



60
YEARS
1957-2017

Globe of Honour 2017

Chief Adjudicator's Report

Globe of Honour 2017

Chief Adjudicator's Report

Results

In 2017, 17 submissions were received for the Globe of Honour awards and 15 (88%) of these 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

This is now the third year in which the awards have involved an explicit link to applicants' Five Star Environmental Audit ('audit'). Regrettably, whilst it is evident that applicants continue to learn from previous years' awards, a slight decline was apparent in the overall quality of submissions received for the 2017 award series. No clear trend or explanation could be attributed to this decline.

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 zero 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 adhered to 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.

The assessment methodology proved once more to be a reliable differentiator between the stronger and weaker submissions. The assessment process in 2017 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.

In 2017 there were again a number of high quality, well written submissions that incorporated

Globe of Honour 2017

Chief Adjudicator's Report

good examples in support of each individual response. Submissions of this nature made clear that a considerable amount of preparation, thought, time and effort had been invested for which the applicants concerned are to be commended. Nonetheless, it was disappointing to note that there were fewer submissions compared to previous years that could be described as outstanding (as evidenced by no applicant being awarded the very highest marks available).

Once more, the strongest applicants 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 the maximum word count and provided a balanced response to each question reflecting appropriately on each element of the question.

The best 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. While there was no requirement to do so, there was a clear trend that the best submissions frequently 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 offers 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 their submission; the Chief Adjudicator believes that the marking schemes are poorly utilised by a proportion of 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 the organisation concerned. Stronger submissions were also typically supported by a range of relevant and practical examples - with appropriate balance between the site/business unit and (where applicable) those at a group level.

These awards seek to identify evidence of excellence covering both environmental and

Globe of Honour 2017

Chief Adjudicator's Report

sustainability issues. The 2017 submissions again demonstrated that that these terms are not always fully understood and can sometimes overlap in an operational environment.

All applicants are once again reminded of the importance of reading each question thoroughly and in providing comprehensive responses that make effective use of the available word limit. Applicants are also reminded to ensure submissions are proof-read to ensure that simple errors, spelling mistakes and related formatting issues are addressed. While 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 reminded 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 somewhat disappointing that there were fewer submissions in 2017 that exhibited true innovation or environmental best practice with there being rather an over-emphasis on compliance as opposed to true continuous improvement.

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

Multiple and dual 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.

It is strongly advised that future applicants also study the Chief Adjudicator's Report for the

Globe of Honour 2017

Chief Adjudicator's Report

Sword of Honour (a related award recognising excellence in health and safety management standards) and particularly so where dual submissions are being made as many of the comments and recommendations will be of pertinence.

Globe of Honour 2017

Chief Adjudicator's Report

Main Business Activities

Submissions for the 2017 awards were received from businesses with widely diverse environmental risk profiles. The sector/industry areas involved included pharmaceuticals, food manufacturing, engineering, security and prison services, construction, logistics, shipping and energy.

The strongest submissions continue to provide a clear summary of the business activities that have a potential or actual impact on the environment and identified the most significant risks to the environment.

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 answers.

By reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Audit:

1. Explain how the Five Star Environmental Audit outcomes and recommendations will be used as an input factor within the planning process when establishing environmental objectives for the coming year(s)

In line with previous years, applicants who answered the opening question effectively usually performed well more generally. Strong responses provided a clear link between the outcomes/recommendations and their use in the subsequent planning process. The best responses provided a clear and suitably prioritised summary of outcomes/recommendations and, in many cases, direct references to the audit report section or sections that were most relevant. High scoring responses were noted for concentrating on how planning processes were used to establish environmental objectives (having clearly identified these processes at the outset).

Weaker responses to this question tended to list a range of the processes undertaken by the site and neglected discussion of their relevance or application.

Several of the submissions from sites forming part of a wider group were overly reliant on generic or company-wide planning policies. Responses of this nature were, rather inevitably, lacking in terms of how the specific site/business unit took account of the issues raised (as required by the question).

Globe of Honour 2017

Chief Adjudicator's Report

2. Discuss how the organisation has considered internal and external factors which impact upon the effective implementation, maintenance and continual improvement of environmental policies, processes and practices

It was encouraging to observe that most answers to this question exhibited a clear understanding of potentially relevant internal and external factors to the site/business unit. However, a clear differentiation was apparent between average and strong responses. High scoring responses detailed, with suitable justification, a range of internal and external factors that took account of both company-wide issues and those of a site-specific nature. While it was expected that the role of stakeholders would form a significant part of the response here, weaker responses were noted for their over-emphasis on people and organisations over the wider internal/external issues typically considered by higher scoring responses.

Strong responses to this question incorporated a range of examples that were clearly aligned to the environmental risk profile of the organisation.

The Globe of Honour is intentionally not aligned directly to ISO 14001. Nonetheless, the strongest responses often recognised its potential relevance when addressing the following.

- Environmental conditions (e.g. climate, air quality, water quality, land use)
- External factors (i.e. cultural, social, political, legal, regulatory, financial)
- Internal characteristics or conditions of the organisation

Regrettably, only the very best submissions took full account of the second part of the question concerning “effective implementation, maintenance and continual improvement of environmental policies, processes and practices”. Several weaker responses entailed a bland description of the organisation’s processes with limited or no associated referencing to the site or the potential impact of relevant internal/external factors.

3. Explain how the effective participation of non-managerial roles ensures the continual improvement of environmental policies, processes and practices

This question was reasonably well answered by the majority of applicants. Most responses included a range of relevant non-managerial roles. However, several applicants focused rather unduly on methods of consultation. High scoring responses articulated how the effective participation of non-managerial roles had actively contributed to the “continual improvement of environmental policies, processes and practices” (as required by the question).

Globe of Honour 2017

Chief Adjudicator's Report

The strongest responses detailed the application of a range of approaches and supported this information with clear examples on how the participation of non-managerial roles had resulted in tangible environmental improvements. These responses were also typically well balanced through their coverage of ostensibly minor environmental issues - the handling of which often produced immediate improvement in environmental performance - and longer term, more strategic matters such as climate change.

4. Describe specific programmed and/or innovative business solutions that have been implemented in the last 12 months that have contributed to environmental (and other) benefit(s) for the organisation.

Responses to Question 4 frequently received the highest marks and indeed a number of exemplary responses were identified here. In each instance, the applicant made a clear link back to the audit report and incorporated various excellent examples to support the environmental and sustainability improvements detailed within their answer.

The highest scoring applicants provided a balanced response that addressed both short-term initiatives capable of initiation and completion within a twelve month period alongside those constituting a longer-term strategy.

Question 4 served as a clear differentiator between average and strong submissions to these awards. Weaker responses tended towards the generic and offered limited evidence of site-specific solutions.