



Satisfaction evaluation of the Green Office (GO) projects in Thailand: A step towards achieving continuous sustainability

Sayam Aroonsrimorakot^{1,2*}, Kampanad Bhaktikul², Meena Laiphrakpam¹, Suthep Mungkun³, Kornkanok Sarapirom⁴ and Piyaruk Pradabphetrat⁵

¹Center for Research Assessment and Certification of Environmental Management, Faculty of Environment and Resource Studies, Mahidol University, Salaya, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand 73170

² Faculty of Environment and Resource Studies, Mahidol University, Salaya, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand 73170

³ Faculty of agriculture technology. Phuket Rajabhat University

⁴Pathum Thani University 140 Soi Ban Klang 4/7, Tambon Ban Klang, Amphoe Mueang Pathum Thani, Chang Wat Pathum Thani 12000, Thailand

⁵ Faculty of Public Health and Allied Health Sciences, Yala Rajabhat University

Abstract

This article aims to evaluate satisfaction with the continuity of the Green Office project's performance and to present an evaluation of the GO projects in Thailand in terms of environmental, economic, and social performance. The study evaluated the operation of twenty activities, such as information on Greenhouse gas emissions, initiatives to publicize the office staff, consumption of water, energy, paper, management of waste, seminars, meetings, procurement, etc., by collecting data from administrators and operators, using a questionnaire from 73 offices during 2015 to 2017. An in-depth interview was also conducted with 25 key respondents. Satisfaction evaluation revealed that 86.0% of operators were satisfied with the staff's knowledge, intelligence, and awareness of the operating steps of GO, followed by satisfaction that participation in the GO project has promoted the staff's quality of work and life (80.82 percent). Also, 90.41% of administrators were satisfied with the view that the GO project increased the knowledge about the GO operation procedure, and 89.04% were satisfied as the GO project has awarded certificate trophies to offices based on the auditing score. Finally concluded that the GO project in Thailand brings satisfaction to offices in terms of economy, society, and the environment.

Keywords: Environment, Green Office Thailand, Satisfaction, Continuity, Sustainability

Article history: Received 13 March 2026, Revised 20 April 2026, Accepted 22 April 2026

1. Introduction

Nowadays, every nook and corner of the world has been experiencing the impact of climate change, which has resulted in lots of discussion among scholars, academicians, and scientists on the global environmental problems, including pollution, increase of the global surface temperature, ozone depletion, reduction of natural resources, etc. [1,2,3].

Careless use of natural resources, and unsustainable ways of mankind, for example, using diesel, petroleum, and other fuels for industrial usage, to drive vehicles, or generate electricity, which release large quantities of Carbon dioxide, cause these negative impacts on the environment [4,5,6]. Consequently, there are operating steps for leading towards sustainability, that pressurize all kinds of

*Corresponding author; e-mail: sayam.aro2560@gmail.com

organizations worldwide to include the element of sustainability in the management and working process, with due consideration of emissions, generated waste and disposal, and energy usage [7, 8, 9], including regions of hot weather like Thailand leading to the reduction of energy usage even by 16.56 percent due to the development of innovative energy saving guidelines in air conditioning systems[10]. The GO Project has been operating continuously under the sponsorship of the Department of Environmental Quality Promotion(DEQP), Thailand to promote sustainability in the daily office operations. Sustainability is composed of three elements, including environmental, economic, and social sustainability [11]. As sustainability has been defined as meeting current needs without compromising the abilities of future generations [12], it is closely related to human activity, which is responsible for significantly intensifying the greenhouse effect [13]. The main issue of environmental sustainability is minimizing the impact of organizational activities on the environment, and identifying the sources of environmental problems with standardized environmental management systems such as ISO 14001 [14]. This standard aims to improve the environmental performance of an organization by following the procedure of evaluation. More specifically, the procedure encompasses auditing, evaluation of performance, etc. [15,16].

Recent studies have also reported on managing and reducing GHG emissions, electricity and water consumption, waste generation, and air pollution [17,18,19]. Minimizing the impact of climate change requires substantial human efforts to achieve reductions in greenhouse gas emissions in the coming decades through changes in our economy, system of production, and consumption behavior [20, 21]. Even though this change focuses mostly on the government and industrial sector, we need changes at the individual, household, and community level

because it has been estimated that 2/3 of the world's emitted GHGs have been caused by people's latent or manifest behavior and practices [22]. Environmental sustainability has become an ethical and strategic imperative for organizations, and more and more employees are interested, encouraged, or instructed to act in environmentally sustainable ways. Consistent with current societal and workplace trends regarding environmental sustainability, there are prominent theoretical frameworks from social and environmental psychology that influence employee green behavior (EGB). This includes the theory of planned behavior, which suggests that people's attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control predict their intentions, resulting in behavior change, such as the use of environmentally sustainable packaging, and an employee's intention to go by public bus [23]. Since many organizations now include environmental sustainability goals in their strategy, organizational scholars and psychologists have increasingly studied employee green behavior (EGB). Characteristics of EGB include a meaningful set of employee behaviors that contribute to the shared organizational goal of promoting environmental sustainability (e.g., creating sustainable products or delivering services in sustainable ways [24]. Thus, employees' behavior can be evaluated in terms of its contribution toward (or detracting from) these goals [25].

