be defined before the assessment begins — not reverse-engineered from a desired outcome. An organization that assigns different significance scores to similar aspects in different sections of the register, without documented rationale for the difference, has either not defined its criteria clearly or has not applied them consistently. Both create audit findings.

The documented significance criteria must be specific enough that two different assessors applying them to the same aspect would reach the same significance conclusion. Criteria that require significant subjective judgment without defined anchor points ("High if very significant, Medium if moderately significant") do not meet this test. Criteria that define specific anchor points for each scoring level ("Severity 4 = impact affecting area beyond facility boundary; Severity 5 = irreversible impact or human health effect") enable consistent application.

The Life Cycle Perspective: What "Control" and "Influence" Mean in Practice

ISO 14001:2015's life cycle perspective requirement introduces a deliberate asymmetry in the aspects assessment: the organization must consider aspects it controls (its own direct operations) and aspects it influences (in its supply chain and in the use and end-of-life of its products). The appropriate EMS response differs based on whether control or influence is the relationship:

Relationship Type	EMS Response Approach and Cascade Application
Direct control (own operations)	Full EMS treatment: documented aspect in the register; significance determination; operational control procedures; monitoring and measurement; potential environmental objective. Cascade controls: all in-facility coating, pre-treatment, waste management, and energy use operations directly.
Influence over upstream suppliers	Operational planning controls (Clause 8.1): environmental criteria in supplier selection; environmental requirements in purchasing specifications; supplier environmental questionnaire; preference for lower-impact alternatives where technically equivalent. Cascade influences: VOC content of purchased coating materials; hazardous substance profile of pre-treatment bath chemicals; environmental practices of waste disposal contractors.
Influence over product use (customer operations)	Communication and product design controls: product environmental data sheets; communication to customers about coating system selection and its environmental implications; formulation choices that affect product environmental profile. Cascade influences: coating durability (affecting recoating frequency over product life); coating chemistry (affecting recyclability and end-of-life disposal classification of coated components).
Influence over product end-of-life	Product stewardship and communication: guidance to customers on end-of-life disposal implications of different coating systems; preference for coating formulations that do not create hazardous waste characterization concerns at end-of-life. Cascade influences: whether chromate-based conversion coatings create

Relationship Type	EMS Response Approach and Cascade Application
	RCRA-regulated waste when coated components are eventually discarded.

Register Maintenance: Keeping the Aspects Register Current

A certified aspects register is not a permanent document — it is a living record that must be updated whenever the organization's environmental profile changes. The most common post-certification aspects register failure is allowing the register to become a historical snapshot rather than a current description of the organization's environmental aspects. Triggers that require aspects register review and potential update:

- New chemicals or materials introduced into operations: any new coating product, pre-treatment chemical, or cleaning solvent may have a different VOC content, hazard profile, or disposal classification than the materials it replaces. The purchasing process (Clause 8.1) must include an EMS review step before new chemical introduction.
- Process changes: modification of spray booth configurations, changes in production volumes for specific coating types, introduction of new surface preparation steps, or changes to the pre-treatment bath sequence may introduce new aspects or change the significance of existing ones.
- New regulatory requirements: a new PSCAA air quality rule, a change in the State Waste Discharge Permit conditions, or a new EPA RCRA enforcement guidance may change the regulatory significance score of aspects that were previously less significant.
- Facility changes: physical expansion, new buildings, outdoor storage area additions, or changes in stormwater drainage patterns may introduce aspects not previously assessed or change the significance of existing aspects.
- Environmental incidents: an actual spill, discharge exceedance, or regulatory finding that reveals an aspect whose significance was underestimated should trigger a register review for that aspect and potentially related aspects.

Best Practice

The most effective mechanism for ensuring aspects register currency is a formal change management trigger in the EMS that connects operational change to the aspects register review process. Cascade's MPC-EMS-PRO-001 (VOC Emission Control) and MPC-EMS-PRO-014 (Document Control) both include a provision: when a change to a covered process is planned, the EHS Manager receives advance notification and evaluates whether the change requires aspects register review. This "EMS change ticket" approach — modelled on engineering change control practices familiar in manufacturing — prevents the register from becoming a static document while avoiding unnecessary reviews for minor operational adjustments.

