



International Safety Awards 2027

Question Set and Marking Scheme

Question number	Note on questions: Questions 1 and 2 do not attract marks. Questions 3 to 12 attract a maximum of five marks each scored against the criteria.						
1	Describe the nature and scope of the main operational activities at your site. Include the number of employees and regular contractors; principal functions; organisational structure and reporting arrangements; significant recent or planned operational changes; and factors affecting how health, safety and wellbeing are managed. Word limit: 600 words.						
2	Identify the three most significant occupational safety hazards, occupational health hazards and wellbeing concerns at your site. Explain briefly why each is significant, including people potentially affected, possible harm and the incident, exposure, absence, survey or performance information used to prioritise it. Word limit: 600 words.						
3	Which occupational safety hazard identified in Question 2 has the highest overall risk rating? Explain the risk method and how likelihood and severity were determined; people and activities exposed; controls in hierarchy order; residual risk and control-effectiveness checks; employee and contractor involvement; the 2026 injury incidence rate; the justified 2027 target; and improvement action arising from results. Word limit: 600 words.	Criteria – 5 marks Meets all four-mark requirements and shows embedded hierarchy-based controls, residual risk, workforce involvement, trend analysis and verified or transferable improvement, with the 2026 rate and justified 2027 target.	Criteria – 4 marks Meets all three-mark requirements with a clear method, site-specific likelihood and severity, hierarchy-linked controls, review of effectiveness, workforce involvement and both performance figures.	Criteria – 3 marks Identifies the highest-rated hazard; explains likelihood and severity; describes controls and implementation checks; and provides the 2026 rate and 2027 target.	Criteria – 2 marks Partial response with one or more core components missing or weakly evidenced.	Criteria – 1 mark Names a relevant hazard but gives little site-specific explanation of risk, controls, implementation or performance.	Criteria – 0 mark No relevant answer is provided.

4	Which occupational health hazard identified in Question 2 has the highest overall risk rating? Explain exposure, likelihood and severity; people and activities exposed; controls in hierarchy order; surveillance or exposure monitoring; residual risk; 2026 work-related ill-health days lost; justified 2027 target; and improvement and learning. Word limit: 600 words.	Criteria – 5 marks Meets all four-mark requirements and shows embedded hierarchy-based controls, suitable surveillance, residual risk, trend review and verified or transferable improvement, with 2026 days lost and justified 2027 target.	Criteria – 4 marks Meets all three-mark requirements with a clear method, site-specific exposure and severity, hierarchy-linked controls, monitoring or surveillance, review and both performance figures.	Criteria – 3 marks Identifies the principal hazard; explains risk; describes controls and monitoring; and provides the 2026 days lost and 2027 target.	Criteria – 2 marks Partial response with one or more core components missing or weakly evidenced.	Criteria – 1 mark Names a health hazard but gives little site-specific explanation of exposure, controls, monitoring or performance.	Criteria – 0 mark No relevant answer is provided.
5	Which wellbeing concern identified in Question 2 is the principal concern? Explain how it was prioritised; preventive and supportive measures; employee consultation; indicators and review frequency; accountable senior leaders; decisions or resources resulting from review; and measurable improvement or learning in 2026. Word limit: 600 words.	Criteria – 5 marks Meets all four-mark requirements and demonstrates measurable improvement, meaningful worker involvement, senior decisions or resources, impact evaluation and learning used to refine the approach.	Criteria – 4 marks Meets all three-mark requirements with multiple measures, defined indicators, meaningful consultation, named senior ownership and evidence that findings are acted upon.	Criteria – 3 marks Identifies and prioritises the concern, describes measures and monitoring, explains employee involvement and names the accountable leader.	Criteria – 2 marks Partial response missing prioritisation, measures, consultation, measurement, leadership or resulting action.	Criteria – 1 mark Refers to wellbeing but gives little relevant detail.	Criteria – 0 mark No relevant answer is provided.
6	Describe objectives and arrangements for preventing and managing psychosocial risk, including identification and prioritisation; preventive controls; employee consultation; manager capability; monitoring; and changes during 2026 arising from data, feedback or review. Word limit: 600 words.	Criteria – 5 marks Meets all four-mark requirements and demonstrates a mature prevention-led approach, measurable objectives, integration, participation, capable managers, impact and sustained or transferable improvement.	Criteria – 4 marks Meets all three-mark requirements with a clear method, specific objectives, preventive controls, meaningful involvement, manager support, monitoring and action.	Criteria – 3 marks Shows sound understanding, identifies hazards and affected groups, states objectives, describes controls and consultation, and explains monitoring.	Criteria – 2 marks Basic awareness with incomplete evidence of assessment, prevention, consultation, manager capability or monitoring.	Criteria – 1 mark Little understanding; vague objectives and no meaningful prevention, consultation or monitoring.	Criteria – 0 mark No relevant answer is provided