So, we need to evaluate factors that help in adopting sustainable behaviors to reduce GHG emissions [26]. It is commonly seen that workplaces worldwide are a major source of carbon emissions, and CO₂ emissions due to energy usage are estimated to increase to 720.5 million tons in the year 2050 from 188.0 million tons in 2010 [27]. So, attitude and behavioral change in energy usage, such as the adoption of energy-saving habits of employees and behavioral interventions in the office environment, a sustainable green management

system (SGMS) saves energy, and also helps to reduce the impact of carbon dioxide emissions on the environment [28,29].

Department of Environmental Quality Promotion (DEQP) Thailand is an organization that assists with projects of good management for environmental sustainability, and one such prominent project is the Green Office (GO). DEQP has developed a criterion, tested it, and evaluated participating offices that meet the criteria to certify as green offices starting in 2013. Gradually, GO upgraded the environmentally safe offices and extended the certification of offices to all kinds of organizations, both public and private, as qualified green office standards. The main aim

of GO is to change office staff's ways of using office resources to save resources for minimizing global warming and other impacts on the environment, which have increased due to the reckless behavior of human beings, that increases GHG emissions without consideration of the natural environment [30]. The green office has been set up to promote sustainable work practices in the office work process through the provision of training and education programs among the office staff to increase environmental awareness on the effects of climate alteration and adopt practices through behavioral changes and usage of innovative energy-saving products [31]. The main elements of the GO Management System, adapted from [12], are given below in Figure 1.



Figure 1. Elements of the Green Office Management System

The working principles of GO practices are designed to minimize generated office waste through situational behavioral changes such as the adoption of sustainable meetings, saving resources such as paper, ink, and energy, recycling office wastes, refraining from using harmful insecticides and chemicals, and promote purchasing of environmentally

friendly office utilities and services [32, 33, 34, 35]. So, all organizations need to pass the GO standards as these will encourage these offices to save resources, reduce generated waste, and if generated waste, recycle it for further usage. This suggests that to qualify for the GO standard, participating offices encourage office staff to minimize the use of

energy, water, and other resources, switch to renewable energy, reduce PM_{2.5} and other impacts due to environmental pollution, promote reusing and recycling waste, consider using innovative eco-friendly office furniture, space, design, and construction [36].

1.2 Research Objectives

The objectives of this research paper are:

- 1) to evaluate satisfaction with the continuity of green office projects' performance
- 2) to present an evaluation of the Green Office projects in Thailand in terms of environmental, economic, and social performance

2. Methodology

The satisfaction of the green offices' project operation in Thailand was evaluated with a focus on the performance procedure of GO under the sponsorship of DEQP in the following ways:

1. Formation of a managerial committee, comprising an auditor, board members, and other team members with a specific responsibility.
2. Preparation and setting up of guidelines for participating offices that apply to get the GO Standards.
3. Organization of operational training program for participating offices on GO operations and how to maintain it continuously.
4. Evaluation and decision for qualifying organizations to be awarded green office standard certificates in different strata in terms of the office's performance on environmental safety and consideration.

The working principles of GO practices are designed to minimize generated office waste through situational behavioral changes such as the adoption of sustainable meetings, saving resources such as paper, ink, and energy,

recycling office wastes, refraining from using harmful insecticides and chemicals, and promote purchasing of environmentally friendly office utilities and services [32, 33, 34, 35]. So, all organizations need to pass the GO standards as these will encourage these offices to save resources, reduce generated waste, and if generated waste, recycle it for further usage. This suggests that to qualify for the GO standard, participating offices encourage office staff to minimize the use of energy, water, and other resources, switch to renewable energy, reduce PM_{2.5} and other impacts due to environmental pollution, promote reusing and recycling waste, consider using innovative eco-friendly office furniture, space, design, and construction [36].

1.2 Research Objectives

The objectives of this research paper are:

- 1) to evaluate satisfaction with the continuity of green office projects' performance
- 2) to present an evaluation of the Green Office projects in Thailand in terms of environmental, economic, and social performance

2. Methodology

The satisfaction of the green offices' project operation in Thailand was evaluated with a focus on the performance procedure of GO under the sponsorship of DEQP in the following ways:

1. Formation of a managerial committee, comprising an auditor, board members, and other team members with a specific responsibility.
2. Preparation and setting up of guidelines for participating offices that apply to get the GO Standards.
3. Organization of operational training program for participating offices on GO operations and how to maintain it continuously.

4. Evaluation and decision for qualifying organizations to be awarded green office standard certificates in different strata in terms

of the office's performance on environmental safety and consideration.