Significance Threshold Calibration — Getting It Right the First Time and Defending It Later

The significance threshold is the boundary between aspects that require active EMS management (significant) and those that are acknowledged but not managed at the same intensity (not significant). Setting the threshold too low produces an unmanageable register; setting it too high produces a register that misses environmentally important aspects. Getting it right requires calibration against three reference points:

- Regulatory alignment: aspects that are subject to specific permit conditions or regulatory limits should almost always be significant — the regulatory authority has already determined that they warrant specific

management. A threshold that produces a non-significant determination for a directly regulated aspect is almost certainly calibrated too low for that factor.

- Resource calibration: the total number of significant aspects should be manageable given the organization's EMS resources. If significance determination produces 25 significant aspects, each of which theoretically requires an operational control procedure, a monitoring metric, and a potential objective, the threshold may be too inclusive — or the organization needs to acknowledge that its EMS resources are not matched to its environmental profile.
- Auditor defensibility: the organization must be able to explain, for any aspect that was determined non-significant, why that determination is correct given the aspect's environmental impact profile. Auditors will select one or two non-significant aspects and ask the Management Representative to defend the determination. If the answer is "the score came out below the threshold" without substantive environmental reasoning, the defensibility of the significance determination methodology is weak.

Auditor Perspective

The aspects register receives more auditor scrutiny at Year 2 surveillance than at initial certification — because at Year 2, the auditor can evaluate whether the register has been maintained rather than only whether it was built. The specific Year 2 audit questions for aspects: "Has anything changed in your operations since last year that might require an update to this register?" "Show me the aspect for [a process area observed on the facility walkthrough]. I notice you added [observable change] to that area — was that captured in the aspects register review?" The walkthrough observation of an operational change that is not reflected in the register is one of the most common Year 2 surveillance nonconformance findings. The EMS change management trigger described above directly addresses this vulnerability.

Clause 6.1.3 — Compliance Obligations: The Living Legal Register

Standard Requirement

ISO 14001:2015, Clause 6.1.3: "The organization shall: a) determine and have access to the compliance obligations (legal requirements and other requirements) related to its environmental aspects; b) determine how these compliance obligations apply to the organization; c) take these compliance obligations into account when establishing, implementing, maintaining and continually improving its environmental management system. The organization shall maintain documented information of its compliance obligations."

The "Determine How They Apply" Requirement — The Most Missed Element

Clause 6.1.3(b) requires not only that the organization identifies applicable legal requirements but that it determines how those requirements apply to the organization. This is the Section B function of the compliance obligations register described in Guide 1.3 — translating regulatory language into specific operational compliance obligations. It is the element most frequently missing from compliance registers, and its absence is the root cause of the compliance evaluation gap that the guide 1.1 gap analysis identified as the most consequential finding for Cascade.

The difference between a regulatory inventory (Section A) and a compliance obligation register (Section A + Section B):

- Section A only: "PSCAA Air Quality Permit No. [X] applies to Cascade's coating operations. Permit expires [date]."
- Section A + Section B: "PSCAA Air Quality Permit No. [X], Condition 4.5: Coating material identity, VOC content, and quantity applied must be recorded for each day that coating operations are conducted. Specific obligation: coating operator records these three data elements at the end of each production shift on MPC-EMS-FRM-001. Monitoring method: EHS Manager reviews completed logs monthly and confirms no blank fields. Responsible role: Coating Operator (daily); EHS Manager (monthly review)."

The Section A entry tells the organization that the permit applies. The Section B entry tells a coating operator what they must do to comply with a specific condition of that permit. Only Section B enables genuine compliance evaluation and genuine operational compliance management.

