Corporate Sustainability Handprint® (CSH) - Report 2014/15
The Corporate Sustainability Handprint® (CSH) is the management tool used by GIZ for gathering and evaluating data and promoting corporate sustainability in our offices abroad. Focusing on corporate responsibility, the CSH investigates the extent to which the company is operating in a sustainable manner through its strategies, guidelines and work processes in our partner countries. Evaluation of projects and programmes is not part of the CSH; this is the task of GIZ’s established evaluation systems (https://www.giz.de/en/aboutgiz/quality_results_evaluation.html).

The report introduces the CSH as a management tool and explains its significance for GIZ and our field structure. It presents the initial aggregated results from the participating countries (as at May 2016) and provides an overview of progress to date.

The report is primarily targeted at GIZ employees who are currently engaged in, and have contributed to, the CSH process in their country or project offices, but it is also designed for other staff members who are less familiar with the CSH management tool. We hope that stakeholders outside GIZ will be interested in reading the report as well.
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Dear readers,

Sustainability is central to our work and is the principle which guides our projects and programmes and the way we operate as a company. With the Corporate Sustainability Handprint® (CSH), we turn the spotlight on our corporate sustainability practices worldwide.

Since 2014, we have implemented the CSH in 40 countries. As part of this process, the country directors, working with local projects and programmes, have adopted more than 450 practical targets for improving their own sustainability within the next two years, based on a broad range of measures, from increasing the share of locally procured goods to upgrading small electronic devices in their offices. Around 85% of the implementing countries have incorporated CSH goals into their annual planning as well. This means that aspects of sustainability that are of key importance to GIZ are being integrated on a binding basis into day-to-day operations.

For our country directors and programme managers, the CSH provides a framework for their own sustainability management. The countries can set their own targets, giving due consideration to local conditions and scope for action. In that sense, the CSH is a perfect match for our corporate culture and leads to continuous improvements in our field structure as well. Furthermore, with the CSH, we have developed a tool which will fully track our main environmental impacts in future.

The CSH additionally offers insights into the progress made towards good corporate governance in our partner countries. The self-assessments and the formulation of their own sustainability goals show us which priorities are being set. The CSH also expands and strengthens employee participation in our partner countries.

We therefore wish to take this opportunity to express our particular thanks to our local employees who make the CSH a meaningful reality. In many of our partner countries, the CSH teams have set up working groups and launched initiatives which are firmly committed to strengthening corporate responsibility and applying creative solutions that are tailored to the country context. We regard this very positive development as both an affirmation and an incentive to continue to refine and raise awareness of this new management tool.

Tanja Gönner
The Corporate Sustainability Handprint® (CSH) – Background

Sustainability – GIZ’s guiding principle

Sustainable development, as one of GIZ’s guiding principles, comprises responsible corporate governance based on internationally recognised agreements, an integrated and value-based way of working, and effective contributions to long-term human capacity building. Corporate sustainability is embedded in our mission statement and is implemented through rules and standards for our employees and managers. The Sustainability Board, led by the Chair of GIZ’s Management Board, advises on sustainability targets and agrees the long-term strategic direction for responsible corporate governance. With our Corporate Sustainability Handprint® (CSH), our aim is to strengthen and promote the guiding principle of sustainability across the company as a whole.
**What is corporate sustainability?**

GIZ understands corporate sustainability to mean a form of corporate governance that reconciles social responsibility, ecological balance, political participation and economic capability. We believe that balanced interaction between these four dimensions is essential for sustainable development. In practice, this means taking environmental and social aspects into account in our procurement processes, for example. A product’s price, quality and durability continue to be key procurement criteria, but we also consider whether it has a low environmental impact during use or whether workers’ rights were respected during its manufacture.