2.1 Green office evaluation criteria

Table 1. Green office evaluation criteria (New)

Criteria
Evaluate specific policies, plan ways of office performance, pattern of resource usage, impart awareness, green office laws, and rules, collect data on GHG, plan for continuous improvement, and administrative section review
Evaluate established channels for communication, awareness, training, knowledge sharing, understanding, publicity, and campaigning
Evaluate energy and other resource consumption
Evaluate steps for minimizing waste and reusing generated waste
Evaluate steps to preserve a safe environment on the usage of air, light, sound, livability, and emergency preparedness
Evaluate office procurement

2.2 Procedure for joining the Green Office Project

Table 2. Procedure for joining the Green Office Project

Step	Procedure
1	Any office can send a completed application form to check the quality of the office and to get the award for the GO project.
2	Submit to the management team of DEQP the introductory document for evaluation
3	If the office is qualified for the introductory evaluation, it should be informed.
4.	All participating office staff should be provided facilities to receive training and education on practicing green office
5.	Visit the office to recommend for improvement
6.	Each area committee should evaluate the performance of applicant offices
7.	The responsible national committee should reevaluate offices that scored 90 percent in all criteria.
8.	The evaluation result of the committee should be summarized in a meeting of DEQP.
9.	Finally, the results of the successful applicants should be announced on DEQP's website

The participant offices were evaluated to check whether they followed the green office's criteria. After the assessment, the result scores were prepared for awarding the GO trophies. Qualified satisfactory offices were awarded the green office trophies, divided into three levels: 1. Gold (90% and above); 2. Silver (80% to 89%); 3. Bronze (60% to 79%). If an office scored less than 60%, it is considered to be unqualified for awarding the trophies [37].

2.3 Tools employed for data collection

This research used many techniques for data collection, notably questionnaires, in-depth interviews, and literature review. Researchers used both primary data (obtained from a questionnaire) and secondary data (obtained by reviewing the literature of previous research) for evaluation. For evaluating the offices that applied for

certification as qualified GO standards, data was collected during the years 2015 to 2017. The main tool used for collecting data was a mail questionnaire set in the Thai language, as it is a convenient tool for collecting data for a large sample size. The questionnaire was prepared according to the objectives of the research. The questionnaire was divided into two parts, one for operators and the other for administrators, with questions set to examine the status, continuity, benefit, and satisfaction of the GO project. The questionnaire was sent to 207 certified green offices. However, only 73 (35%) offices responded and returned the completed questionnaire. Details of the questionnaire can be seen in Tables 5 and 6. In this study, there was consideration to recruiting only those green offices that have been certified with gold and silver trophies, who have knowledge and awareness about the operating steps of GO, and who could spare time to provide answers to questions of in-depth interviews. 25 key respondents having in-depth knowledge of the procedure and working process of the GO were contacted, and a scheduled time and place for an in-depth interview were fixed. The target objective of evaluating the GO was to find out whether the respondents were satisfied with the working process and continuity of the GO. The selected in-depth interviewees consisted of administrators and working groups. The selected sample respondents for in-depth interview were divided into four groups in terms of area size, such as 1) very large areas above 50,000 square meters (2 agencies were recruited), 2) large areas having 12,500-50,000 square meters (9 agencies were from this group), and 3) small areas having less than 1,500 square meters (5 agencies were from this group). Department of Environment Quality Promotion has given 21 agencies the gold award and 4 agencies the silver award.

2.4 Steps for the evaluation of the Green Office Project operation

The GO research project was evaluated stepwise, as shown below in Table 3.

The participant offices were evaluated to check whether they followed the green office's criteria. After the assessment, the result scores were prepared for awarding the GO trophies. Qualified satisfactory offices were awarded the green office trophies, divided into three levels: 1. Gold (90% and above); 2. Silver (80% to 89%); 3. Bronze (60% to 79%). If an office scored less than 60%, it is considered to be unqualified for awarding the trophies [37].

2.3 Tools employed for data collection

This research used many techniques for data collection, notably questionnaires, in-depth interviews, and literature review. Researchers used both primary data (obtained from a questionnaire) and secondary data (obtained by reviewing the literature of previous research) for evaluation. For evaluating the offices that applied for certification as qualified GO standards, data was collected during the years 2015 to 2017. The main tool used for collecting data was a mail questionnaire set in the Thai language, as it is a convenient tool for collecting data for a large sample size. The questionnaire was prepared according to the objectives of the research. The questionnaire was divided into two parts, one for operators and the other for administrators, with questions set to examine the status, continuity, benefit, and satisfaction of the GO project. The questionnaire was sent to 207 certified green offices. However, only 73 (35%) offices responded and returned the completed questionnaire. Details of the questionnaire can be seen in Tables 5 and 6. In this study, there was consideration to recruiting only those green offices that have been certified with gold and silver trophies, who have knowledge and awareness about the operating steps of GO, and who could spare time to provide answers to questions of in-depth interviews. 25 key respondents having in-depth knowledge of the procedure and working

process of the GO were contacted, and a scheduled time and place for an in-depth interview were fixed. The target objective of evaluating the GO was to find out whether the respondents were satisfied with the working process and continuity of the GO. The selected in-depth interviewees consisted of administrators and working groups. The selected sample respondents for in-depth interview were divided into four groups in terms of area size, such as 1) very large areas above 50,000 square meters (2 agencies were

recruited), 2) large areas having 12,500-50,000 square meters (9 agencies were from this group), and 3) small areas having less than 1,500 square meters (5 agencies were from this group). Department of Environment Quality Promotion has given 21 agencies the gold award and 4 agencies the silver award.

