



Safety Engineering Awards 2026

Guidance for Completing the Nomination Form

For nominators, nominees, organisations, government institutions, members and non-members

Document Reference: NISafetyE/SEA/NOM-GUIDE/2026/002 | Version 2.0 | September 2026

Important: Read this guidance before completing NISafetyE_Awards_2026_Nomination_Form_V2.0. Complete all applicable fields, select only one award category per form, and attach an indexed evidence pack. Submit the signed form and evidence by 25 September 2026 to awards@nisafetye.com.

1 Purpose of This Guidance

This document explains how to complete each part of the official nomination form accurately and how to present evidence in a way that enables fair, objective and category-specific assessment. It does not replace the Nomination Guidelines and Eligibility Criteria. Where any difference arises, the approved awards rules and formally issued instructions take precedence.

2 Before You Start

- Read all 12 category titles and definitions before selecting the category that best matches the nominee's principal achievement.
- Obtain the nominee's agreement and confirm the correct spelling of names, titles, credentials and organisation details.
- Define the exact subject of the nomination: whole organisation, business unit, asset or facility, field, project, programme, or individual contribution.
- Choose a clear assessment period and gather evidence that falls within, or directly explains, that period.
- Create an evidence index using the category code and sequential numbers, for example B1-01, B1-02 and B1-03.
- Verify exceptional claims, statistics and milestones. Where independent verification is unavailable, state the source and limitation honestly.
- Use a separate form for every nominee and every category. Do not tick multiple categories on one form.

3 Key Terms

Term	Meaning in this form
Nominator	The person or organisation submitting the nomination.
Nominee	The individual, organisation or government institution being proposed for an award.
Assessment period	The defined dates during which the achievement, contribution or performance will be assessed.
Nomination scope	The precise boundary of the claim, such as an entire organisation, FPSO, factory, project, programme or individual initiative.
Evidence reference	A unique identifier used consistently in the form and evidence pack to locate a document or record.
Independent source	A verifier or record not solely produced by the nominee, such as an auditor, regulator, client, employer, partner or recognised certifying body.
Normalised indicator	A rate that accounts for exposure, scale or population, such as LTIFR per million hours or completion rate as a percentage.
N/A	Not applicable. Use only when a field genuinely cannot apply, and briefly explain why.

4 Quick Completion Route

1. Enter the nominator's details.
2. Enter the nominee's details and select the correct nominee type.
3. Tick one award category only.
4. Define the scope, boundaries and assessment period.
5. Write the four-part nomination statement: challenge, actions, results and wider value.
6. Complete the exceptional-claims table where a milestone, rate or performance claim is relied upon.
7. Tick and attach evidence only for the selected category.
8. List every attachment in the Supporting Evidence Register.
9. Provide an independent referee or verifier.
10. Complete declarations, obtain signatures and perform the final submission check.
11. Leave the Administrative Review section blank; it is for NISafetyE official use.

Recommended writing method: Use the sequence "Situation - Action - Result - Evidence." State what problem existed, what the nominee did, what changed, and which numbered attachment proves it.

5 Section-by-Section Completion Instructions

5.1 Section 1 - Nominator Details

Form field	What to enter	Example
Full name	Legal or professionally used full name of the person submitting the nomination.	Engr. Amina Bello
Organisation and position	Current employer or represented body and job title. For a self-nomination, state this clearly.	ABC Energy Ltd - HSE Manager
NISafetyE status	Tick one: Member, Non-member, or Organisation/institution.	☒ Member
Email and telephone	Active details through which the Secretariat can request clarification. Include country code.	amina@example.org; +234 800 000 0000
Relationship to nominee	Explain your connection and ability to attest to the nomination.	Client representative who supervised the project, 2024-2025

Avoid: Using an assistant's contact details when that person cannot answer questions about the submission; writing only "colleague" without explaining the relationship; or leaving the membership/status box unticked.

