

1. REVIEW

The following procedure details the Environmental Aspects and Impacts arising from the activities, products and services relative to the Buck & Hickman operations in UK. The businesses are wholly distribution based and have no control over the manufacture or manufacturing processes of the products they sell.

The aspects were identified through a review of all businesses and business operations by a senior management team. Input was also provided by the QSHE Manager, Facilities Manager on site-specific issues.

2. REGISTER

From the review a list of all identified aspects was drawn up and the Aspects Register created. Each Aspect was considered and the relative Impact weighted from 1, little or no impact, to 5, significant impact either existing or potentially through any unwanted incident, e.g. fire or flood.

The register also lists any potential actions that could be implemented to reduce the impact. The impact weighting reflects if any of these measures are already employed

NB: Impact weighting is not a one-off process but will be revisited and re-scored annually. The potential for negative impact may reduce with improved processes and controls but may increase as equipment, e.g. storage facilities, ages and corrodes.

The Aspects and Impacts register is used to support the selection of Environmental Objectives.

3. MEASUREMENT & REPORTING

A general register of Environmental Impacts has been developed which is common to all Buck & Hickman businesses. Not all the Impacts will be relevant to all businesses but they do provide maximum, measurable “cover”. Each business unit measures the relevant impacts and reports back to Group via the environmental team on a quarterly basis. The information is also reported publicly through the Annual Report and Accounts.

Monitoring and measurement processes will be robust and capable of external verification. Information that will be used, for instance, will be taken from utility bills, fuel records, transport records, waste notes, travel agents returns etc. Guesswork is not acceptable. It is, however, reasonable to make estimations when accurate data are not available. For example many of the smaller call centres are unable to provide detailed information relating to energy use as this figure is costed to part of the rent payable. In this case it is in order to provide pro-rata measures in comparison with similar sized and staffed facilities.

4. EVALUATING THE IMPACT

Author: Mark Strong
A QSHE Manager

Issue- 2- 31st July 2007

<http://www.buckandhickman.com/>

Impacts are rated on a scale of 1, little or no impact, to 5, significant impact. The impact rating will reflect current activity. If there are measures in place to control or reduce the impact then the impact rating will reduce. Conversely if there are no measures to control the impact then the rating will increase.

This rating can make what appears to be a less significant impact seems more environmentally damaging than one of higher significance but the potential impact will reduce as more control measures are implemented. This enables more relevant Objective setting.

5. RECORDS

The main records held by the business for internal and external reporting will reflect the environmental impacts.

Records of all environmental impacts shall be retained as an electronic copy for at least 5 years to enable comparison year-on-year to ensure improvements are made and systems are effective. These records will be retained by the relevant global representatives, one for Europe and Asia Pacific and one for the Americas.

Data to support the submissions shall be retained at local level for a period determined either by local legislation or until any due verification has been undertaken by either the relevant authority, e.g. the Environment Agency in the UK, or Group Internal Audit. Supporting data are defined on the impact register.