2.4 Steps for the evaluation of the Green Office Project operation

The GO research project was evaluated stepwise, as shown below in Table 3.

Table 3. Stepwise evaluation of the Green office project

Step	Procedure
1	Reviewed and specified the product as the target of the green office criteria
2	Selected the criteria that affect quantitatively
3	Classified the result into the dimensions of economic, social, and environmental
4.	Specified the quantitative result assessment guideline
5.	Calculated the result on each dimension
6.	Compared the result as a unit of economic value
7.	Summed the result up as the total benefit of the project
8.	Evaluated the worthiness of the project

2.5 Background of Financial Proxy Data.

There were two major steps of the Green Office Project operation, namely, giving suggestions and knowledge, and evaluation of the criteria of auditing set up by the audit committee under the sponsorship of DEQP, which financed the operating budget of the Green Office Project, divided into the following budget types:

1. Auditing and registration of the audit committee in the Project.
2. Organizing meetings of the audit committee.
3. Advisors who provide suggestions for improving the green office criteria

4. Auditing offices that have participated in the GO project

Activities of the GO project were evaluated by examining participants' comments given in the GO operation form. The data obtained from these participants of the GO project, which consisted of both quantitative and qualitative data, was analyzed accordingly in a systematic way, including background of previous data, measurement of indicators of GO, and monetization of Financial Proxy (FP). FP was calculated by multiplying the carbon credit cost by the reduced quantity of GHGs, and the result obtained can help decrease the budget allocated for GHG management. Table 4 provides the background of the data listed as an FP.

Table 4. Background of FP data.

Item	unit	mean	min	max
Average rate of water supply cost	m ³	27.50	21.75	29.75
Electricity price per unit	kWh	4.10	3.80	4.50

Item	unit	mean	min	max
Diesel price (2017)	Liter	25.56	21.89	26.79
Gasohol price (2017)	Liter	26.89	24.78	27.98
Paper price (A4)	Ream	120	100	140
Waste management cost	Kg	2	1	6
Wastewater treatment cost for an office size of more than 100 square meters	m ³	4.00	2.00	6.00
The ratio of consumed raw water per water supply, including water leakage in the pipe	m ³	1.44	1.29	1.55
Recycle material price (average)	kg	4.5	3.5	8.95
Training expenditure on the course of Carbon footprint operation(CFO)	Half course	5,000	5,000	5,000
Electricity bill of air purifier for a room size of 60 square meters (Baht/20 staff)	Half year	3,700	2,000	4,000
Training cost for general environmental awareness per person	person	250	100	800
Average Carbon credit price of the T-VERS project (2017)	tCO ₂ e	30	21	100
Water supply cost	m ³	0.15	0.10	0.40

Source: Aroonsrimorakot et al. [30]

The compensation of the GO Project, divided into three dimensions, namely, economic, social, and environmental, was evaluated. From this result, as given in Table 7,

the estimated benefit was obtained. The GO project activities were evaluated to check the benefit/ worthiness of the project, which was calculated by using the formula given in (1).

$\text{The worthiness of the GO Project} = \frac{\text{Benefit-Cost}}{\text{Investment}} \quad (1)$

3. Results and Discussion

The results of the study of the Satisfaction Evaluation of GO Projects in Thailand are discussed in the following headlines:

1. Evaluation to assess satisfaction with the Green Office Project
2. Quantitative evaluation result of the Green Office project
- 3.1 Evaluation to assess satisfaction in the Green Office Project

An evaluation to assess the satisfaction of participants was conducted to investigate the obtained benefits and the opinions of respondents in the operation of future projects. To assess satisfaction in different strata from the office that participates in the GO Project, data were collected from two categories, that is, operators and administrators of the participating offices in the project (Table 5 and Table 6), which contained statements listed to identify the level of satisfaction of respondents from the three categories, namely, High, Medium, and Low.