5.2 Section 2 - Nominee Details

Form field	How to complete it
Nominee type	Tick one only: Individual, Organisation, or Government institution.
Full or registered name	For an individual, use the full professional name. For a body, use its registered or statutory name; do not use an informal abbreviation alone.
Position or principal activity	For an individual, state current role. For an organisation, state its principal industry, regulatory function or public-interest role.
Address	Give the principal business/contact address relevant to the nomination.
Email and telephone	Provide an official or authorised contact for verification.
Website	Provide the official website. If none exists, enter N/A.

Example organisational entry: Nigerian Upstream Petroleum Regulatory Commission (NUPRC); Government institution; upstream petroleum technical and commercial regulator; official contact and website.

5.3 Section 3 - Award Category: Select One

Tick the category that most directly reflects the achievement described in the nomination. Eligibility alone does not determine category fit. Select the category by asking: "What is the main achievement for which recognition is sought?"

Code	Use this category when the main evidence demonstrates
A1	Effective safety regulation and regulatory oversight, including standards, risk-based inspection, enforcement, compliance improvement and sector/public impact.
A2	Evidence-based safety advocacy delivered through effective collaboration, with verified reach and influence on behaviour, practice, culture or policy.
A3	Emergency preparedness, response, recovery and resilience demonstrated through plans, capability, exercises/incidents, learning and continuity.
B1	Oil and gas safety engineering excellence, especially process safety, major-accident prevention, operational controls, integrity and verified outcomes.
B2	Manufacturing safety engineering excellence through engineering safeguards, machinery/process control, maintenance, exposure control and workforce protection.
B3	Construction safety engineering excellence through design, planning, high-risk work controls, temporary works, contractor management and project outcomes.
C1	An individual Safety Engineer's original, technically rigorous innovation or contribution with measurable safety impact.
C2	An individual Safety Engineer's distinguished, sustained service and advocacy beyond routine duties.
C3	An individual Safety Engineer's impactful training and mentoring that improves competence, performance or professional progression.
D1	A Safety Engineering Professional's visible leadership commitment, governance, resourcing, culture influence and attributable safety outcomes.
D2	A Safety Engineering Professional's positive influence through advocacy, collaboration and promotion of safety engineering.
D3	A Safety Engineering Professional's contribution to structured professional development, education, mentoring, competence and progression.

If uncertain: Choose the category matching the dominant achievement and evidence. Do not tick two categories. A nomination submitted in the wrong category may be returned for clarification and must not be silently reclassified by a judge.

5.4 Section 4 - Nomination Scope and Assessment Period

This section prevents misleading comparisons and makes clear exactly what the evidence covers. The scope must be consistent throughout the nomination and attachments.

Field	Completion guidance	Illustrative entry
Scope type	Tick one boundary.	☒ Asset/facility
Exact scope name and boundaries	Identify what is included and excluded.	FPSO Alpha operations; offshore operations and onboard contractors included; onshore offices excluded.
Location(s)	State facility/project locations.	Offshore Niger Delta, Nigeria.
Assessment period	Use exact start and end dates.	1 Jan 2023 to 31 Dec 2025.
Population	State workforce, contractor or beneficiary population and relevant exposure.	Average 620 persons; 7.4 million work hours.
Operational context	Describe operating phase, hazard profile, complexity and contractor proportion.	Operating FPSO; hydrocarbon processing, lifting and marine interfaces; 48% contractor hours.
Exclusions/limitations	Disclose unavailable data or boundary changes.	2023 contractor occupational-health data excludes one marine vendor; limitation explained in B1-15.

Comparison principle: Raw totals alone are not enough. An FPSO, field, factory and construction project have different hazards and exposure. Supply the context and denominators needed for risk-adjusted, proportionate assessment.

5.5 Section 5 - Nomination Statement

Write concise, factual answers under all four headings. Refer to numbered evidence in brackets. Avoid copying a job description or company profile.