**International developments and client expectations**

With the CSH, we have not only developed a participatory management tool that helps us to improve our own sustainability performance. The CSH is also our response to higher expectations on the part of our current and future clients and to corporate reporting requirements. The CSH is therefore based on international sustainability reporting standards (Global Reporting Initiative). The CSH is a management tool that enables us to emphasise our credibility as a service provider committed to sustainability. We provide evidence of this in our Progress Report on Sustainability and in our Integrated Company Report, which marked the launch of our integrated reporting in 2015. In these reports, we not only present our business figures but also showcase our engagement in the field of corporate sustainability.


“Here in the Palestinian territories, the CSH has given us a useful format that will make it easier to switch from wishful thinking to practical action. For many of us, this boosts motivation and fosters commitment.”

Palestinian territories – Portfolio manager Volker Bode 2015

---

**Agenda 2030**

In the spirit of a new global partnership, the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development was adopted at the UN Summit in New York in December 2015. The 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) apply to all countries in the international community. The German Government is currently revising its National Sustainability Strategy in order, among other things, to adequately reflect the significance of Agenda 2030 as a roadmap for the future. Sustainability in the context of economic, environmental and social development – particularly at the corporate level – is a fundamental principle in the SDGs. GIZ, as a federal enterprise, therefore has a particular responsibility to act appropriately here. The CSH was developed prior to the adoption of Agenda 2030 and can now play a key role in implementing the diverse requirements of corporate sustainability on a transnational basis.
Turning the spotlight on GIZ’s sustainability performance worldwide

GIZ’s registered offices are located in Bonn and Eschborn. In 2015, our business volume exceeded EUR 2.2 billion. Out of a total of 17,050 staff, 14,848 – more than 82% – were deployed in other countries and 3,202 were working in Germany. Our national personnel, who are recruited and contracted in the partner countries, make up more than two-thirds of our workforce. Until now, we have lacked reliable data to assess our field structure’s sustainability performance, e.g. as regards resource consumption or CO2 emissions, as these locations are not yet included in our annual Environmental Audit; it currently includes data for our German sites only. In future, however, we will be able to present these environmental data as well and, on this basis, set global targets for reducing our consumption and negative environmental impacts.

Supporting our managers, promoting employee participation

Sustainability management in our partner countries is the responsibility of the country directors and the project and programme managers. In addition to the guidelines and rules adopted by GIZ’s central management, these managers have a degree of latitude that enables them to develop and implement their own more far-reaching, locally appropriate measures in the partner countries. The CSH offers them a harmonised framework and the requisite flexibility to review and improve their own sustainability performance in their country context.

Furthermore, through its implementation at the country level, the CSH encourages our employees to participate in corporate sustainability processes, imparting a coherent and practical understanding of sustainability as one of our guiding principles. Depending on the scope available to them in the given country, employees are thus able to involve themselves in the process more fully, discuss the results with a broader range of colleagues and join forces with them to initiate measures together.

“Here in Mexico, the CSH has opened our eyes to the fact that in a country with a very large environmental and climate portfolio, we ourselves still have major shortcomings in relation to ecological balance. We now have a basis on which to address these issues more systematically.”

Mexico – Country Director Corinna Küsel 2015

Promoting the corporate strategy

The corporate strategy, which is currently being developed in a company-wide process, will include the key targets set out in GIZ’s Sustainability Programme 2016-2020, such as reducing our global CO2 emissions. The strategy will thus continue to refine our existing corporate responsibility processes. All organisational units will be responsible for reaching the targets, e.g. on procurement. As an established management tool, the CSH can thus make a major contribution to attaining the goals defined in the corporate strategy.
Recognising cost-cutting potential

The CSH can help to conserve resources and increase efficiency. Upgrading the office air conditioning system or reducing the number of business trips not only eases the burden on the environment but also reduces costs. Responsible management practices thus enhance the company’s competitiveness and help to attract clients and partners.

Taking local conditions into account

While we have established viable processes and procedures for Germany and signed up to a number of certification schemes, for example, it is not always possible to implement them to the same extent in the field structure. Environmental balance is just one example: most of the buildings at our Bonn, Berlin and Eschborn sites have been certified under the European Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS) since 2013. However, extending this type of scheme to our office structure in our partner countries would be far too complex an undertaking: the costs would far outweigh the benefits. The CSH therefore offers our field structure an alternative way of adopting binding targets outside a formal certification scheme.

