

Globe of Honour 2020

Question Set and Marking scheme

Background

This marking scheme relates to the written application component of the 2020 Globe of Honour scheme. The final marks for each submission will be determined by reference to applicants' performance in both the written application and the Five Star Audit process (weighted at 60% and 40% respectively).

Please note that the marking descriptors are indicative by nature.

For example, two organisations may adopt differing approaches to the written application and score equally well. Nonetheless, high-scoring organisations will typically answer all aspects of the question, adhere to the marking scheme, provide site-specific references (evidenced through the audit report) and fully utilise (but not exceed) the specified word allowance per response.

Scoring criteria

- A maximum of 60 marks are available for the written application. Applicants must score a minimum of 45 marks to remain eligible for the award.
- A minimum of two individual responses must be scored within the top mark band (11-15 marks).
- Submissions will become ineligible for the Globe of Honour award should any individual responses be scored within the lower mark band (0-5 marks).
- Responses to each sub-question must not exceed 750 words per sub-question (i.e. 3,000 words overall per submission).

Globe of Honour 2020

Question Set and Marking scheme

	11-15 marks	6-10 marks	0-5 marks
<p>1. With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Environmental Sustainability Audit:</p> <p>Describe how you intend to both mitigate and adapt to specific climate change risks you have identified.</p>	<p>A full explanation clearly demonstrating the difference between climate change mitigation and adaptation using IPPC terminology and the organisations climate change risks specific to the applicant's business.</p> <p>The response is supported with clear examples (three or more from each) of BOTH mitigation and adaption measures relevant to the applicant's climate change risks.</p>	<p>An adequate explanation demonstrating the basic difference between climate change mitigation and adaptation using general terminology. The stated organisation climate change risks may not all be specific to the applicant's business but generic ones.</p> <p>The response is supported with some examples (between 1-2 in each area) of BOTH mitigation and adaption measures though may not all be directly relevant to the applicants stated climate change risks.</p>	<p>A weak explanation that does not demonstrate the basic difference between climate change mitigation and adaptation. The stated organisation climate change risks are not all specific to the applicant's business.</p> <p>The response is supported with limited examples (1 or none) of either mitigation and/or adaption measures and not directly relevant to the applicants stated climate change risks.</p>
<p>2. With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Environmental Sustainability Audit:</p> <p>Describe the primary benefits your organisation gained from the FSES audit process using the five capital sustainability model.</p>	<p>A full description of the benefits the organisation gained from the FSES audit process using examples from EACH area of the five capital sustainability model.</p>	<p>An adequate description of the benefits the organisation gained from the FSES audit process using examples from 3-4 areas of the five capital sustainability model.</p>	<p>A weak description of the benefits the organisation gained from the FSES audit process using few examples from 1-2 areas of the five capital sustainability model.</p>
<p>3. With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Environmental Sustainability Audit:</p> <p>Explain how your organisation will use new and emerging environmental and sustainability tools, techniques or international standards to address the FSES audit recommendations.</p>	<p>A full explanation clearly demonstrating a link between the FSES audit outcomes and how they will be addressed using named new and emerging environmental and sustainability tools, techniques or international standards.</p> <p>The response is supported with clear examples (four or more) of relevant emerging environmental and sustainability tools, techniques or international standards linked to a wide range FSES audit outcomes.</p>	<p>An adequate explanation demonstrating a link between the FSES audit outcomes and how they will be addressed using named new and emerging environmental and sustainability tools, techniques or international standards.</p> <p>The response is supported with some examples (2-3) of relevant emerging environmental and sustainability tools, techniques or international standards linked to more limited range of FSES audit outcomes.</p>	<p>A weak explanation not demonstrating a link between the FSES audit outcomes and how they will be addressed using named new and emerging environmental and sustainability tools, techniques or international standards.</p> <p>The response is supported with limited examples (1) of emerging environmental and sustainability tools, techniques or international standards that may not be fully linked to a very limited range of FSES audit outcomes.</p>

Globe of Honour 2020

Question Set and Marking scheme



<p>4. With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Environmental Sustainability Audit:</p> <p>Using relevant audit outcomes explain your organisations approach to life cycle thinking to improve your environmental performance</p>	<p>A full explanation clearly demonstrating a link between the FSES audit outcomes and policies, procedures and practices that promote life cycle thinking to improve environmental performance.</p> <p>The response is supported with a range examples (four or more) of relevant policies, procedures and practices (at least one from each) that show clear life cycle thinking to improve environmental performance.</p>	<p>An adequate explanation demonstrating a link between the FSES audit outcomes and policies, procedures and practices that promote life cycle thinking to improve environmental performance.</p> <p>The response is supported with some examples (2-3) of relevant policies, procedures and practices (at least from two of these areas) that show life cycle thinking to improve environmental performance.</p>	<p>A weak explanation not demonstrating a link between the FSES audit outcomes and policies, procedures and practices that promote life cycle thinking to improve environmental performance.</p> <p>The response is supported with one or no examples (0-1) of relevant policies, procedures and practices (from just one area) that show limited life cycle thinking to improve environmental performance.</p>
--	--	--	--
