



ONE PLANET CITY CHALLENGE

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA INTERPRETATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS



CONTENTS

1. The OPCC in a nutshell	4
2. Why an interpretations and assumptons booklet?	5
3. Key interpretations and assumptions	6

This document contains key interpretations and assumptions for selected pre-screening scoring questions and complements the instructions found on OPCC’s Candidates Booklet and CDP and ICLEI’s unified reporting system website.

The 2019-2020 One Planet City Challenge (OPCC) is open to cities in many countries across the globe. If you would like your country to be added to the list, let us know by sending a message to opcc@wwf.se.

Contributors

Editor in chief: Tabaré A. Currás (WWF-Sweden).

Principal writer: Stephanie Robson and Laura Frost (ARUP).

Cover photo: Global Warming Images / WWF

CONTACT INFORMATION

Questions? Please contact your national WWF office or WWF’s international OPCC Core Team (at opcc@wwf.se) for general questions about the OPCC.

Technical questions related to CDP’s reporting platform should be directed to CDP at cities@cdp.net.

Other kind of technical support questions should be directed to ICLEI at carbonn@iclei.org.

ONE PLANET CITY CHALLENGE

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA INTERPRETATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

THE OPCC IN A NUTSHELL

The One Planet City Challenge (OPCC) is a biennial competition organised by the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) to guide cities towards effective climate action, while publicly recognising the most ambitious cities as leaders in the field.

The OPCC aims to develop and disseminate climate mitigation and adaptation best practices. In this respect, the OPCC invites cities to:

- Report ambitious climate commitments, in line with the Paris Agreement and the goal of not exceeding 1.5 °C global warming; and
- Report ambitious, cross-cutting, inclusive big-win climate action plans that deliver on those commitments.

This year, for the first time, participating cities have been assessed on how their efforts align with the Paris Agreement and the stated goal of a maximum of 1.5 °C of global warming. Participants have also received guidance on big-win actions to help them get there. Given the importance of energy and buildings to help a city move towards 1.5 °C alignment, WWF has also provided cities with support tools focused on these areas, including webinars, tips and guidance. In some cases, national WWF offices may have provided additional guidance on for example, consumption-based emissions or transportation.

To participate in the OPCC, cities are required to report their climate ambitions through CDP and ICLEI's unified reporting system and enter data through CDP's platform¹. The OPCC data requirement is fully aligned with the Common Reporting Framework of the Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy (GCoM). This means that cities can meet the GCoM reporting requirements by participating in the OPCC, and vice versa.

The OPCC has grown steadily since its inception in 2012. By last count more than 582 cities from 53 countries on 6 continents participated at least once in the OPCC.

¹ In previous rounds, cities reported their climate ambitions through ICLEI's carbonn Climate Registry (cCR). CDP and ICLEI are partnering to present one unified process for subnational climate action reporting. Beginning in April 2019, local and regional governments will only have to report once on CDP's platform.

WHY AN ASSESSMENT CRITERIA INTERPRETATION AND ASSUMPTIONS BOOKLET?

OPCC participating cities will complete a pre-screening questionnaire through CDP and ICLEI's unified reporting system². To minimise the reporting burden, the data request is aligned with the Common Reporting Framework of the Global Covenant of Mayors (GCoM)³. Data collected through the platform will be checked and validated at this stage.

The data submitted by the cities will be assessed against the pre-screening scoring matrix. This focuses on carbon reduction targets, greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories and climate action plans. This automated process is designed not only to highlight the best performers, but also to provide feedback to each participating city suggesting how it can develop its climate ambition and action. The top performers in each country will be shortlisted and taken forward.

Whilst developing the scoring formulae for cities data submissions, the scoring methodology and criteria required interpretation where it was not specific to the submitted data, and in some cases assumptions were a prerequisite. This booklet details each of the scoring criteria where a key interpretation or assumption was needed in order to attribute proper scoring. The next section details these key interpretations and assumptions for selected pre-screening scoring questions.

² In previous rounds, cities reported their climate ambitions through ICLEI's carbonn Climate Registry (cCR). CDP and ICLEI are partnering to present one unified process for subnational climate action reporting. Beginning in April 2019, local and regional governments will only have to report once on CDP's platform. Publicly reported data will be automatically shared with ICLEI.

³ For more information, please refer to Global Covenant of Mayors Common Reporting Framework in the following link: <https://bit.ly/2wRn1wf>