Using a handprint instead of a footprint

Many companies and organisations use an environmental footprint to measure their consumption of resources such as electricity, water and energy. By contrast, the CSH encompasses all four of our dimensions of sustainability. At GIZ, we have developed a handprint – the CSH – which can be used not only to collect data on our resource consumption and any negative impacts that it may have, but also to identify approaches that have been successful and depict these positive contributions. Whereas the environmental footprint compares results in the form of data, the CSH is a tool which communicates positive achievements - including to colleagues - and creates opportunities for mutual learning.
Elements of the CSH

The CSH was developed in cooperation with relevant organisational units in Germany and abroad. It was piloted in Ghana, Nicaragua, Cambodia and Viet Nam in 2013, providing a basis for its further refinement in 2014. In the same year, a decision was taken to implement the CSH in all partner countries with GIZ country offices within two years (2015 and 2016).

Assuming social responsibility

GIZ’s staff are the key factor in its success. In the social responsibility dimension of sustainability, GIZ has identified health, safety & security, employability, and work-life balance as its key fields of action. As a company with operations in crisis regions, the safety and security of our staff and their families is a matter of particular importance.

Maintaining the ecological balance

This environmental principle applies primarily to our German operations but also provides guidance for our field structure. We attempt to avoid negative environmental impacts, to improve our environmental performance on a continuous basis and to involve our employees in environmental management. In so doing, we aim to act as a role model for Germany and other countries in order to inspire environmentally sound behaviour elsewhere. The fields of action identified by GIZ in the environmental balance dimension of sustainability are CO₂ emissions, resource efficiency and sustainable event management.

Facilitating political participation

The regular involvement of internal and external interest groups not only increases the legitimacy of corporate action but also enables GIZ to provide tailor-made solutions and continuously refine its innovative services in the interests of sustainable development. Within the political participation dimension of sustainability, employee participation, stakeholder involvement, social commitment and equal opportunity and diversity are regarded as particularly important.

Strengthening economic capability

Preventing corruption – both within the company and in our worldwide activities – is essential if our work is to be successful. We also aim to increase the impact and cost-effectiveness of our services. The economic performance dimension of sustainability comprises four fields of action – quality, integrity & anti-corruption, procurement and efficiency.
The four dimensions of sustainability were sub-divided into 14 fields of action, which provide the framework for the CSH process and reflect the aspects of sustainability that are of particular importance to GIZ.
The CSH process

All 14 fields of action are addressed in the partner countries. A CSH team is formed in each participating country, usually consisting of the country director, a specially appointed CSH officer and other staff members. The CSH team collects quantitative data relating to key indicators such as paper consumption or the proportion of locally procured goods and services, and records the country’s existing strategies and measures in the 14 fields of action. Once data gathering has been concluded and a questionnaire completed, the CSH team meets to discuss and evaluate the results. The country team’s evaluation of its performance in individual fields of action determines the scores allocated in the self-assessment. This then forms the basis for the self-commitment in which the GIZ country office sets itself targets and identifies appropriate actions. Focusing on participation and ownership, the CSH targets precisely those areas in which there is a recognised need for action at the local level.

In Niger, the CSH has encouraged us to pause and reflect. We had some very lively discussions at the self-assessment workshop: are our routines still adequate or is there scope for us to do things differently – and better?

Niger – Country Director Jörg Maxin 2015
Progress to date

During 2014/2015, the CSH was implemented in 40 countries. This equates to approximately 50% of the countries where GIZ maintains offices. The aim is to have implemented the CSH in all partner countries with GIZ country offices by the end of 2016.