Table 5. Evaluation for operators to assess contentment in the green office steps

The green office operation steps	Level of satisfaction in percent		
	High	Medium	Low
1. Project publicity, advertising, and an invitation to any offices for participation	47.95	<u>50.68</u>	1.37
2. The office responds to the invitation by sending a completed document of the first round self-assessment form	58.90	39.73	1.37
3. Interested office joins the green office training program	56.16	38.36	5.48
4. GO team visit and provide recommendation criteria for improvement	61.64	31.51	<u>6.85</u>
5. Evaluation of the GO in terms of area by the national committee	72.60	24.66	2.74
6. Based on the evaluation result, the national GO auditors certify offices	<u>79.45</u>	17.81	1.37
7. When the evaluation is concluded, list offices that are qualified and give trophy awards based on the result score	78.08	19.18	2.74
8. Suitability of the duration of the GO project	58.90	35.62	5.48
9. Satisfied with the staff's knowledge, intelligence, and awareness of the operating steps of GO	<u>86.30</u>	12.33	1.37
10. Participation in the GO project led to behavioral changes in staff	76.71	23.29	0.00
11. Participation in the GO project has increased the staff's work efficiency	68.49	30.14	1.37
12. Participation in the GO project resulted in saving resources and reduction of resource consumption	63.01	<u>34.25</u>	2.74
13. Participation in the GO project has promoted the staff's quality of work and life	80.82	17.81	1.37
14. Participation in the GO project trained the office staff to improve continuously to create a sustainable environment at all times	72.60	23.29	<u>5.48</u>
15. To check the efficiency of the GO work procedure and resource consumption, it is essential to collect office operation data continuously	75.34	24.66	0.00

Table 6. Satisfaction evaluation result of administrators in the green office project operation

The green office operation steps	Satisfaction Level in percent		
	High	Medium	Low
1. Joining the GO project provided knowledge to my office about the GO operation procedure	<u>90.41</u>	6.85	0.00
2. The GO project has awarded certificate trophies to my office based on the auditing score	89.04	8.22	0.00
3. The GO project has provided a policy for continuous improvement of the office	84.93	12.33	0.00

The green office operation steps	Satisfaction Level in percent		
	High	Medium	Low
4. Like the policy for renewing the GO certification for improving the office continuously	68.49	<u>17.81</u>	<u>9.59</u>
5. To check the efficiency and improvement of the GO work procedure and resource consumption, it is essential to collect office operation data continuously by the concerned GO team	83.56	13.70	0.00

3.2 Quantitative evaluation result of the

Green Office project

The data of the GO operation were evaluated according to the criteria given in Table 1. Results of the GO project operation were converted into an improvement compensation value. The total compensation

value obtained from the evaluation was 299.00 million Baht, which is 1.4 million Baht per office per year. On dividing the compensation into three dimensions, it was found that 262.5 million Baht was spent on economic compensation, 28.5 million Baht on social compensation, and only 7.55 million Baht was for environmental compensation. The detailed values are given in Table 7.

Table 7. Quantitative evaluation of the GO project (2015-2017)

No.	Category Activities	Results	Evaluation guidelines	Quantitative result	Unit	Compensation)Baht(		
						Economic	Social	Environmental
1	Information on GHG	Increased ability to evaluate GHG emissions of the office	To reduce GHG by calculating GHG quantity	207	person	--	1,035,000	--
2	Initiatives to publicize the staff	Increased awareness and participation of staff	To provide training and education for behavioral change of staff	54,980	person	--	27,490,473	--
3	Consumption of Water	Quantity of water consumption reduced	To save water and reduce the bill	640,247	m ³	17,606,786	--	--
4	Consumption of water	Quantity of water consumption reduced	To save water and reduce GHG emission	513	tCO ₂ e	--	--	15,377
5	Consumption of water	Quantity of water consumption reduced	To reduce water consumption	923,236	m ³	--	--	138,485
6	Consumption of energy	Quantity of energy consumption reduced	To reduce electricity bill	49,351,000	kWh	202,338,907	--	--
7	Consumption of energy	Quantity of energy consumption reduced	To reduce GHG emission from electrical appliance	30,100	tCO ₂ e	--	--	902,086
8	Consumption of energy	Quantity of fuel oil	To reduce fuel bill	503,000	Liter	12,855,696	--	--

No.	Category Activities	Results	Evaluation guidelines	Quantitative result	Unit	Compensation)Baht(		
						Economic	Social	Environmental
		consumption reduced						
9	Consumption of energy	Quantity of diesel oil consumption reduced	To reduce GHG emissions from fuel consumption	1,381	tCO ₂ e	--	--	41,419
10	Consumption of energy	Quantity of gasohol consumption reduced	To reduce expenses on fuel consumption	6,680	Liter	179,693	--	--

Source: Aroonsrimorakot et al. [30]

