

Manufacturer-Independent Water Treatment

From plant audit to a resilient overall system



Technology follows the function

THE DECISION SEQUENCE

- 01 Demand
- 02 Quality
- 03 Process
- 04 Interfaces
- 05 Operation

Water-treatment projects often begin with a machine selection. That order is risky for complex industrial water systems. Only when water streams, quality targets, operating states, residuals and interfaces are understood can a suitable technology combination be chosen. Manufacturer-independent planning places products within the task and creates a sound basis for investment, tendering and operation.

One technology rarely solves every requirement. Softening, filtration, membranes, biological treatment, disinfection and recirculation address different substances and goals. A premature product choice can overlook pretreatment, side streams or operating limits. A good overall system begins with a demonstrable function.

Consider five decision levels together: demand, quality, treatment process, interfaces and operation. Relate every supplier claim to the same feed-water, target and operating conditions. Make water paths, flows, qualities and data gaps visible; compare technologies by function and limits; and plan acceptance, control, maintenance and responsibilities from the start.

An audit creates a shared evidence base

Plans, measurements and operating practice must describe the same system. Differences between documentation and reality are themselves an important audit result. Map actual water paths, users, storage, wastewater streams, measurement points and operating modes. Test historic data for completeness and plausibility, including manual bypasses, seasonal settings and regularly needed flushing.

The system model then assigns flows, qualities and responsibilities. It shows missing data and assumptions that make an investment decision uncertain. This transparency is often the first major benefit of an independent assessment.

Combine quantity and quality in a cascade

A water balance connects intake, use, evaporation, water bound into product, return and discharge. It identifies quantitatively important streams, losses and opportunities for recovery. Assess each stream by its real quality and the quality required at its next use. Reuse is an allocation problem: the next purpose sets the necessary standard.

Not every user needs drinking-water quality, and not every discharge stream is unusable without treatment. Matching quality to purpose can create suitable loops, provided accumulation of substances and cross-contamination are reliably limited. Supply only as much quality as is needed, with explicit limits for accumulation, hygiene and process stability.

Compare functions before brand names

A neutral comparison covers more than achievable outlet quality. It also tests tolerance of changing feed water, residual streams, cleanability, energy, chemicals and operating effort. Translate supplier figures to a common feed range, target quality, temperature, load and availability before comparing costs or performance.

A process may be efficient with stable feed water but sensitive to temperature changes or high salt loads. A robust design cannot assume permanently ideal conditions at the site. State clearly when pretreatment, storage, recirculation, cleaning sequences or discharge are necessary. A known technical limit is manageable if the system controls it.

Assess removal or degradation, feed-water range, energy and chemical use, residual generation, cleaning and maintenance, and availability across the whole treatment chain. No single performance figure can replace a system decision. Ask under which conditions a performance promise applies and who carries the risk when conditions depart from them.

A working component does not guarantee a stable system

Many failures originate at interfaces: insufficient balancing, a pump outside its appropriate range, a missing sensor or unclear residual handling. Independent planning describes these interfaces early and allocates responsibility. Include hydraulic transitions, storage capacity, chemical dosing, cleaning, disposal, spare parts and the response to faults and restarts.

Control engineering is part of the process. Measurement data must be of appropriate quality; alarm limits need a technical reason; interventions must be traceable. Components can each perform correctly while their control loops make the overall

system unstable.

For every interface, examine hydraulics such as flow, pressure, storage and transitions; quality such as sensor position, sampling, alarms and release; and responsibility such as supply boundary, operation, maintenance and evidence. Ask both whether a component meets its specification and whether the entire process remains stable during load changes, cleaning, faults and restarts.

A pilot should answer a design question

Where feed composition, fouling or biological response is uncertain, piloting can reduce investment risk. It tests not only attainable quality but also cleaning demand, residuals, energy and operator effort. Derive trial criteria from the decision that the project must make.