7	Describe fire prevention and emergency response arrangements, including principal risks and controls; detection, alarm and evacuation; responsible people and competence; the latest drill; lessons and completed changes; and verification of effectiveness. Word limit: 600 words.	Criteria – 5 marks Meets all four-mark requirements with comprehensive site-specific arrangements, competent coverage, a realistic exercise, clear lessons, completed changes and subsequent verification.	Criteria – 4 marks Meets all three-mark requirements with detailed arrangements, responsibilities and competence, drill outcome, completed improvements and review.	Criteria – 3 marks Describes arrangements, responsible people and training, latest drill and at least one resulting action.	Criteria – 2 marks Partial or generic information with important detail missing.	Criteria – 1 mark General reference only, with no useful site-specific evidence.	Criteria – 0 mark No relevant answer is provided.
8	Explain how the site communicates and consults on objectives and targets, operational changes, training, routes for employees and contractors to raise concerns, feedback responses, accessibility and one 2026 example where workforce input changed a decision, control or way of working. Word limit: 600 words.	Criteria – 5 marks Meets all four-mark requirements and shows embedded two-way communication, inclusive access, barrier-free reporting, feedback and workforce influence on a meaningful, reviewed improvement.	Criteria – 4 marks Meets all three-mark requirements with multiple channels, effective upward and downward communication, inclusive access, consultation and a clear action example.	Criteria – 3 marks Identifies suitable channels, explains how concerns are answered and gives a site-specific consultation example.	Criteria – 2 marks Lists channels but weakly addresses workforce groups, upward feedback or resulting action.	Criteria – 1 mark Vague communications description with no meaningful consultation evidence.	Criteria – 0 mark No relevant answer is provided.
9	Explain how competence is ensured and maintained for people involved in communication, risk assessment, audit or inspection, supervision of significant risks and specialist or emergency roles. Cover competence standards; assessment of education, training, skills and experience; induction and refresher development; competent advice; supervisor verification; and a 2026 capability gap that was addressed and rechecked. Word limit: 600 words.	Criteria – 5 marks Meets all four-mark requirements and demonstrates an embedded role-based competence system, continuing development, supervision, competent advice, behavioural verification and a rechecked 2026 improvement.	Criteria – 4 marks Meets all three-mark requirements with clear standards, assessment and development across required roles, refresher activity, verification and action on gaps.	Criteria – 3 marks Describes how requirements are set and assessed, relevant training, development, supervision and competent advice.	Criteria – 2 marks Partial evidence or reliance mainly on training attendance without competence verification.	Criteria – 1 mark Vague reference to training or qualifications only.	Criteria – 0 mark No relevant answer is provided.