Compliance Obligations Register Maintenance — The Currency Challenge

The compliance obligations register is only useful if it reflects current regulatory requirements. Environmental regulations change — permits are renewed and amended, regulations are revised, new rules are promulgated, and enforcement interpretations evolve. The organization must have a systematic process for detecting and incorporating regulatory changes into the register. The three mechanisms that together provide adequate regulatory currency monitoring:

Mechanism 1: Regulatory Subscription and Monitoring

Subscribe to regulatory agency notifications for each relevant regulatory authority: PSCAA regulatory update emails; Washington State Department of Ecology regulatory calendar; EPA regulatory action tracker for applicable RCRA and Clean Air Act regulatory programs. Most regulatory agencies provide free email notification of proposed and final rules. The EHS Manager should review these notifications and evaluate whether any proposed regulatory change would affect the compliance obligations register.

Mechanism 2: Permit Renewal as a Register Update Trigger

Every permit renewal is an opportunity for permit conditions to change. Cascade's PSCAA Air Quality Permit renewal (Month 30 post-certification) may result in tighter VOC limits, new monitoring requirements, or changed reporting obligations. The permit renewal process must be managed as an EMS event: Marcus Webb reviews the draft permit during the public comment period, identifies any changes from the previous permit conditions, and updates the compliance obligations register before the new permit takes effect.

Mechanism 3: Annual Regulatory Applicability Review

Once per year — typically as part of the compliance evaluation process — the EHS Manager conducts a formal review of all entries in the compliance obligations register to determine whether any regulatory changes have occurred since the last review. This review also assesses whether Cascade's operations have changed in ways that bring new regulatory requirements into scope (e.g., a new process that creates a new emission source may trigger PSCAA new source review obligations).

Cascade Case Study

Cascade Compliance Obligations Register — Year 1 Update: During the Year 1 compliance evaluation conducted in Month 21 post-certification, Marcus Webb identified two regulatory developments that required compliance obligations register updates. First, EPA finalized new RCRA regulations for hazardous waste generators that included a modified requirement for the content of emergency contingency plans. Marcus reviewed the updated requirement, confirmed that Cascade's emergency preparedness plan (MPC-EMS-PRO-012) required a minor update to include the new required elements, updated the plan, and added the new regulatory citation to the compliance obligations register Section B. Second, Washington State Ecology published updated NPDES Industrial Stormwater General Permit conditions with new benchmark monitoring requirements for zinc. Marcus identified that Cascade's stormwater monitoring program did not include zinc analysis. He added zinc to the monitoring schedule, updated the compliance obligations register Section B, and conducted supplemental monitoring for the remainder of the monitoring year. Both updates were documented in the compliance evaluation record for Year 1 (MPC-EMS-CER-002). At the Year 1 surveillance audit, the auditor reviewed these updates and noted them as evidence of active compliance management rather than static compliance documentation.

Clause 6.2 — Environmental Objectives and Planning to Achieve Them

Standard Requirement
ISO 14001:2015, Clause 6.2.1: "The organization shall establish environmental objectives at relevant functions, levels and processes, needed to maintain and continually improve the environmental management system and its environmental performance. The environmental objectives shall: a) be consistent with the environmental policy; b) be measurable (if practicable); c) take into account applicable compliance obligations; d) take into account the organization's significant environmental aspects; e) take into account the views of interested parties; f) be monitored; g) be communicated; h) be updated as appropriate. The organization shall maintain documented information on the environmental objectives."
Clause 6.2.2: "When planning how to achieve its environmental objectives, the organization shall determine: a) what will be done; b) what resources will be required; c) who will be responsible; d) when it will be completed; e) how the results will be evaluated, including indicators for monitoring progress toward achievement of its measurable environmental objectives at defined intervals."

What Distinguishes a Genuine Environmental Objective from a Compliance Metric

The single most important distinction in environmental objective-setting is between objectives that drive performance improvement and metrics that confirm compliance maintenance. Many first-cycle EMS environmental objectives are disguised compliance metrics — they measure whether the organization is meeting its regulatory obligations rather than whether it is improving beyond them. This distinction matters because compliance is the floor, not the ceiling. An EMS whose environmental objectives are all compliance metrics cannot demonstrate continual improvement of environmental performance — which is what the standard requires.