Table 7. Quantitative evaluation of the GO project (2015-2017)*Continued*

No.	Category Activities	Result	Evaluation guideline	Quantitative result	Unit	Compensation)Baht(		
						Economic	Social	Environmental
11	Consumption of energy	Quantity of gasohol and other fuel consumption reduced	To reduce GHG emissions from fuel consumption	15.2	tCO ₂ e	--	--	456
12	Consumption of paper	Quantity of paper consumption per unit reduced	To reduce paper consumption	558,617	Kg	26,813,656	--	--
13	Consumption of paper	Quantity of paper consumption per unit reduced	To reduce GHG emissions from paper consumption	2,913	tCO ₂ e	--	--	78,335
14	Consumption of paper	Quantity of paper consumption per unit reduced	To reduce GHG emissions	63.1	tCO ₂ e	--	--	1,893
15	Seminar, meeting, and other arrangement	Quantity of paper consumption for meeting reduced	Switched to Online meeting to reduce GHG emission	15.7	tCO ₂ e	--	--	472
16	Management of waste	Quantity of generated waste reduced, reused, and recycled	To reduce the cost of eliminating waste	413	ton	827,344	--	--
17	Management of waste	Quantity of recycled and reused products increased	Giving compensation for purchasing reused and recycled products	413	ton	1,861,525	--	--
18	Management of waste	The quantity of generated waste reduced	To reduce GHG emission by separating leftover food	195,200	tCO ₂ e	--	--	5,856,640
19	Management of office equipment	The source of air pollution in the office is not	To improve sanitation and reduce air	139.1	Machine/year	--	--	514,662

No.	Category Activities	Result	Evaluation guideline	Quantitative result	Unit	Compensation)Baht(		
						Economic	Social	Environmental
		due to usage of the office equipment	pollution by using air-purifier					
20	Procurement	Sustainable procurement increased	To reduce GHG emissions by purchasing eco-friendly products such as:	142.58	tCO ₂ e	--	--	4,277
			- paper	104	tCO ₂ e	--	--	3,125
			- envelope	15.5	tCO ₂ e	--	--	465
			- office file	3.14	tCO ₂ e	--	--	94
			- ink cartridge	19.2	tCO ₂ e	--	--	576
			- tissue paper	0.59	tCO ₂ e	--	--	18
Total						262,483,609	28,525,473	7,552,056

Source: Aroonsrimorakot et al. [30]

The analysis of the data from in-depth interviews revealed that each has at least one responsible person who took responsibility for the operation of the GO project. Also, every participating office formed a responsible committee, who were assigned responsibilities, criteria of auditing, and performance in meetings organized periodically. Each committee of an office has at least 10 members, and the average days to complete the certification process is 30 days per office. On analysis of Table 7, it was found that the total budget for the GO Project operation was 5.1 million baht per year, which was 15.3 million Baht in total for operating three years, that is, 2015, 2016, 2017, and the equivalent budget per office was 72, 440 Baht. However, expenses for replacing old office items with new ones and other office materials were excluded from evaluation. The worthiness of the project was calculated as given in equation (1). The obtained value after calculation was 18.5, and the median value ranges from 15.6 to 22.6. Excluding electricity cost, the cost value was found to be decreased, and if the quantity of paper consumption increased, the amount of compensation also increased to 69.4 million Baht. The mean value of the GO budget was 3.54.

4. Summary and Conclusions

This study aimed to evaluate satisfaction with the continuity of green office

projects' performance and to present an evaluation of the Green Office projects in Thailand in terms of economic, social, and environmental activities. The GO Project has been operating continuously under the sponsorship of the Department of Environmental Quality Promotion, Thailand to promote sustainability in the daily office operations. The evaluation of the current research was undertaken for a period of three years, from 2015 to 2017. The total budget sanctioned for this project was 15.28 million Baht. The study evaluated the operation of twenty activities listed in Table 7, such as information on Greenhouse gas emissions, initiatives to publicize the office staff, consumption of water, consumption of energy, consumption of paper, management of waste, seminars, meetings, and other arrangements, procurement, etc. The operating budget of the GO project consisted of economic, social, and environmental costs. 89.0 percent of the total budget was for economic activities such as expenses on energy and other resources used directly and indirectly, while 9.0 percent of the budget was sanctioned for social activities, including training, seminars, meetings, etc., for sharing knowledge and developing awareness among the staff. Lastly, 2.0 percent of the GO budget was spent on environmental activities.

Regarding the satisfaction of the GO operation among operators, a high proportion of participants (86.30 percent) were satisfied with

the staff's knowledge, intelligence, and awareness of the operating steps of GO, followed by satisfaction that participation in the GO project has promoted staff's quality of work and life (80.82 percent), satisfaction on the evaluation result of the national GO auditors certifying offices (79.45 percent), and satisfaction that participation in the GO project led to behavioral changes of staff (76.71 percent). Similarly, on evaluation of the satisfaction of administrators in the green office project operation, most administrators were satisfied with the view that joining the GO project provided knowledge to their office about the GO operation procedure (90.41 percent), followed by the view that the GO project has awarded certificate trophies to offices based on auditing score (89.04 percent). Based on this satisfaction evaluation, it can be concluded that