The CSH should be carried out every two years, and three countries have already completed the CSH for the second time. Three further countries have only partially implemented the CSH. Here, the process focused solely on the country office, not GIZ’s projects and programmes, which means that the environmental data cannot be included in the annual Environmental Audit. However, the results of the self-assessment and self-commitment have been fully incorporated into this report. The following table shows which countries introduced the CSH in 2014/2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Department</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Regional Department</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Regional Department</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Europe, Mediterranean, Central Asia</td>
<td>Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td></td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td></td>
<td>Algeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td></td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The great diversity of our country portfolios has a decisive influence on the scope for contributing to sustainability. The countries’ highly diverse climatic conditions, socio-cultural, political and legal frameworks and infrastructures also come into play.
Results of the CSH 2014/15

The country self-assessments

During the self-assessment, the CSH teams allocated scores, ranging from 0 (lowest mark) to 100 (maximum score), for their own sustainability performance in each field of action. All the fields of action must be assessed, taking into account the country-specific conditions and resulting scope for action. For the self-assessment, it is crucial that the CSH teams make a fair evaluation which accurately reflects the CSH team’s perceptions and the country context.

The results reveal considerable diversity in the countries’ self-assessments. In some countries, the teams generally tended to give themselves lower scores, while others viewed their performance more positively overall. This result was to be expected, as there are always ‘high-rankers’ and ‘low-rankers’ in any self-assessment. The scores given to the individual fields of action within countries also vary considerably: a large number of countries gave themselves very low scores (even including 0) in some fields of action but rated themselves very positively in others, with scores above 80 points in some cases. In other words, there is considerable heterogeneity in the countries’ approach to the self-assessment.

“The CSH offered us key insights which enabled us to take a holistic view of what we are doing and look at new practices and ways of possibly introducing them. The CSH tool gives us the right framework for this process.”

Kosovo – CSH Officer Karin Pluberg 2015
By way of illustration, **three country self-assessments** are presented below to show the **diversity of the results** of the individual evaluations.
The aggregated self-assessment in the field structure

In order to gain a comprehensive overview of the results, all the countries’ self-assessments were aggregated and the average was calculated. This aggregated CSH for the four dimensions of sustainability reveals that the highest average scores – well in excess of 50 points – were given to economic performance. This is followed by social responsibility, with clear differences between the fields of action. The scores for political participation were slightly lower and reveal the greatest variations between the fields of action. The lowest scores went to environmental balance.

In order to gain a better understanding of these assessments, we have contrasted the aggregated handprint with another handprint, known as CSH Global, which shows the results of a self-assessment of the entire company undertaken by the Sustainability Board in 2014. The reasons for producing CSH Global were twofold: firstly, to introduce the tool to the Sustainability Board, and secondly, to present collated data as a basis for discussion and conduct an initial self-assessment for the company as a whole to serve as an example. Although CSH Global covered the same fields of action, the evaluation was not based on worldwide data relating to key indicators and qualitative factors in every case. In relation to the dimension of environmental balance, for example, only the environmental data from GIZ’s German sites were taken as the basis for the assessment.

“In Burundi, the CSH has opened our eyes to the fact that even in a very poor country with limited technical facilities, disposing of our office waste in an environmentally compatible way is quite straightforward. And we learned that taking responsibility for this process is fun!”

Burundi – Country Director Dr Petra Wagner 2015
It is immediately obvious that the scores in CSH Global are much higher than those shown in the aggregated handprint. In the field structure, no field of action scores more than 75 points, whereas 10 out of 14 fields of action achieve this high score in CSH Global. This suggests that the country offices tend to view their own performance quite critically and objectively. Although they had every opportunity to award higher scores to their own performance, they opted for a realistic assessment.

This indicates that the countries see considerable scope for improvement in the individual fields of action. Particularly low scores were awarded to CO2 emissions (26 out of 100), sustainable event management, resource efficiency and social commitment. By contrast, the scores for integrity & anti-corruption (68 out of 100), health, safety & security, efficiency, and employee participation are highest. This suggests that these fields of action have already been prioritised by the various countries in recent years and that performance in these areas is judged to be correspondingly high.
The self-assessment in the individual regional departments

In order to analyse the differences between the three regional departments, the country assessments for the three departments were aggregated and the sustainability dimensions were compared. This revealed that there is considerable homogeneity in the average scores for the fields of action in three out of the four dimensions of sustainability. As an example, the assessment for economic performance – as one of the four dimensions of sustainability – is shown below.