Part	What a strong response contains	Short model
Challenge or Need	Baseline problem, affected people/assets, risk significance and dates.	In 2023, repeat permit-control deviations affected 14% of audited high-risk tasks across the asset (B1-04).
Actions and Contribution	Specific decisions and actions by the nominee; roles of partners; timeline.	The nominee redesigned permit verification, introduced supervisor field checks and trained 86 permit authorities between Feb and Jun 2024 (B1-04, B1-10).
Results and Measurable Impact	Baseline versus current result, rate or trend, dates, attribution and verification.	Deviation rate fell from 14% to 3% by Dec 2025 across 420 sampled permits; audit verified by XYZ Assurance (B1-04, B1-13).
Significance and Wider Value	Why exceptional, durability, learning, replication and beneficiaries.	The control has operated for 18 months, is embedded in assurance reviews and has been replicated on two assets (B1-16 to B1-18).

Evidence citation style: Place evidence references immediately after the relevant claim, for example: "Inspection compliance improved from 68% to 91% (A1-10, pages 12-16)."

5.6 Section 6 - Performance and Exceptional Claims

Complete this section whenever the nomination relies on a notable statistic, milestone, record or performance claim, including LTI-free hours, TRIR/LTIFR, regulatory compliance improvement, persons trained, response time, reach, qualification rate or risk reduction.

Field	Illustrative 10 million LTI-free FPSO entry
Claim or milestone	10,000,000 work hours without a Lost Time Injury.
Definition/calculation	LTI means a work-related injury causing at least one full shift/day away after the day of occurrence; hours include employees and contractors.
Boundary/exposure	FPSO Alpha onboard operations; 1 Jan 2021-31 Dec 2025; 42% contractor hours.
Baseline/comparator	Previous five-year period: 2 LTIs in 8.1 million hours; LTIFR reduced from 0.25 to 0.00 per million hours.
Leading/serious-risk data	Critical-control verification 96%; Tier 1 process-safety events 0; Tier 2 events reduced 3 to 1; overdue safety-critical maintenance 1.8%.

Field	Illustrative 10 million LTI-free FPSO entry
Independent verification	Auditor's assurance statement B1-13; regulator return B1-14; signed verification dated 5 Sept 2026.
Limitations/qualifications	The milestone is significant but does not alone prove process-safety or asset-integrity excellence; accompanying barrier, event and integrity evidence is supplied.
Important: A single milestone can be strong evidence, but it does not replace evidence against the complete criteria. LTI-free hours are lagging personal-safety data and should be supported by process-safety, serious-risk, integrity, competence, leadership and learning evidence where relevant.	

5.7 Section 7 - Category-Specific Evidence Checklist

Complete only the checklist for the selected award category. Tick an item only when the corresponding evidence is attached. Equivalent credible evidence may be used when a listed example is unavailable, but explain the substitution in the evidence register or nomination statement.

How to Build the Evidence Pack

- Use the selected category code followed by a sequential number, for example A1-01 or C3-07.
- Put an evidence index at the front of the pack.
- Give every file a descriptive title and date.
- For long documents, identify the exact page, section, table or data field relied upon.
- Redact irrelevant personal, commercially sensitive or security-sensitive data, while retaining enough information for verification.
- Do not alter source records. Explain corrections, revised boundaries or changed definitions.
- Use photographs only with captions stating date, place, activity, relevance and source.
- Use testimonials that identify the writer, relationship, dates and specific outcome; generic praise carries limited evidential value.