- The majority of the participant administrators have high satisfaction with the view that the GO project provided knowledge to my office about the GO operation procedure (90.41%)
- The majority of the participant administrators have high satisfaction with the statement that the GO project has awarded certificate trophies to offices based on auditing score (89.04%)
- The majority of the participant administrators have high satisfaction with the statement that the GO project has provided a policy for continuous improvement of the office (84.93%)
- The majority of the participant operators have high satisfaction with the staff's knowledge, intelligence, and awareness of the operating steps of GO (86.30%)
- The majority of the participant operators have high satisfaction that participation in the GO project has promoted staff's quality of work and life (80.82 %)
- The majority of the participant operators have high satisfaction, which is based on the evaluated result, the national GO auditors certify offices as GO (79.45%)

- The majority of the participant operators have high satisfaction that when the evaluation is completed and finalized, qualified offices are listed, and then award trophies based on the result score (78.08 %)

On the evaluation of the GO project in Thailand in terms of economic, social, and environmental compensation, the result shows that the total compensation value obtained from the evaluation was 299.00 million Baht, which is 1.4 million Baht per office per year. On dividing the compensation into three dimensions, it was found that 262.5 million Baht was spent on economic compensation, 28.5 million Baht on social compensation, and only 7.55 million Baht was for environmental compensation. The above result also shows a massive reduction in the consumption of energy, paper, other office resources, and generated waste, which is an indirect outcome of each office's adoption of resource-saving measures, and these measures directly or indirectly cause an impact on sustainability on the economy, society, and the environment. In the end, it can be concluded that the result of the performance evaluation of the GO Project in Thailand reveals that participation in the GO Project brings satisfaction to offices in terms of economy, society, and the environment. Adoption of GO activities promotes sustainability through behavioral changes, which indirectly leads to the reduction of consumption of natural resources. On the whole, certifying an office with the Green Office Standard is essential to save resources for achieving a sustainable environment. Finally, the study suggested that the GO project should get support and approval as a national policy from the government in the years to come for the continual development of the GO Thailand standard at the international level.

References

- [1] M. Kabir, U.E. Habiba, W. Khan, A. Shah, S. Rahim, R. Patricio, ... & M. Shafiq. Climate change due to increasing concentration of

- carbon dioxide and its impacts on the environment in the 21st century: a mini review. *Journal of King Saud University-Science*, 35(5) (2023) 102693-102699.
- [2] S. Celik. The effects of climate change on human behaviors. In: S. Fahad, M. Hasanuzzaman, M. Alam., H. Ullah, M. Saeed, I.A.Khan, M. Adnan (Eds). *Environment, climate, plant and vegetation growth*. Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany: Springer; (2020), 577-589.
- [3] P.W. Barnes, C.E. Williamson, R.M. Lucas, S.A. Robinson, S. Madronich, N.D. Paul, ... & R.G. Zepp. Ozone depletion, ultraviolet radiation, climate change and prospects for a sustainable future. *Nature Sustainability*, 2(7) (2019) 569-579.
- [4] J. Wang & W. Azam. Natural resource scarcity, fossil fuel energy consumption, and total greenhouse gas emissions in top emitting countries. *Geoscience Frontiers*, 15(2) (2024) 101757-101771.
- [5] I. Marin-Beltran, F. Demaria, C. Ofelio, L.M.Serra, A. Turiel, W.J. Ripple ... & M.C. Costa. Scientists' warning against the society of waste. *Science of The Total Environment*, 811, (2022) 151359-151372.
- [6] R.L. Singh & P.K. Singh. Global Environmental Problems. In: Singh, R. (Eds.) *Principles and Applications of Environmental Biotechnology for a Sustainable Future* (2017) (pp.13-41). Part of the "Applied Environmental Science and Engineering for a Sustainable Future" book series. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-1866-4_2
- [7] D. Mathivathanan, V. Agarwal, K. Mathiyazhagan, T. Saikouk & A. Appolloni. Modeling the pressures for sustainability adoption in the Indian automotive context. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 342 (2022) 130972-130984.
- [8] U. Dhanda & V.K. Shrotryia. Corporate sustainability: the new organizational reality. Qualitative research in organizations and management: An International Journal, 16(3/4) (2021) 464-487.
- [9] M.A. Mustapha, Z.A. Manan & S.R.W. Alwi. Sustainable Green Management System (SGMS)—An integrated approach towards organisational sustainability. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 146 (2017) 158-172.
- [10] C. Panraluk & A. Sreshthaputra. Developing guidelines for thermal comfort and energy saving during hot season of multipurpose senior centers in Thailand. *Sustainability*, 12(1) (2019) 170-196.
- [11] H. Li, V. Nitivattananon & P. Li. Developing a sustainability assessment model to analyze China's municipal solid waste management enhancement strategy. *Sustainability*, 7(2) (2015) 1116-1141.
- [12] World Commission on Environment and Development. Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our common future 1987; <http://www.un-documents.net/wced-ocf.htm>
- [13] A. Mikhaylov, N. Moiseev, K. Aleshin, & T. Burkhardt. Global climate change and greenhouse effect. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 7(4) (2020) 2897-2913.
- [14] H. Gmelin & S. Seuring. Determinants of a sustainable new product development. *Journal of Cleaner production*, 69 (2014) 1-9.
- [15] S.A. Melnyk, R.P. Sroufe, & R. Calantone. Assessing the impact of environmental management systems on corporate and environmental performance. *Journal of Operations Management*, 21(3), (2003) 329-351.
- [16] T. Tibor & I. Feldman. ISO 14000: a guide to the new environmental management standards. (1996) Chicago: Irwin; P. 237.
- [17] A. Konya & P. Nematzadeh. Recent applications of AI to environmental disciplines: A review. *Science of The Total Environment*, 906 (2024) 167705 -167718.
- [18] K. Ali, N. Kausar & M. Amir. Impact of pollution prevention strategies on environment sustainability: role of environmental management accounting and environmental proactivity. *Environmental*