The only striking difference is Africa's score for local procurement, which is much lower than the scores achieved by the other two regional departments in this field of action. The fields of action in the social responsibility and political participation dimensions of sustainability show a similar level of homogeneity.

Self-assessment // Economic Capability

- Africa
- Asia, Latin America, Caribbean
- Europe, Mediterranean, Central Asia
- Average of all fields of action

“...In Viet Nam, the CSH helped us to promote sustainability from a corporate perspective. Putting it into practice is a great way to build a sense of shared identity among our staff.”

Viet Nam – Country Director Jochem Lange 2016
In the environmental balance dimension, by contrast, the average scores awarded in the self-assessment are not only much lower than in the other dimensions of sustainability, but also vary significantly. It is particularly striking that in all three fields of action – sustainable event management, resource efficiency, and CO₂ emissions – there is a gap of more than 15 points between the Asia, Latin America and Caribbean region and the Europe, Mediterranean and Central Asia region. It is not possible to provide a reasoned explanation of this discrepancy here, but it is assumed that the European, Mediterranean and Central Asian countries generally identify more scope for improvement than do the Asian, Latin American and Caribbean countries.

---

**Self-assessment // Ecological Balance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable event management</th>
<th>Resource efficiency</th>
<th>CO₂ emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

“In the Philippines and the Pacific region, the CSH has helped us to make the abstract notion of sustainability more vivid and real.”

Philippines – Country Director Dr Andreas Kalk 2015
Comparison of self-commitments and self-assessments

In addition to the self-assessment at country level, the self-commitment within the CSH framework is of key importance. The CSH suggests setting goals that can be achieved within a timeframe of up to two years. Experience shows that processes to achieve improvements in sustainability often take some time to become established. However, it is also possible to agree immediate measures, in the form of smaller-scale actions that can be implemented straight away with minimal effort and offer an initial taste of success.

In total, the countries have adopted more than 450 self-commitments. Around 92% of the countries have adopted at least one self-commitment in the resource efficiency field of action, followed by 86% in health, safety & security and also in CO₂ emissions. Resource efficiency and CO₂ emissions scored very poorly in the self-assessment, so it is not surprising that countries see a priority need for action here. Although health, safety & security scored highly, the goals set show that this field of action currently remains a high priority for countries.

More than half the countries have also set themselves at least one goal in each of the procurement, employee participation, and efficiency areas. As the results of the self-assessment showed, employee participation and efficiency are already judged to be areas of relatively good performance. Even so, the countries regard improving their performance in these fields as a priority.

The number of self-commitments is lowest for integrity & anti-corruption. This is presumably because this field of action – a high priority for the company as a whole – has already been incorporated into all GIZ’s guidelines and rules and a range of measures have already been put in place, meaning that the formulation of new goals takes less precedence here. This is borne out by the highest average score (68 points) given to this field of action in the self-assessment.

The other three fields of action with fewest self-commitments – stakeholder involvement, social commitment, and sustainable event management – were also given very low scores in the self-assessment. This suggests that despite the relatively low scores in the self-assessment, these fields of action are not regarded as particularly important at present.

The following overview of the self-assessments and self-commitments shows the correlations described above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large number of self-commitments</th>
<th>Self-assessment score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health, safety &amp; security</td>
<td>High &gt; 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource efficiency</td>
<td>Low &lt; 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ emissions</td>
<td>Low &lt; 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee participation</td>
<td>High &gt; 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>Medium &gt; 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low number of self-commitments</th>
<th>Self-assessment score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrity &amp; anti-corruption</td>
<td>High &gt; 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>Medium &lt; 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social commitment</td>
<td>Low &lt; 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable event management</td>
<td>Low &lt; 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder involvement</td>
<td>Medium &lt; 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets for improving performance

The countries have set themselves highly diverse goals for improving their sustainability performance. For example, the 57 self-commitments for health, safety & security include a total of 34 different measures.

