



Globe of Honour 2022

Chief Adjudicator's Report

Globe of Honour 2022

Chief Adjudicator's Report

In 2022, 12 submissions were received for the Globe of Honour awards and 9 of these were adjudged and reached the pass standard. There is no quota of Globes to be awarded and nor will there be in future years. All applicants who meet the minimum criteria required will be awarded a Globe of Honour.

General Comments

It was positive to note that the impact of the global pandemic at a country and company/project level had a less significant impact on the Globe of Honour ("GOH") applications in 2022. While there were again some excellent applications – the overall quality was below what we have experienced in recent years. There appears no obvious theme or reason, although the weaker applications notably did not consistently link their application back to the Five Star Audit or fully answer the question being asked.

Due to the relatively small number of Globe applications compared to the Sword of Honour, this report is limited in scope. We therefore encourage reference to the Sword of Honour Chief Adjudicator's Report, which also provides valuable insight into how to make a good submission as it is applicable to both award schemes. Some general features of the best applications included:

- Clear and explicit linkage and reference to the Five Star Environmental Audit
- Effective and justified use of good evidence (e.g., data and statistics)
- Clear and justified use of company/project specific examples
- Well-structured and balanced answers with effective use of paragraphs and key bullets
- Clear and simple language and style, where possible avoiding excessive use of complex terms and acronyms.

A maximum of 60 marks are available for the written aspect of the Globe of Honour application. Applicants must score a minimum of 45 marks to remain eligible with a minimum of two individual responses being scored within the top mark band (11-15 marks). Submissions become ineligible for a Globe of Honour should any individual responses be scored within the lower mark band (0-5 marks). With the pass standard set high (45 out of 60), it is important to score well on each question.

One or two weak answers will put the pass standard out of reach. As in previous years, the highest-scoring applicants answered all aspects of each question and adhered closely to the marking scheme, and it was evident that the advice to read the prior year's Chief Adjudicators Report had been taken. This allowed the applicant to submit a much more complete answer and so access the top mark band for each question.

In addition, applicants are reminded that the marking scheme is made available to applicants for reference when completing their application and should be considered throughout the application process. The Chief Adjudicator considers that this support was consistently used well by the applicants scoring the highest marks. The highest-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 supported with examples where required. Some applicants also sought to include additional information after the main application was submitted. While this may be accepted in exceptional circumstances, applicants should not assume that these late changes will be marked.

The Globe of Honour assessment methodology is very closely linked to the Five Star Environmental Sustainability Audit specification content, report and its findings and it was pleasing to note that most applicants, but by no means all, consistently referenced the audit

outcomes in their submissions. There were again a number of well written submissions and some of a very high-quality standard. It was obvious that a considerable amount of preparation, thought, time and effort had been put into these submissions for which the applicants concerned are to be commended. However, there were fewer examples of some of the exceptional applications as seen in some previous years.

An important section of the application was the description of the Main Business Activities. Whilst marks are not awarded for this section, it is important that applicants clearly describe the main business (operational) activities, the personnel involved and the most significant environmental risks and issues. This section underpins the whole application as it helps to put the rest of the submission into context and provides the adjudicator with a valuable insight into the organisation, its operation and risk profile. Most applicants this year provided a comprehensive summary of the main business activities, key risks and operational aspects. This section was especially important where multiple applications came from the same Group/Company.

Q1. With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Environmental Sustainability Audit: Explain how you intend to further enhance the organisational culture to improve environmental sustainability performance.

Most of the applications took full account of the marking scheme by reference relevant organisational culture examples linked to the Five Star report findings. It was clear some of the weaker applications did not sufficiently understand or appreciate the concept of “organisational culture” in the context of improved environmental sustainability performance. An explanation or definition of the term could have helped better develop the answers presented.

The best submissions presented a range of relevant examples. They were also able to provide and demonstrate a linkage to the role organisational culture had in improving actual sustainability improvements. The reference to sustainability in the context of the question also expected that the answer went beyond site based environmental “compliance” type examples.

Q2. With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Environmental Sustainability Audit: Describe how your organisation will further enhance sustainable procurement programmes and plans to improve environmental sustainability performance.

The best submissions recognised that sustainable procurement programmes and plans go beyond simple contractor and supplier environmental compliance checks. The nature and scope of any procurement programme will be dependent on the environmental risk profile of the organisation and the nature and complexity of its wider supply chain. For this reason, a range of different approaches could be accepted in an answer submitted.

Before looking at how to enhance sustainable procurement programmes – some context or explanation of the existing programmes was needed. This need not have been in detail, but should have set out their scope, application and any identified gaps/deficiencies (e.g., as raised in Five Star Audit). This would have enabled the identification of what improvements were needed. The reference to both operational and managerial examples made clear a range of examples were expected, covering more practical procurement through to more governance/compliance type expectations/requirements placed on the supply chain. The best answers provided a range of relevant and justified operational and managerial type examples.

Q3. With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Environmental Sustainability Audit: Describe how the current knowledge management system (KMS) will be further enhanced to improve the environmental sustainability performance of the organisation.

Unfortunately, not always well answered in part due to a lack of understanding of the scope and application of what a Knowledge Management System (KMS) is. While the degree of formality may vary, the essential elements should have taken into account how “knowledge” is identified, captured, assessed, and disseminated in order to lead to improved organisational efficiencies; in this case, improvements in environmental sustainability performance.

The best submissions either provided a clear explanation of a formal KMS, or explained how in the absence of a formal system, what equivalent processes they deployed. It was essential that the examples submitted made a clear linkage as to how the KMS processes led to, or would

improve/enhance the organisation's sustainability performance - these were ideally measurable examples. Clear linkage back to the Five Star was again necessary to get into the top band of marks.

Q4. With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Environmental Sustainability Audit: For FOUR of the audit outcomes, provide a simplified cost/benefits analyses of planned programmes to improve environmental sustainability performance.

As the question clearly required four specific audit outcomes to be discussed – in most cases was well answered. Weak answers sometimes did not understand what was meant by a Cost Benefit Analysis (“CBA”). In addition, some presented a CBA – but these were unnecessarily detailed and complex, missing the point that they needed to explain how they would improve environmental sustainability performance.

The best applications were also able to differentiate and give supporting CBA evidence covering direct and indirect costs/benefits. Often the simplest summaries and CBAs supported by clear and justified examples to support the answer gained the highest marks.