- Science and Pollution Research, 30(38) (2023) 88891-88904.
- [19] A. Naderipour, Z. Abdul-Malek, R.N.Arshad, H. Kamyab, S. Chelliapan, V. Ashokkumar, & J. Tavalaei. Assessment of carbon footprint from transportation, electricity, water, and waste generation: towards utilisation of renewable energy sources. *Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy*, 23 (2021) 183-201.
- [20] K. Abbass, M.Z. Qasim, H. Song, M. Murshed, H. Mahmood & I. Younis. A review of the global climate change impacts, adaptation, and sustainable mitigation measures. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 29(28) (2022) 42539-42559.
- [21] A. Spence & N. Pidgeon. Psychology, climate change & sustainable behaviour. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 51(6) (2009) 8-18.
- [22] K. Williamson, A. Satre-Meloy, K. Velasco & K. Green. Climate change needs behavior change: Making the case for behavioral solutions to reduce global warming (p. 1-55) (2018) Rare: Arlington, VA, USA.
- [23] A.Yuriev & W. Sierra-Barón. Exploring sustainability cross-culturally: Employees' beliefs on green behaviors. *Sustainable Development*, 28(5) (2020) 1199-1207.
- [24] H. Zacher, C.W. Rudolph, & I.M. Katz. Employee green behavior as the core of environmentally sustainable organizations. *Annual review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior*, 10(1) (2020) 465-494.
- [25] D.S. Ones, S. Dilchert, B.M. Wiernik & R. M. Klein. Environmental sustainability at work. *The SAGE handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology*, 3 (2018) 351-373.
- [26] A.T. Ngo G.E. West & P.H. Calkins. Determinants of environmentally responsible behaviours for greenhouse gas reduction. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 33(2) (2009) 151-161.
- [27] A. Q. Al-Amin, R. Rasiah & S. Chenayah. Prioritizing climate change mitigation: an assessment using Malaysia to reduce carbon emissions in the future. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 50 (2015) 24-33.
- [28] C. H. V. Chen & Y. C. Chen. Assessment of enhancing employee engagement in energy-saving behavior at workplace: an empirical study. *Sustainability*, 13(5) (2021) 2457-2474.
- [29] S.C. Staddon, C. Cycil, M. Goulden, C. Leygue & A. Spence. Intervening to change behavior and save energy in the workplace: A systematic review of available evidence. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 17 (2016) 30-51.
- [30] S. Aroonsrimorakot, M. Laiphrakpam & W. Paisantanakij. Impacts of green office projects in Thailand: An evaluation consistent with sustainable development goals (SDGs). *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 13(4) (2020) 164-177.
- [31] S. Aroonsrimorakot, M. Laiphrakpam, & C. Korattana. Green office, its features and importance for sustainable environmental management: A comparative review in search for similarities and differences. *Interdisciplinary Research Review*, 14(5) (2019) 31-38.
- [32] N. Wichai-utcha & O. Chavalparit. 3Rs Policy and plastic waste management in Thailand. *Journal of Material Cycles and Waste Management*, 21(1) (2019) 10-22.
- [33] S. Aroonsrimorakot. Green Office Management Standard in Mahidol University, Thailand. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 26(4) (2018) 2505-2521.
- [34] I.S. Zen, D. Subramaniam, H. Sulaiman, W. Omar & M.R. Salim. Institutionalize waste minimization governance towards campus sustainability: A case study of Green Office initiatives in Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 135 (2016) 1407-1422.
- [35] World Wide Fund. Green Office Environmental Management System for

Sustainable Organisations, Achievements and Activities in 2010. World Wide Fund. p.5. Retrieved July 30, 2022, from <https://wwf.fi/mediabank/1414.pdf>

- [36]S. Aroonsrimorakot & K. Sarapirom, K. The development of green office standard: Thailand initiative. Interdisciplinary Research Review, 15(2) (2020) 8-18.

- [37]Department of Environmental Quality Promotion. G-green award. Department of Environmental Quality Promotion (DEQP). Retrieved August 1, 2019, from <http://www.datacenter.deqp.go.th/service-portal/g-green/thailandggreenaward2019/>