The highest number of self-commitments were made in relation to resource efficiency, slightly ahead of health, safety and security, with CO₂ emissions trailing a little way behind in third place.

Targets on identifying new suppliers for sustainable procurement, thus encouraging the purchase of sustainable office materials, were adopted in 16 cases. This is followed by 11 self-commitments to measures aimed at improving recycling and waste management, with a further 11 self-commitments focused on developing strategies and manuals on resource efficiency in the country office and in projects and programmes.
### Results of the CSH

#### Self-Commitments nach Handlungsfeldern

- **Beschaffung**
  - Identify new suppliers for sustainable/local procurement and procurement of sustainable office materials (16 mentions)
  - Develop strategies and manuals on resource efficiency (11 mentions)
  - Adopt measures to improve recycling and waste management (11 mentions)
  - Retrofit or replace equipment (switches, light bulbs, motion sensors, electric sockets, etc.) (10 mentions)
  - Update safety strategies/review and develop safety and security measures (9 mentions)
  - Run information events on health (diet, ergonomics, physical exercise, sport) (8 mentions)
  - Awareness-raising for staff, focusing on resource efficiency (including training and events) (7 mentions)

In summary, the high number and diversity of the self-commitments indicate that countries are utilising the flexibility afforded by the CSH. This is a sign of its strength: the countries can specify which particular topics are most important to them and thus take into account the scope for action available in the country concerned.
The CSH in GIZ’s offices in Germany

The CSH was originally developed for GIZ’s field structure. In late 2014, however, the question of the tool’s potential application in GIZ’s state and regional offices in Germany also arose. In addition to our main sites in Bonn, Eschborn and Berlin, GIZ has a number of smaller and medium-sized offices and various training and conference centres in Germany. Their structure and day-to-day operations differ considerably from those of the offices abroad.

In 2015, the CSH was piloted at four small and medium-sized sites – Bremen, Dresden, Düsseldorf and Saarbrücken. With 22 employees, Düsseldorf is the largest of these sites; the other offices each have fewer than 10 employees. The CSH was therefore adapted as necessary, e.g. by reducing the collection of data relating to key indicators while retaining all 14 fields of action.

In total, the four sites adopted 41 self-commitments across the four dimensions of sustainability, as follows.

As can be seen, there is a very even distribution across all four dimensions, with a slight trend towards prioritisation of environmental balance.

The self-assessment shows that the CSH is suitable as a tool for improving the offices’ sustainability performance to only a limited extent, primarily because these sites have only a certain degree of individual management scope. Procurement, for example, is managed from Bonn and Eschborn. What’s more, the country and regional offices have no responsibility for site management: this is dealt with by GIZ’s central Property Division. In other words, many aspects, such as resource efficiency, do not fall within the smaller offices’ area of responsibility.

Based on the pilot at these four sites, a decision was taken not to implement the CSH across the board at all GIZ’s German sites. One possible option, instead, is to focus on the four regional offices in future.

Verteilung der Self-Commitments / Deutsche Büros

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Self-commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wirtschaftliche Leistungsfähigkeit</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soziale Verantwortung</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politische Teilhabe</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ökologisches Gleichgewicht</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown of the self-commitments most frequently mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to develop stakeholder dialogue</td>
<td>3 out of 4 offices (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase efficiency</td>
<td>2 out of 4 offices (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce paper consumption</td>
<td>2 out of 4 offices (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable event management</td>
<td>2 out of 4 offices (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“ In the Saarland, the CSH took up more time for data gathering and team discussions than we had expected, but at the end of the process, it had sharpened our awareness of the challenges and potential for making sustainability a reality in a small regional office in Germany.”

Saarland – Country Director David Robert 2016
The tool will have taken more than four years to progress from initial development (early 2012) to full implementation by all the relevant countries (end of 2016). In other words, continuing to refine the CSH and bringing it to a state of maturity was a medium-term project. Throughout this process, the lessons learned in the various countries have frequently helped to improve the CSH, particularly by reducing the effort involved in implementing and repeating the CSH. Feedback from the countries confirms the feasibility of data collection.