Objective Type	Examples and What They Demonstrate
Compliance metric masquerading as an objective (insufficient)	"Maintain 100% compliance with all PSCAA permit limits." "Complete all required RCRA annual reports by their deadlines." "Ensure all hazardous waste is disposed of at licensed TSDFs." These are compliance obligations — meeting them is required, not aspirational. They do not constitute environmental objectives in the ISO 14001:2015 sense because they measure adherence to the floor, not improvement above it.
Performance improvement objective (sufficient)	"Reduce VOC emissions from coating operations by 25% from the Year 1 baseline by the end of Year 2, as measured by the monthly VOC emission calculation." "Reduce hazardous waste generation (spent solvents) by 20% from the Year 1 baseline by the end of Year 2, as measured by total hazardous waste manifests." These objectives commit the organization to measurable improvements beyond current performance — which is what the standard requires.
Advanced performance objective (excellent)	"Complete transition of Lines 2 and 3 to high-solids coating formulations by Month 20, achieving VOC emission rate reduction of at least 28% on affected lines and reducing total facility VOC

Objective Type	Examples and What They Demonstrate
	emissions by at least 15% from Year 1 baseline." This objective commits to both process change (the action) and environmental outcome (the emission reduction) with specific, verifiable metrics — demonstrating an EMS that is genuinely driving environmental performance improvement.

The Clause 6.2.2 Achievement Plan — Five Required Elements

ISO 14001:2015 Clause 6.2.2 requires the organization to document not only the objective itself but the plan for achieving it — with five specific elements. This requirement ensures that objectives are more than aspirations: they are resourced, assigned, and time-bounded commitments. An objectives tracker with targets but no achievement plans has documented the destination without providing directions.

Required Element (Clause 6.2.2)	What Adequate Documentation Looks Like
(a) What will be done	Specific actions, not vague commitments. Not "improve VOC control" but "transition Lines 2 and 3 to high-solids coating formulations; install compatible spray equipment; qualify new formulations for all affected part numbers; train operators on revised application parameters."
(b) What resources will be required	Specific resource commitments. Capital: spray equipment purchase ($42,000 approved). Personnel: Engineering Manager project management (estimated 15 hours/month, months 15-20); Production Supervisor overtime during qualification trials (estimated 24 hours). External: Coating supplier technical support for formulation qualification.
(c) Who will be responsible	Named roles (not individuals, for resilience to personnel changes) with specific accountability. Owner: Engineering Manager (overall project management, equipment specification, supplier coordination). Supporting: EHS Manager (environmental aspect monitoring during transition); Quality Manager (coating performance qualification). Accountable to: CEO at management review.
(d) When it will be completed	Specific milestones with target dates, not a single "completion date." Equipment order placed: Month 15. Equipment installed: Month 18. Qualification trials complete: Month 19. Full production transition: Month 20. Final VOC reduction measurement: Month 21 (first full month at new formulation).
(e) How results will be evaluated, including monitoring indicators	Specific metrics monitored at defined intervals. Primary indicator: monthly VOC emission calculation (MPC-EMS-FRM-002) — tracked against pre-transition baseline. Secondary indicator: VOC content per gallon of coating applied (calculated from materials usage and SDS data) — tracks formulation transition progress. Monitoring frequency: monthly. Reported to management: at each management review.

Cascade Environmental Objectives — Year 2 Cycle

The following shows Cascade's three environmental objectives for Year 2 post-certification, illustrating how the objective-setting process evolved from the certification-year objectives to more ambitious and strategically connected Year 2 objectives. The Year 2 objectives were established at the Year 1 management review (Month 12 post-certification).

