Re-certification Criteria

New Standard - Scope Document

GEO Certified™ - Club & Course Management

Version: 1.0

Approval Date: 15th August 2012

Amended Dates: 17th August 2012

Official Language: English
Re-certification Criteria

New Standard - Scope Document

Development

Focus of Standard
The Golf Environment Organization (GEO) is putting forward a proposed criteria document for the re-certification of clubs. This standard will focus on ensuring all clubs are evaluated to the same standard when going through the re-certification process.

Timeline
The consultation process will begin in the second half of 2012. At the completion of the consultation process, approval from the Board of Directors will be sought during the first quarter of 2013. Full adoption is targeted for 1 January 2014.

Process
The development of the re-certification criteria will follow GEO’s Standard-Setting Procedures.
Proposed Standard / Criteria

Please refer to the GEO Certified™ Re-certification Criteria document for the full-proposed standard.

A summary of the proposed standard for each of the 6 areas of sustainable golf is as follows:

- LANDSCAPE & ECOSYSTEMS
- WATER
- ENERGY & RESOURCES
- PRODUCTS & SUPPLY CHAINS
- ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
- PEOPLE & COMMUNITIES

Purpose of the Criteria

As clubs come to the end of their first three years of GEO Certified, GEO expects them to have improved, and be willing to continue to improve, their overall environmental, community and resource performance. In order to retain the ecolabel, clubs should therefore have to, and be able to, meet new and more stringent criteria. This is directly in line with GEO’s mission to support and recognize credible continual improvement and enhanced sustainability performance over time.

In finalizing the re-certification criteria, we have to find a balance between credibility and accessibility. Making them too easily attainable will not encourage clubs to explore sustainability deeply enough, while criteria that are too challenging are likely to be ignored, and clubs are likely to drop out of the programme, loose the ecolabel and discontinue their role as industry leaders and credible exemplars for sustainability in their communities.

As with all GEO criteria, these are the minimum requirements expected for re-certification. We encourage clubs to go above and beyond these whenever and wherever they can.

These international criteria are integrated into national legislation and priorities through the work GEO undertakes with National Partners and through the knowledge and experience of the GEOSA Network during the on-site verification and recommendations process.

Consultation

How to Contribute

Parties interested in contributing during the consultation period may email their comments to info@golfenvironment.org. Comments submitted should include the following:

- Contact information for correspondence in relation to development of standard and comments submitted.
- Comments against the proposed criteria shall include proposed alternative solutions.
### Stakeholder Mapping

An appropriate range and type of international, national and local stakeholders are contacted for their input on the proposed criteria. The following list outlines the relevant interest sectors and key stakeholders. Each of these that appear on the list has been identified because of their direct involvement and influence over the management of golf clubs & courses. GEO Sustainably Associates have also been included, as the criteria will directly impact the verification activities they undertake.

- Golf Bodies (Global Governing, National Federations, International and National Associations)
- GEO Certified™ Clubs and Clubs OnCourse™
- Practitioners within clubs interested, but not currently holding GEO Certified™
- GEO Sustainability Associates Network
- Select individuals GEO felt may want to have more involvement

### Key Dates in the Consultation Process

Outline of anticipated key dates from drafting to approval and adoption:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of recertification criteria</td>
<td>GEO technical staff</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal consultation</td>
<td>GEO Technical Commission</td>
<td>June and July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Scoping</td>
<td>GEO Technical Staff</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open consultation – first round</td>
<td>Distribution to stakeholders</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close of first round consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open consultation – second round</td>
<td>Re-distribution to stakeholders and</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close of second round of consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal consultation</td>
<td>GEO Technical Commission</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>GEO Board of Directors</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated adoption</td>
<td>GEO Board of Directors</td>
<td>1 January 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Decision-Making Process

Consensus will be sought through the consultation process for the proposed criteria and any possible changes to it. The consensus sought is of a majority. If a majority cannot be established for a particular item after two rounds of consultation, the alternate decision-making process will be enacted in accordance with the GEO’s Standard-Setting Procedures.
**Terms of Reference**

**Objectives of Re-certification Criteria**
The objective of the Re-certification Criteria is to ensure continual improvement in the sustainability performance among the clubs being re-certified as GEO Certified™ for Club & Course Management.

**Justification of Need**
The re-certification criteria are to ensure clubs are evaluated against a common set of criteria for re-certification. The criteria will also provide a clear set of requirements for re-certification that are clear eliminating uncertainty around the overall strength of re-certification in terms of overall sustainability efforts put forth by clubs.

**Assessment of Risks**
The risks of implementing the criteria and ways to mitigate these risks are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk of implementation</th>
<th>Ways to Mitigate Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Falsification of Data</strong></td>
<td>Continue with required 3rd party verification and limiting the same 3rd party to only 3 verifications in a row for a given club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ambiguity Around Performance</strong></td>
<td>Clear national priorities and ongoing training and specific guidance to verifiers. Establishment of performance thresholds for key aspects of resource consumption. Increasing use and analysis of key performance indicators, including analysis of longer term trends (6 years worth of performance data at time of recertification).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>