10	Describe risk-based pre-contract and post-contract arrangements covering selection and prequalification; competence and prior performance; communication; induction and coordination; supervision and monitoring; performance and incident review; contractor consultation; shared learning; and a verified 2026 improvement. If not applicable, explain equivalent third-party controls. Word limit: 600 words.	Criteria – 5 marks Meets all four-mark requirements and demonstrates a mature lifecycle approach covering safety, health and wellbeing, contractor involvement, performance review and verified or transferable benefit.	Criteria – 4 marks Meets all three-mark requirements with detailed prequalification, mobilisation, coordination, supervision, review, feedback routes and action to improve standards.	Criteria – 3 marks Outlines prequalification and post-contract management, expectations, induction, monitoring and improvement activity.	Criteria – 2 marks Omits or weakly addresses an essential lifecycle component.	Criteria – 1 mark Refers to appointment or management but gives no useful detail.	Criteria – 0 mark No relevant answer is provided.
11	Describe how the site responds to, reports and learns from injuries, ill health, dangerous occurrences, near misses and wellbeing-related events. Cover immediate response; escalation; competent responsible people; proportionate investigation; employee and contractor involvement; underlying causes; action tracking and verification; and one 2026 example of communicated learning. Word limit: 600 words.	Criteria – 5 marks Meets all four-mark requirements and shows timely, proportionate response, competent investigation, workforce involvement, organisational-cause analysis, verified actions and learning shared beyond the immediate team.	Criteria – 4 marks Meets all three-mark requirements with clear response, escalation, investigation, competent people, involvement, tracking, verification and a strong 2026 example.	Criteria – 3 marks Describes response and reporting, competent responsible people, investigation and an example of corrective action and learning.	Criteria – 2 marks Partial information missing competence, investigation, involvement, cause analysis, tracking or verification.	Criteria – 1 mark Basic reference only, with no meaningful evidence of investigation and learning.	Criteria – 0 mark No relevant answer is provided.
12	Identify an individual or team instrumental in 2026 in improving awareness, participation or ownership. Provide three activities; groups involved; impact on understanding, reporting, behaviour, decisions or practice; measurement; use of feedback; and recognition, support or reward. Word limit: 600 words.	Criteria – 5 marks Meets all four-mark requirements with strong evidence of each activity's impact, sustained or transferable improvement, response to feedback and continuing participation.	Criteria – 4 marks Meets all three-mark requirements with site-specific evidence for all activities, groups, impacts, feedback and recognition.	Criteria – 3 marks Identifies the person or team, describes three activities, explains impact and outlines recognition or support.	Criteria – 2 marks Covers only some required elements or lacks credible impact evidence.	Criteria – 1 mark Refers only to a person, activities or recognition with little supporting detail.	Criteria – 0 mark No relevant answer is provided.

13	Describe internal and external audit and assurance; frequency, scope, method and competence or independence; operational checks; prioritisation and closure; senior review of themes; three implemented changes; actual or expected impact; and verification of effectiveness. Word limit: 600 words.	Criteria – 5 marks Meets all four-mark requirements and demonstrates integrated risk-based assurance, thematic senior review, completed changes, actual impact, verification and learning used elsewhere.	Criteria – 4 marks Meets all three-mark requirements with detailed assurance, multiple internal activities, competent reviewers, clear governance, three complete examples and impact review.	Criteria – 3 marks Describes internal and external assurance, frequency and responsibility; findings management; and three changes with intended or actual impact.	Criteria – 2 marks Omits important detail or provides fewer than three complete examples.	Criteria – 1 mark Refers to auditing or inspection but gives no meaningful detail.	Criteria – 0 mark No relevant answer is provided.
----	---	---	---	--	---	--	---

Accreditation marks

ISA 2027 applicants can also gain a maximum additional three marks by uploading evidence of the following accreditations:

- **1 mark:** 3 Star outcome from the British Safety Council Five-Star Audit (within the ISA 2027 eligibility period);
- **2 marks:** ISO 45001 Certification (current) or 4 Star outcome from the British Safety Council Five-Star Audit (withing the ISA 2027 eligibility period);
- **3 marks:** 5 Star outcome from the British Safety council Five-Star Audit (within the ISA 2027 eligibility period).