The challenges

The effort required to implement the CSH depends on conditions in the country concerned. For example, considerable effort is required in countries with a high proportion of air travel because in many of these countries the travel agencies we use do not yet collect data on CO₂ emissions from aviation. Accordingly, the data for the flights must be processed manually in most cases, which takes time and, unfortunately, is open to error. However, we expect travel agency services to improve in many countries in future, significantly reducing the CSH-related effort. By collecting data on CO₂ emissions, GIZ is creating a demand for travel agencies to produce these figures in our partner countries.

Internal communication was another challenge in the introduction of the CSH. It is essential, first and foremost, to raise awareness of this new tool and explain it in detail. Many of our staff are unaccustomed to the self-assessment component in particular and therefore require support, which is available in the form of manuals, a video and an online portal. The Sustainability Office can also be contacted to answer country offices’ questions. However, even with support from Germany, more communication is needed between the country offices and the programmes and projects in almost every country. In the medium term, the effort involved in this communication is also likely to decrease as a result of the CSH’s embedding in daily work processes and its introduction as an obligatory element of the induction training for new staff in early 2016.

Successes

One of the CSH’s obvious successes is that 85% of countries that have implemented the CSH have incorporated their self-commitments into their annual planning for 2016, which means that these commitments now form part of their strategic plans. Here, the CSH works in a similar manner as in Germany in that it applies at corporate level, with work currently under way to integrate key goals from the Sustainability Programme 2016-2020 into the new corporate strategy.
Certainly, aspects such as avoidance of CO2 emissions or promotion of health management would not have been considered to the same extent in country planning without the CSH. According to the feedback received, management-level discussions of the issue of flights for business trips in the countries concerned have focused for the first time not only on financial criteria but also on the possibility of incorporating environmental aspects into travel planning.

Feedback from the countries has shown that our workforce’s attitudes towards corporate sustainability are also shifting dramatically. Previously, this topic was regarded as rather abstract and difficult to understand, but the CSH is considered as a useful tool in making it more accessible and providing guidance for practical change. In many countries, CSH working groups have been set up, and there has been positive feedback about employees’ willingness to participate actively on CSH-related issues. By encouraging this employee participation, the CSH fulfils one of the key criteria for employees’ ‘ownership’ of decision-making and corporate processes.

As a management tool for corporate sustainability, the CSH – even at this early stage – is already widely respected. In the Corporate Responsibility Index (CRI) 2015, GIZ’s CSH was singled out as one of five best practice examples among participating companies. The CRI – an initiative of the Bertelsmann Stiftung, Bayreuth University and concern GmbH – assesses success factors in the context of corporate sustainability. GIZ has performed particularly well in the CRI: as one of the top 10% of the 187 German companies surveyed, GIZ was awarded the title Corporate Responsibility Champion in the CR Index. In its description of best practices, the Bertelsmann Stiftung emphasised that ‘GIZ, with its Corporate Sustainability Handprint, has created a framework within the company that requires all business areas to ensure corporate responsibility is integrated into their activities and to document all CR-relevant data online’.

The CSH has enabled us to substantially expand our knowledge of our own operations and finally to focus systematically on corporate sustainability in our partner countries. GIZ has adopted sustainability as one of its guiding principles and is committed to implementing this principle across the company through a wide range of self-commitments, professional and effective sustainability management and employee participation, thereby making it a meaningful reality. Notwithstanding all the successes achieved, this means regularly reviewing progress and asking self-critical questions. Where can we do better? Which topics are we not prioritising to an adequate extent? Where can we benefit from our colleagues’ experience? The CSH helps us pinpoint these blind spots, identify potentially conflicting goals and transform challenges into solutions with the help of our most important resource – the skills and wealth of experience of our in-country staff.
As a federally owned enterprise, GIZ supports the German Government in achieving its objectives in the field of international cooperation for sustainable development.
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