Obj. ID	Objective Statement	Policy Link	Aspect Link	Year 2 Target
EO-01	Reduce total facility VOC emissions from coating operations by 25% from the Year 1 baseline (measured by annual VOC emission calculation from monthly logs)	Policy Commitment 1: Protect the environment; prevent pollution	CA-A-001 (VOC emissions — coating, significant)	Year 1 baseline: [X] tons VOC. Year 2 target: [X x 0.75] tons VOC. Primary action: high-solids transition (Lines 2 and 3, Month 20). Owner: Engineering Manager + EHS Manager.
EO-02	Reduce spent solvent hazardous waste generation by 15% from Year 1 baseline through improved solvent management practices	Policy Commitment 1: Protect the environment; Policy Commitment 3: Continual improvement	CA-A-003 (spent solvents — hazardous, significant)	Year 1 baseline: [Y] gallons spent solvent. Year 2 target: [Y x 0.85] gallons. Primary actions: solvent recovery containers at mixing stations; standardized line-cleaning sequence to minimize changeover waste. Owner: Production Manager.
EO-03	Achieve 100% on-time completion of all compliance reporting deadlines and regulatory submissions across all three permits	Policy Commitment 2: Fulfil compliance obligations	CA-A-001, CA-A-002, CA-A-003 (all regulated aspects)	Target: 100% (zero late submissions). Year 1 performance: 98% (one submission 2 days late due to data error — corrected before deadline with PSCAA notification). Action: compliance calendar with 14-day advance reminders for all regulatory deadlines added to MPC-EMS-LEG-001. Owner: EHS Manager.

Note on EO-03: This objective sits at the boundary between compliance metric and improvement objective. It is included in the Cascade objective set because (1) the Year 1 performance was 98% rather than 100%, creating a genuine improvement target; (2) the action (compliance calendar with advance reminders) represents a systemic improvement rather than simply maintaining current practice; and (3) meeting 100% of regulatory deadlines consistently year-over-year is genuinely important to Cascade's regulatory relationship and license to operate. An EMS with only EO-01 and EO-02 and no compliance performance metric would also be adequate — the choice to include EO-03 reflects Cascade's specific compliance history context.

Handling Off-Track Objectives — The Management Review Connection

Environmental objectives that are off-track at any monitoring point require a management decision — not simply a note in the tracking record. The management review is the governance mechanism through which off-track objectives receive leadership attention and the EMS responds. Three types of management response to an off-track objective:

- Revised action plan: the original actions are inadequate or have encountered obstacles; a revised or supplemented action plan is needed. The management review must document the specific revised plan — not a general commitment to "try harder."
- Revised target: the original target was over-ambitious given constraints that became apparent during implementation; the target is revised to what is genuinely achievable with committed resources. Target revision must be justified and documented — it cannot be routine, or objectives lose their improvement-driving function.
- Additional resources: the original action plan was adequate but under-resourced; the management review allocates additional resources to restore the program to trajectory. This is the most direct demonstration of leadership commitment — committing resources to close an environmental performance gap.

What is not an acceptable management review response to an off-track objective: acknowledging the gap in the minutes without making a specific decision about how to respond. The management review minutes must show that a specific decision was made — not that a situation was observed.

The Clause 6 Integration: How the Four Elements Work as a System

The four Clause 6 elements are not independent requirements — they are designed to function as a coherent planning system. Understanding the integration between them transforms the EMS from a collection of separate documents into a connected analytical framework that actually drives environmental management decisions.

Integration Relationship	How It Works in Practice at Cascade
Aspects Register (6.1.2) feeds Objectives (6.2)	Significant aspects are the primary source of environmental objectives. Cascade's EO-01 (VOC reduction) targets significant aspect CA-A-001; EO-02 (spent solvent reduction) targets CA-A-003. An environmental objective that does not connect to at least one significant aspect is either addressing a non-significant environmental dimension or the aspects register is incomplete.
Risk Register (6.1.1) prioritizes Aspects management	The risk register identifies which significant aspects carry the highest risk of control failure or regulatory consequence, directing EMS management attention and resource allocation. Cascade's R-02 (permit renewal VOC limit tightening risk) makes EO-01 a strategic priority rather than an optional improvement — the objective directly addresses the identified risk.
Compliance Obligations (6.1.3) constrains Objectives (6.2)	Environmental objectives must "take into account applicable compliance obligations" (Clause 6.2.1(c)). This means objectives cannot conflict with compliance obligations — they must operate above the compliance floor, not below it. An objective to reduce monitoring frequency below permit-required levels is not a legitimate environmental objective.
Context and Interested Parties (4.1, 4.2) inform all Clause 6 elements	The external context (regulatory trends, customer requirements) feeds both the risk register (regulatory tightening as a risk) and objectives (GHG reporting capability as an opportunity). The interested party requirements (customer sustainability data demands) feed the compliance obligations register (voluntary commitments) and objectives (EO-03 compliance performance).
Risk Register opportunities (6.1.1) become Objectives (6.2)	Opportunities identified in the risk register are the source of the most strategically valuable environmental objectives. Cascade's O-01 (high-solids transition opportunity) became EO-01 (VOC reduction objective). The path from opportunity identification to objective commitment is the mechanism through which the EMS drives proactive environmental improvement rather than reactive compliance management.