Code	Evidence expected	Example of a precise evidence reference
A1 Regulation and oversight	Statutory mandate; approved regulatory plan; issued instruments and consultation; risk-based inspection database; enforcement and closure analysis; compliance trend; independent sector review; stakeholder/inter-agency records; assurance and management review.	A1-10: Audited 2023-2025 compliance trend showing repeat major findings reduced from 22% to 8%, methodology on pp. 4-6.
A2 Advocacy and collaboration	Needs assessment and strategy; technically reviewed materials; accessibility check; attendance/platform analytics; partner records; pre/post survey; observed behaviour or policy change; beneficiary data; evaluation and continuation plan.	A2-11: Six-month follow-up observation showing helmet-use compliance increased from 61% to 87% across three beneficiary sites.
A3 Emergency preparedness, response and recovery	Emergency risk register and plans; role cards; equipment/inspection register; competence matrix; drill or incident logs; response timings; external responder feedback; continuity/recovery results; stakeholder communication; lessons and retest.	A3-17: Corrective-action tracker showing 18 of 18 drill actions closed and independently verified before the June 2026 retest.
B1 Oil and gas	HAZOP/bow-tie/barrier records; PTW and MOC audits; operating-envelope data; integrity plan and overdue analysis; emergency drill; contractor assurance; leadership and competence records; normalised exposure and injury/process-safety trends; verified innovation.	B1-15: 2023-2025 Tier 1/2 event trend with exposure hours, definitions, investigation summaries and 98% action closure.

Code	Evidence expected	Example of a precise evidence reference
B2 Manufacturing	Machine/process risk assessments; guarding and hygiene validation; LOTO, maintenance and MOC records; workforce/contractor competence; consultation; exposure and normalised safety trends; incident learning; drill/continuity tests; verified improvement.	B2-02: Third-party guarding validation for Lines 1-4 confirming closure of 27 high-risk access points.
B3 Construction	Design-risk and constructability records; lift/excavation/temporary-works plans; permit and critical-control verification; contractor prequalification and competence; workforce engagement; hours, LTIFR/TRIR and high-potential event trends; verified innovation.	B3-06: Monthly critical-control verification data for lifting and work at height, 1,240 checks, 96% effective-control rate.
C1 Innovation and contribution	Baseline need and risk study; technical design/calculations; peer review; commissioning and verification; pre/post risk or performance data; maintenance/replication; publication or professional reference.	C1-08: Validated pre/post assessment showing residual risk reduced from 20 (Extreme) to 5 (Low), sustained across 12 months.
C2 Distinguished service and advocacy	Appointments and service records; campaign outputs and reach; adopted practice/policy; stakeholder confirmations; collaboration records; beneficiary/outcome evaluation; succession and continuing legacy.	C2-06: Signed confirmations from three industry bodies showing the nominee's guidance was adopted into member audit protocols.
C3 Impact training and mentoring	Needs assessment and curriculum; reviewed learning materials; observation/quality report; attendance and completion; inclusion support; assessment analysis; supervisor/employer validation; mentoring logs; progression and multiplier evidence.	C3-09: Employer validation showing 78% of participants applied the competence within six months, with a 34% reduction in repeat audit errors.
D1 Leadership commitment	Governance minutes; resource decisions; culture/worker feedback; risk and performance trends; competence framework; development outcomes; partner/stakeholder confirmation; assurance and succession.	D1-02: Board-approved capital allocation linking £450,000 to closure of safety-critical integrity risks, with completion records.
D2 Positive influence	Strategy and professional review; advocacy analytics and participation; partnership agreements/reports; pre/post behaviour or policy evidence; inclusion and ethics records; evaluation, continuation and replication.	D2-08: Approved industry practice note adopted by four partner organisations following

Code	Evidence expected	Example of a precise evidence reference
		the nominee-led collaboration.
D3 Professional development	Competence-gap analysis and programme map; moderated learning materials and QA; learner access/support; assessment and employer validation; qualification/progression; mentoring and trainer approval; evaluation and improvement.	D3-09: Verified record of 42 practitioners progressing to higher-responsibility safety roles within 18 months of programme completion.

5.8 Section 8 - Supporting Evidence Register

List every attachment, even if it is mentioned in the category checklist. The register is the bridge between the claim and the proof. The reference in this table must match the filename or tab in the evidence pack.

