



Globe of Honour 2021

Chief Adjudicator's Report

Globe of Honour 2021

Chief Adjudicator's Report

In 2021, **15** submissions were received for the Globe of Honour awards and 73% 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

2021 has again been another challenging year. While the impacts of the global pandemic have varied by country and sometimes company/project, it still continued to impact on every sector, size and type of business. Let's hope 2022 is more positive for everyone concerned.

It is therefore commendable that the quality of all Globe submissions in 2021 were overall of a high standard. However due to the slightly higher cohort of applications, there was a wider range of quality in the submissions.

Due to the relatively small number of Globe applications compared to the Sword of Honour, this report is limited in scope. However, reference to the Sword of Honour Chief Adjudicator's Report which also provides valuable insight into how to make a good submission is applicable to both award schemes.

Some general features of the best applications included:

- 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 headings and clear reference to Five Star Environmental Sustainability Audit findings
- 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.

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 consistently referenced the audit outcomes in their submissions.

There were a significant 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.

The use of examples to support the answer was more prevalent this year and provided a more complete and engaging answer in the best submissions.

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. Indeed, 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. All applicants this year provided a comprehensive summary of the main business activities, key risks and operational aspects.

Q1: With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Environmental Sustainability Audit:

Explain how the application of the principles of the ‘circular economy’ across your organisation has enhanced sustainability performance.

Overall applicants answered this question very well. The best candidates provided a clear definition/explanation of the “circular” economy” and in particular its relevance and application to the company/project. Weaker submissions sometimes provided an incorrect or poorly explained response.

Good applications were able to set out both the “big picture” concepts of a “circular” economy” but to then provide clear linkage to the organisation/project concerned. Weaker applications provided more of an academic answer on the “circular” economy” and not much on how it applies to them.

Answers in the top band require evidence of how the “circular” economy” has enhanced sustainability performance. This required clear and justified examples to be provided. The best responses provided qualitative and quantitative evidence to support the submission.

As with all the questions, it was necessary to make a clear linkage to the outcomes of the Five Star Audit. [Applies to all questions]. The best applications did this [often using relevant clause references] and made sure the linkage and evidence/examples used clearly applied to the principles of the circular economy.

Q2: With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Environmental Sustainability Audit:

Describe how the organisation will use the Five-star environmental sustainability audit outcomes to help plan a strategy toward a ‘NET ZERO’ future.

Most applicants fully explained and demonstrated an understanding of “net zero”. However the weakest applications provided sometimes confusing or partial evidence.

This was a question where a wide range of examples were expected to be used to set out the organisations/project’s strategy to “net zero”.

The best applications understood the strategic nature of the topic and provided a range of relevant and justified examples. Applicants that included qualitative and quantitative examples, with clear timelines, often provided the highest quality responses, especially when clearly linked back to the Five Star Audit.

Good applications provided examples that were clearly relevant to “net zero” commitments. Weaker applications while providing “environmental” examples did not always clearly explain or justify their relevance to “net zero”.

Q3. With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Environmental Sustainability Audit:

Describe how the reliability and accuracy of environmental sustainability data, needed to enhance your organisation's sustainability performance, will be assessed

While well answered by most applicants – this was probably the weakest of the 4 questions. This appeared to be because applicants did not always address all the key points needed. Specifically:

1. A full description of the environmental sustainability data
2. What reliability and accuracy data is used (noting there are differences)?
3. How it links and is used to enhance the organisation's sustainability performance?
4. What assessment methods were used (using justified examples)?
5. How points 1-4 will tie in together and link back to the Five Star?

The best submissions while not necessarily following this exact list – considered both qualitative and quantitative examples and justified their selection and use. Weaker submissions typically provided descriptive examples of environmental sustainability data without explaining their selection and making limited attempt to include any reliability or accuracy information.

Due to the sometimes long timelines set against short term “compliance” pressures, it is necessary to set out some mechanism for prioritisation, and so the reliability and accuracy of all data is critical.

Q4. With relevant reference to the outcomes from your recent Five Star Environmental Sustainability Audit:

Explain how the organisation has enhanced the sustainability of their supply chain and any quantified benefits that this has subsequently achieved

Many applicants were able to set out a comprehensive summary of how they manage the supply chain. This was often in effect a summary of their supply chain procurement or contractor management policies. While not irrelevant, only the best applicants understood this needed to be set alongside the need to demonstrate how the sustainability of the supply chain was enhanced and that this needed to link to quantified benefits.

Some applicants did not clearly explain or understand the question was about how did they [Site/Project/Applicant] enhance the sustainability of their supply chain, **not** how did the supply chain enhance the sustainability of the Site/Project/Applicant. Although accepting they are closely related and interconnected.

Good applicants set out the process but more importantly provided a range of actual improvements and what the quantified benefits were. Weaker applications tended to be more qualitative in scope.

The reference to quantified benefits was vital. The best applicants not only identified what these were but explained/justified how this led to enhanced sustainability of their supply chain. It was also expected that some reference to the process or methodology that was used was set out.

As with all questions, the best applicant made clear linkage back to the Five Star report.