Translate pilot data into full-scale design, including safety factors, redundancy, storage and expected availability. One technically successful week is not a dependable statement about long-term operation. Every trial needs a hypothesis, a plan covering relevant loads and criteria, a dataset on quality, operation, cleaning and residuals, and a documented consequence for sizing and risk.

The purchase price is only one layer of cost

Assess investment together with energy, water, wastewater, chemicals, wear parts, personnel, maintenance, disposal and downtime risk. Include the useful life of critical components and the availability of service and spares. A higher initial investment may be less costly over the full operating period.

Use scenarios rather than false precision. Test higher energy prices, lower utilisation, variable feed quality and stricter discharge conditions. These reveal dependencies that a single assumed operating point hides. A transparent calculation

supports later comparison of purchase, rental, leasing or outsourced operation.

Separate fixed costs such as plant, construction, integration and permits; variable costs such as media, load, cleaning, maintenance and residuals; and risk costs such as breakdown, quality failure, retrofit and disposal.

Tender for performance, limits and evidence

Turn the system concept into functional requirements. Specify feed range, target quality, availability, measurements, side streams and acceptance conditions without unnecessary brand dependence. Ask suppliers to state the conditions behind their promises, including pretreatment, minimum and maximum load, utilities, maintenance intervals, discharge and measurement-data quality.

Keep scope, interfaces and assumptions in one comparative structure. Do not let optional items hide essential functions until after award. A departure from the reference concept is possible if function, risk and life-cycle costs remain comparable.

At minimum, specify feed range and load cases; target quality and test method; availability and redundancy; measurement points and data access; cleaning and maintenance; side streams and disposal; performance limits and exclusions; and acceptance criteria.

Acceptance should test rated load, part load, transitions such as startup, shutdown, cleaning and alarm, and the underlying records and responsible people. Accept an operable, documented system, not merely a nameplate capacity.

Measurements must support an operating decision

Data volume is not decision quality. Each measurement point needs a purpose, plausibility rule, response and owner. Derive limits, alarm levels and reactions from the process model. Records should explain what a value means for operation and release, not only display it.

Assign future operators explicit roles for control, maintenance, data review, handling deviations and restarting. This keeps the planning result useful after commissioning.

Build investment quality in a clear sequence

Phase 1 understands the system through an audit of data, water paths and responsibilities. Phase 2 defines flows, qualities, availability and boundaries. Phase 3 demonstrates options through comparison, piloting, interfaces and costs. Phase 4 embeds performance in tendering, acceptance, operation and improvement.

Independence does not exclude manufacturers' expertise. It places that expertise within a neutral system model so a supplier can show where its process fits the task. Functions, data, limits and evidence should be described precisely and made binding in the project.

Manufacturer-independent planning subordinates products to a clear task. Water balance, quality targets, interfaces, pilot data and life-cycle costs determine the treatment chain. This creates a plant that fits the use and operation, rather than forcing operation to adapt to a previously chosen machine. The benefit is decision quality: assumptions become visible, offers comparable, risks testable and performance verifiable in service.

Sources and working check

Water efficiency: ISO 46001:2019, Water efficiency management systems — Requirements with guidance for use; Amendment 1:2024. Check the current revision with ISO.

Water reuse: German Environment Agency (UBA), information on water reuse and the assessment of risks to people and the environment, updated 7 July 2023.

Industry and resource efficiency: Directive 2010/75/EU, consolidated version of 4 August 2024 including Directive (EU) 2024/1785, describing integrated industrial aims including emissions reduction, waste prevention, resource efficiency and circularity.

Check that water paths and quantities are plausible; quality targets are specified by use; data gaps and assumptions are visible; technologies are compared under equal conditions; interfaces and side streams are described; pilot questions arise from the investment decision; life-cycle costs include operation and risk; the tender states performance limits; acceptance tests transitions and faults; and operation, maintenance and data responsibility are assigned.

Editorial status: August 2026. This report provides technical guidance and does not replace site-specific water analysis, permit review, hazard assessment or contractual design.

Hydreatio GmbH · hydreatio.org · contact@hydreatio.org