Ref	Document/record	Date/period	Claim supported	Independent source
B1-13	Independent assurance of 10 million LTI-free hours	2021-2025	Section 6 milestone; B1 verified performance	XYZ Assurance Ltd
B1-15	Process-safety event and action-closure trend	2023-2025	Section 5 results; B1 process-safety/learning	Internal data; verified by ABC Auditor
B1-17	Benefits-sustainability review	Jun 2025-Jun 2026	Section 5 wider value; innovation sustainability	Client operations review

Weak register entry: "Photos - proof of good safety." Strong entry: "B3-11 - Workforce observation records, Jan-Jun 2026 - supports reporting culture; 1,284 observations and 94% feedback closure - verified by project client."

5.9 Section 9 - Referee or Verifier

Provide a person with direct knowledge of material claims and authority to confirm them. The verifier should be reasonably independent of the person who prepared the nomination. Examples include a regulator, client, auditor, employer, project director, partner organisation, awarding body or competent technical reviewer.

Field	Guidance
Name	Full professional name.
Organisation and position	Enough detail to establish competence and independence.
Email and telephone	Current official details; tell the verifier that NISafetyE may contact them.
Evidence/claims they can verify	Name specific documents, periods and claims, e.g., "Can verify B1-13 and B1-15, including hours, definitions and audit basis."

5.10 Section 10 - Declarations

Read every declaration before signing. By signing, the nominator confirms accuracy, permits verification, discloses scope limitations and accepts that membership, sponsorship, public profile or relationships with NISafetyE do not influence judging. Obtain the nominee's signed consent. Electronic signatures may be used only where permitted by the published submission instructions.

Do not sign on behalf of another person: If nominee consent cannot be obtained before the deadline, contact the Awards Secretariat for direction. Do not fabricate or copy a signature.

5.11 Section 11 - Administrative Review

Leave this section blank. It is reserved for the Awards Secretariat and authorised NISafetyE officials to record receipt, eligibility, category/scope confirmation, completeness, conflict screening, verification needs and the administrative decision.

6 Evidence Quality Standards

Quality test	Question to ask	Good practice
Relevance	Does the document directly support the stated claim or criterion?	Identify the exact claim and page/section.
Authenticity	Is the source identifiable and the record genuine?	Retain signatures, report owners, dates and controlled-document details.
Recency	Does it cover the declared assessment period?	Explain older background evidence and provide current confirmation.
Attribution	Does it show what the nominee contributed?	Separate the nominee's role from team, partner or inherited results.
Completeness	Does it include definitions, denominators and limitations?	Provide methodology, boundaries and missing-data explanation.
Independence	Has an external or separate competent party verified the claim?	Attach assurance, audit, client, regulator or employer confirmation.
Consistency	Do figures and definitions agree across attachments?	Reconcile discrepancies and disclose changes in reporting rules.
Proportionality	Does the claimed impact make sense for the scale and risk context?	Use rates, baselines, population and operational context.

7 Data, Indicators and Fair Comparison

- State the formula and reporting convention for every rate, including the multiplier used.
- Supply exposure hours, workforce/beneficiary population, contractor proportion and operating period where relevant.
- Keep definitions consistent across periods; disclose and reconcile any change.
- Report serious-risk and process-safety information in addition to personal-safety statistics for major-hazard operations.
- Compare performance with the nominee's own baseline and relevant risk context; do not rely only on raw totals or company size.
- Provide enough operational context for judges to compare unlike environments fairly.
- Do not claim causation where the evidence shows only an association. Explain other material factors.

Useful indicator examples: LTIFR/TRIR per defined exposure hours; Tier 1 and Tier 2 process-safety event rates; repeat regulatory non-compliance rate; critical-control verification effectiveness; emergency response and recovery times; competence-assessment improvement; qualification/completion/progression rates; verified campaign behaviour or policy outcomes.