Quick Reference: Clause 6 Audit Readiness

Most Common Clause 6 Audit Findings

Finding Area	Clause	Typical Finding Statement
Risks not distinguished from aspects	6.1.1	The EMS risk register (MPC-EMS-RSK-001) contains entries that describe environmental aspects rather than risks to the EMS's ability to manage those aspects. Entry "VOC emissions from coating operations" describes the environmental aspect documented in the aspects register rather than a risk to EMS effectiveness. The risk and opportunity register does not serve its intended analytical function of identifying what could prevent the EMS from achieving its intended outcomes.
Aspects register not current	6.1.2	The aspects register (MPC-EMS-ASP-001) was last revised at initial EMS implementation. Facility walkthrough identified a new chemical pre-treatment bath installed in the pre-treatment area six months ago (confirmed by Production Supervisor). The new bath uses a different chemistry with a different wastewater discharge profile. The new process has not been assessed for environmental aspects, and the aspects register has not been updated to reflect this operational change.
Emergency condition aspects incomplete	6.1.2	The aspects register identifies aspects for normal and abnormal operating conditions. For four of the seven significant aspects, no emergency condition aspect has been identified. Clause 6.1.2 requires aspects to be determined under normal operating conditions, abnormal operating conditions, and reasonably foreseeable emergency situations. A wastewater treatment system failure that causes un-pre-treated process water to discharge to the sewer system is a foreseeable emergency scenario that is not reflected in the register.
No Section B in compliance register	6.1.3	The compliance obligations register (MPC-EMS-LEG-001) identifies applicable permits and regulations with permit numbers and expiration dates. The register does not document how the specific conditions within those permits apply to the organization — the specific operational requirements, monitoring frequencies, record-keeping obligations, and reporting deadlines that constitute the compliance obligations under each permit. Clause 6.1.3(b) requires the organization to determine how compliance obligations apply to the organization.
Objectives are compliance metrics only	6.2	The organization has established three environmental objectives: (1) maintain 100% PSCAA permit compliance; (2) complete all regulatory reports on time; (3) conduct all RCRA required trainings annually. All three objectives measure adherence to regulatory requirements rather than environmental performance improvement. None of the objectives addresses the significant environmental aspects identified in the aspects register as targets for improvement.

Finding Area	Clause	Typical Finding Statement
		The objectives do not fulfil the Clause 6.2.1 requirement to be needed to "continually improve the environmental management system and its environmental performance."
Achievement plans incomplete	6.2.2	Environmental objective EO-01 (VOC reduction target) is documented with a specific measurable target and a monitoring metric. The objective record does not document the resources required, the responsible roles, the specific actions planned, or the milestone timeline for achieving the target. Clause 6.2.2 requires the organization to determine what will be done, what resources are required, who is responsible, when completion is expected, and how results will be evaluated. Only the evaluation method is documented.
Off-track objective without management decision	6.2 / 9.3	Environmental objective EO-02 (hazardous waste reduction) was at 8% improvement against a 15% target at the Year 1 management review. Management review minutes note that "EO-02 is behind target" but record no specific decision — no revised action plan, no revised target, no additional resource commitment. An off-track objective that receives acknowledgement without a management decision at the management review does not demonstrate that the management review is governing EMS performance.

Next in Volume 2: Guide 2.3 — Clause 7: Support. The support requirements examined in practitioner depth: resource provision, environmental competence (the full assessment methodology), awareness as a measurable outcome, the internal and external communication system, and documented information control as a living system rather than a static archive. The documented information element receives particular attention — the distinction between form and function in EMS documentation is where many certified EMS systems underperform their potential.