



Globe of Honour 2018

Chief Adjudicator's Report

Globe of Honour 2018

Chief Adjudicator's Report

In 2018, 14 submissions were received for the Globe of Honour awards and 13 (93%) of these were adjudged to have reached the pass standard.

There is no quota of Globes to be awarded and nor will there be in future years. If every applicant meets the minimum requirements, every applicant will be awarded a Globe of Honour.

General Comments

Recent awards have involved an explicit link to the applicants' Five Star Environmental Audit ('Audit'). In overall terms, this has proved a positive development in that it has enabled the very highest performing organisations to provide further reassurance and evidence of their good and often outstanding environmental performance. The applicants concerned have successfully referenced the outcomes of their Audit and used the award application to provide relevant and informative evidence to underpin their responses.

A maximum of 60 marks are available for the written aspect of the Globe of Honour application. To remain eligible, applicants must score a minimum of 45 marks with at least two individual responses being scored within the top mark band (11-15 marks) and no responses being scored in the lower mark band (0-5 marks). With the pass standard set high (45 marks out of an available 60), it is important to score well on each question as one or two weak responses will place the pass standard out of reach.

As in previous years, high scoring applicants answered all parts of the question and adhered closely to the marking scheme, which in turn allowed them to access the top mark band for each question. High scoring applicants also followed the requirement that responses to each question must not exceed 750 words (i.e. 3,000 words overall per submission) and provided clear, succinct and well-structured answers. It was pleasing to note the consistency with which this approach was maintained among the submissions this year.

The assessment methodology again acted as a reliable differentiator between the stronger and weaker submissions this year. The assessment process in 2018 also reaffirmed that the attainment of Five Stars in the Audit will not necessarily correlate to the likelihood of achieving the standards required for a Globe of Honour. As such, applicants are reminded to avoid over-reliance on the positive achievements evidenced by their Audit report. The best applicants

recognised that, even with a very high Audit score, there will be opportunities to bring about improvements.

As previously, there were a number high quality, well written submissions that incorporated good examples within the commentary. It was evident that a considerable amount of preparation, thought, time and effort had been invested in these submissions for which the applicants concerned are to be commended. The increase in those applications that could be described as outstanding by being awarded very high total scores was greatly encouraging to observe.

The strongest applicants once again demonstrated a clear understanding of the standards expected of Globe of Honour award winners and exhibited an impressive commitment to deliver the environmental and sustainability objectives concerned. Whilst it is not an explicit requirement of the application, word counts for each individual response were helpful where included. Good applicants took account of the word count limits and provided a balanced response to each question that carefully reflected on each of its elements.

The strongest submissions made full use of the findings from their Audit to review their performance and included additional evidence of their commitment and capability in driving forward specific improvement plans. The best submissions also ensured that there was a clear and appropriate linkage to the findings of the Audit across each individual response. As with the 2017 awards, these submissions often cited an explicit clause or reference from within their Audit report.

Future applicants to these awards are once again advised to study the observations within this report prior to completing their application as it provides helpful comments and direction on how to draft an effective submission. Applicants are also reminded that the marking scheme is made available to reference when completing a submission; the Chief Adjudicator believes the marking schemes remain poorly utilised by a proportion of the applicants to these awards.

The link to the audit is stated explicitly in the award procedures and application. However, it was notable that the strongest applicants frequently went beyond the audit report when developing their responses. Whilst the Audit entails a comprehensive assessment of the management systems in place, stronger applicants recognised that environmental and sustainability issues can be far broader - and reflected this in a series of high-quality answers that responded effectively to the environmental and sustainability profile of their organisation. Stronger submissions were also typically supported by a range of relevant and practical examples, with a balance between the site/business unit and (where applicable) those at a group level.

All applicants are again reminded of the importance of reading each question carefully and in providing complete responses that make effective use of the available word limit. Applicants are also reminded to ensure submissions are proof-read in order to avoid simple errors, spelling mistakes and related formatting issues. Whilst applicants are unlikely to lose marks through such errors, the strongest submissions were noted for being clearly set out, well-structured with effective (but not over-use) of paragraphs, lists and references/links to source evidence such as the Audit report.

Applicants are again advised that whilst the adjudicators will adhere to the marking scheme, there are no 'model' or 'right' answers being sought. The strongest submissions were invariably well thought out, clearly structured, took full account of the marking scheme and (above all) displayed evidence of an organisation striving for excellence in environmental and sustainability performance. These submissions invariably proved interesting to read, displayed innovation and demonstrated a knowledge and passion for the subject matter beyond narrow compliance-based approaches. It was therefore positive that some of the submissions this year exhibited real innovation and environmental best practice that went well beyond compliance obligations.

While some submissions may fall short of the standard required for a Globe of Honour, it should be acknowledged that these organisations have nonetheless been recognised as possessing good/excellent environmental management performance, as recognised by their Audit rating.

Multiple applications

The British Safety Council welcomes applications from organisations with multiple sites that have achieved the Five Star rating. It is acknowledged that there will inevitably be some similarities in the approach of these different sites, not least as many of the internal management systems will be common or shared. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that the Globe of Honour award remains specific to each site/business unit. Therefore, to be awarded the highest marks, it is essential that that each submission takes full account of the associated audit and addresses how that particular site or business unit approached the matter. The strongest submissions made appropriate reference to common systems/approaches together with unambiguous evidence as to how these were then applied at that specific site.