8 Confidentiality, Consent and Sensitive Information

Submit only information that NISafetyE is authorised to receive and process. Remove unnecessary personal identifiers and unrelated confidential information. Where evidence is commercially, legally or security sensitive, provide a suitably redacted copy and explain what was removed. Redaction must not make the central claim unverifiable. Confirm consent for testimonials, photographs and personal data.

9 Common Errors That Weaken a Nomination

- Ticking more than one award category on a single form.
- Describing normal responsibilities rather than a distinctive achievement.
- Providing activity counts without outcomes, such as number trained without competence or workplace impact.
- Using raw LTI-free hours, follower counts or attendance figures without denominator, baseline, definition or verification.
- Submitting generic corporate brochures, certificates or photographs without showing relevance to the criteria.
- Failing to define whether the claim covers the whole organisation, one asset, a project or a programme.
- Using inconsistent dates, totals or reporting boundaries across the form and attachments.
- Leaving material limitations undisclosed.
- Naming an evidence item in the form but failing to attach or index it.
- Providing a referee who cannot independently verify the key claims.
- Relying on NISafetyE membership, sponsorship, prominence, seniority or relationships as support for merit.
- Completing the Administrative Review section.

10 Final Submission Checklist

Check	Confirmation
One official Version 2.0 nomination form is used for one nominee and one category.	☐
Nominator and nominee details are complete and accurate.	☐
One nominee type and one award category are ticked.	☐
The scope, boundaries, locations and assessment period are clearly stated.	☐
The nomination statement addresses challenge, action, results and wider value.	☐
Specific claims cite matching evidence references.	☐
Exceptional statistics include definitions, denominators, boundaries, baselines, serious-risk context and verification.	☐
Only the selected category's evidence checklist is completed.	☐
All attachments are indexed and listed in the Supporting Evidence Register.	☐
Long evidence items include page or section references.	☐
Sensitive information is appropriately authorised or redacted.	☐
A suitable referee/verifier has been informed and their details are correct.	☐
All declarations are read, signed and dated by the appropriate parties.	☐
The official-use section is blank.	☐
The complete form and evidence pack have been reviewed for consistency and submitted by the deadline.	☐

11 File Naming and Submission

Use clear filenames so the submission can be administered without ambiguity. Recommended pattern:

Nomination form: AwardCode_NomineeName_NominationForm_2026.pdf

Evidence pack: AwardCode_NomineeName_EvidencePack_2026.pdf or a clearly indexed folder/ZIP where permitted.

Example: B1_ABC_Energy_Ltd_NominationForm_2026.pdf and B1_ABC_Energy_Ltd_EvidencePack_2026.pdf. Submit both to awards@nisafetye.com by 25 September 2026 and retain proof of submission. Follow any later official delivery instruction.

12 Enquiries

Direct eligibility, category, evidence-format or submission questions to the Awards Secretariat:

Email: awards@nisafetye.com

Website: www.nisafetye.com

The Secretariat may clarify process requirements but cannot write a nomination, guarantee eligibility or predict scores.

Appendix A - Model Nomination Extract

The following abbreviated example illustrates structure only. It must not be copied as a substitute for the nominee's own facts and evidence.

Form part	Illustrative response
Category	B1 - Oil and Gas Safety Engineering Excellence.
Scope	FPSO Alpha onboard employees/contractors, 2023-2025; offices excluded.
Challenge	Three critical controls were inconsistently verified; permit deviation was 14% (B1-02, B1-04).
Action	Standards were reset, barrier owners assigned, checks digitised and permit authorities retrained (B1-02, B1-10, B1-16).
Result	Deviations fell to 3%, overdue barrier actions to 2%, and no Tier 1 event occurred in 7.4 million hours (B1-04, B1-15).
Wider value	Sustained for 18 months, independently assured and replicated on two assets (B1-13, B1-17, B1-18).
Limitation	One contractor health dataset was unavailable; process-safety reporting was unaffected (B1-15, p. 9).