Main Business Activities

As in previous years, the submissions for this award series included businesses with widely diverse environmental risk profiles. The sector/industry areas involved included consulting, construction, government infrastructure, gas transmission, utilities (electricity/water), food manufacture, logistics and shipbuilding.

The strongest submissions provided a clear summary of the business activities with a potential or actual impact on the environment and identified the most significant risks to the environment. Many also detailed both environmental and sustainability topics relevant to the risk profile of their site.

Whilst not attracting marks, this section clearly underpins the substantive elements of each applicant's submission by the context it provides. High-scoring submissions made effective use of this information to develop and justify their subsequent responses.

It is strongly advised that future applicants also study the Chief Adjudicator's Report for the *Sword of Honour* (a related award recognising excellence in health and safety management standards) and particularly so where dual submissions are being made since many of the comments and recommendations will be of pertinence.

1. With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Audit:

Explain how the organisation has established suitable processes for the effective control of planned permanent and temporary changes that have the potential to impact upon organisational environmental performance

A reasonable answer to this question was provided within most submissions. The majority of responses incorporated a clear link to the findings of the Audit, with those scoring higher marks justifying the connection in clear and substantial terms. It should be noted that, as required by the question, examples of both temporary and permanent change management were necessary to access the upper marking band (the strongest responses ensured an appropriately balanced set of examples).

Good responses provided an explanation of the management processes used to identify, prioritise and manage any changes made. They also identified and justified significant change management topics by means of a clear, often risk-based, level of prioritisation (i.e. through considerations of quality). Weaker responses were characterised by the inclusion of large quantities of examples with limited evidence of their prioritisation.

Furthermore, good responses to this question frequently addressed local/site environmental change topics alongside those of a more strategic nature through consideration of the impact of change in terms of sustainability.

Finally, many of the highest scoring responses identified, both in the context of the question posed but also that of their business, that change management is not an isolated exercise, but rather part of an ongoing process that supports continual environmental improvement.

2. With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Audit:

Specify how the organisation's top management ensure the integration of the environmental requirements into its business processes for this site

The quality of responses to this question proved somewhat variable. Whilst most answers entailed some evidence of senior/top management involvement, the evidence to support how they were involved as part of wider business integration was rather less well considered.

Stronger applicants understood that the evidence detailed within their response needed to go beyond senior management straightforwardly acknowledging particular issues and/or providing support through the provision of resources. The highest scoring answers to Question Two demonstrated clear evidence of practical 'ownership' by senior management and their personal involvement with the integration of the identified environmental requirement into the business processes of the organisation.

Good submissions also provided examples of the role and participation of senior management through their participation in wider strategic or business risks. To access the top marking band for this question, specific examples were required of how senior management were engaged through, for instance, evidence of their involvement in relevant meetings, workshops, etc.

Weaker submissions often proved rather inconsistent in terms of the importance of referencing 'top' management, with several focusing incorrectly on middle management functions.

Finally, the stronger responses to this question were noted for making a tangible link from specific improvements through environmental management system requirements to wider business integration, as well as identifying their relationship to sustainability issues. The highest scoring responses therefore provided evidence that top management involvement was not just a 'paper exercise' but rather one supported through active and practical contribution.

3. With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Audit:

Identify the most significant Five Star Audit outcomes and explain how relevant recommendations will be used in ensuring continual improvement of the EMS performance

This was a key question and one that often differentiated between the average and best responses. A key requirement was to understand the importance of identifying the significant Audit outcomes. It therefore called upon evidence of a process to identify those outcomes determined as significant (significance could be justified through, for example, objective risk criteria or perhaps based on the wider environmental or sustainability objectives of the business). In several cases, the applicant's response neglected a clear explanation of how significance was determined and this invariably affected the marks awarded.

Good responses often addressed the significant outcomes by consideration of initiatives or examples that were strategic and long-term in nature (i.e. alongside those that were more short term, perhaps at a site or departmental level).

Good responses also recognised that even where the Audit report recorded a high level of performance, the principles of continual improvement nonetheless expect further enhancements to be pursued. Submissions that merely listed recommendations arising out of the Audit did not command high marks.

Higher scoring responses offered evidence of how the recommendations would potentially drive continual improvement. Clearly, this required evidence of a methodology or means to evidence that continual improvement had occurred (or would follow) because of the initiative or initiatives.

4. With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Audit:

Describe specific projects or programmes that have used the concept of life cycle thinking to contribute to the environmental (and other) performance within the value chain of the organisation.

As with Question Three, the final question proved to be a good differentiator between submissions. It should be noted that whilst an academic/exam-based response was not required to score highly here, a number of applicants evidently struggled with the general concept of life cycle thinking and/or that of a value chain.

High scoring responses included justified and carefully supported examples of innovative and good practice projects or programmes which made a clear linkage to the outcomes of the Audit. Weaker responses tended to rely on lists of initiatives, with limited attempt to explain or justify how they applied a level of life cycle thinking and which had resulted in (or potentially would result in) an improvement in environmental performance within the value chain.

To access the top mark band, evidence was required of a process by which a project was identified and evidence that a recognised life cycle approach resulted in improved environmental and sustainability performance within the value chain.