KEY INTERPRETATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

INDICATOR & SCORING CRITERIA	KEY INTERPRETATIONS OR ASSUMPTIONS RELATING TO SCORING CALCULATION
Mayor/city leader letter of commitment Signed letter provided (5)	Attached files under Q0.2 were manually verified. All Global Covenant of Mayors (GCoM) member cities (according to list provided by WWF) were assumed to score max 5 points.
GHG stacked targets towards neutrality 1.5-degree compliant based on modelling: yes (2.5)	Only targets covering 'all emissions in the city inventory' are assessed for this question.
GHG stacked targets towards neutrality Ambition: more than country NDC (5)	Only targets covering 'all emissions in the city inventory' are assessed for this question. 'Do not know' responses are scored as zero points.
GHG targets aligned with trajectory based on fair-share budget 2030 target: aligned (10) 2050 target: aligned (10)	Only targets covering 'all emissions in the city inventory' are assessed for this question. Where a city has reported more than one type of target, the most ambitious target is selected.
Electricity targets towards neutrality Yes - Percentage: 25% (1), 50% (1.5), 100% (2.5)	Only city-wide targets are scored. Where a city has reported more than one city-wide target, only the most ambitious target (i.e. highest %) is scored.
Electricity targets towards neutrality Yes - Scale: local government (1), city-wide (2.5)	City needs at least one target matching scale criteria to be awarded the points.
Energy efficiency targets towards neutrality Yes - Percentage: 25% (1), 50% (1.5), 100% (2.5)	Only city-wide targets are scored. Where a city has reported more than one city-wide target, only the most ambitious target (i.e. highest %) is scored.
Energy efficiency targets towards neutrality Yes - Scale: local government (1), city-wide (2.5)	City needs at least one target matching scale criteria to be awarded the points.
Adaptation goals and milestones towards a climate resilient city Period: short- (1), mid- (1.5), long-term (2.5) target	Short-term is considered to be anything <2025. Medium term targets are considered to be those falling between 2025 and 2029. Long term targets should be in 2030 or beyond.
Adaptation goals and milestones towards a climate resilient city National alignment: No (1), Yes - but it exceeds its scale or requirements (2), Yes (2.5)	'Do not know' responses are scored as zero points.
Inventory provided Inventory attached (1)	Non-zero responses to the 'Document title and attachment' response column are assumed to meet the scoring criteria of 'inventory provided'.
Inventory status Inventory: no but intending (2), in progress (3), yes (5)	Blank responses and 'not intending to undertake' responses are both scored zero.
Scope of emissions considered Scope: scope 1 (1), scope 1 and 2 (2), scope 3 (5)	City needs to have reported at least the following number of sectors within each scope to meet the criteria for having reported that scope of emissions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope 1: Three out of a possible five (CRF) or six (GPC) sectors • Scope 2: Two out of a possible five (CRF) or two (GPC) sectors • Scope 3: Two out of a possible five (CRF) or three (GPC) sectors

INDICATOR & SCORING CRITERIA	KEY INTERPRETATIONS OR ASSUMPTIONS RELATING TO SCORING CALCULATION
Boundary of assessment Boundary: smaller (1), partial (2), same or larger (3) than city boundary	If the city has not answered this question for any of the assessments it names in its submission, or if it has not named any climate change risk/vulnerability assessments in Q2.0b, it scores zero.
Areas/sectors covered Sectors: 1 (1), 2-3 (1.5), 3+ but not all (2), all (3)	If the city's climate change risk/vulnerability assessments are not identified to cover any sectors, or the city has not named/submitted any assessment, then the city scores zero.
Identification of vulnerable populations Yes (3)	If none of the city's climate change risk/vulnerability assessments identify vulnerable populations, or the city has not named/submitted any assessment, then the city scores zero.
Impact of hazards Impact: one (1), two (2), three (3.5) or all (5) of probability, consequence, frequency, intensity identified for each hazard	Information used from the questions is slightly more specific in phrasing. Scoring relates to whether for each of the hazards identified, the city has reported on the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • current probability • current consequence • future change in frequency • future change in intensity 'Do not know' responses are considered the same as blank responses. The city must have identified the impacts above for every hazard identified to fulfil the scoring criteria - i.e. for every blank or 'do not know' response against hazards in each of the above categories, the city fails that part of the scoring test. For example, if city has not reported current probability for all hazards identified, it is deemed not to have identified current probability and therefore cannot score full marks. If fails to identify each of the impacts for any hazard identified, it scores zero overall.
Future impact description Yes for all hazards (1)	Non-blank responses to Q2.1 column 12 ('Please describe the impacts experienced so far, and how you expect the hazard to impact in the future') all score a point - there is no assessment of the qualitative merit of the response provided.
Climate action or energy access plan Plan attached (2.5)	Non-blank responses to the 'Publication title and attach document' response column are assumed to meet the scoring criteria of 'plan attached'.
Stage of implementation of climate action plan	The responses available to cities under Q5.5a are slightly different (more granular) than those indicated in the scoring criteria, so responses grouped to match criteria as follows:
In development / developed (1), under implementation (2.5), monitoring (5)	Plans that are at 'monitoring stage' or which are 'currently being updated' are considered to both score maximum 5 points, as these responses both reflect mature action plans. If most mature response is either 'plan in implementation' or 'implementation complete', then the city is considered to have an action plan that is under implementation and is awarded 2.5 points. Responses of 'plan in development' or 'plan developed but not implemented' are scored 1 point, and any other answer including blanks score zero points.
Areas covered by action plan Alignment of action plan sectors with inventory sectors (10)	There was no clear specification of what constitutes 'alignment' within the methodology. Whilst alignment could be taken to mean that the city has reported at least one action per inventory sector in its plan, this would not take into account the scale or ambition of the actions and whether this is aligned with the proportion of emissions reported in the inventory. Therefore, alignment is assessed by matching the ranking of overall savings from actions in each sector, with the ranking of emissions in the corresponding sectors of the inventory - and awarding 2 points for each ranking position that matches, out of a possible 5 positions (so maximum score = 10).

INDICATOR & SCORING CRITERIA	KEY INTERPRETATIONS OR ASSUMPTIONS RELATING TO SCORING CALCULATION
<p>Emissions reduction Actions add up to reduction emissions target (10)</p>	<p>Score is % of total inventory emissions addressed by the sum of annual emissions reductions from actions, divided by 10 to meet scoring scale between zero and 10. This assumes that 'reduction emissions target' referred to in scoring criteria is zero for all cities (i.e. the 2050 SBT used in alignment assessment) rather than the city's reported target, to ensure fairness and consistency in scoring.</p> <p>Key assumption made around action savings reported over the projected lifetime – no part of question asks city for the project lifetime in years, so in the absence of any information, an assumed project lifetime of 15 years is used to derive annual emissions reduction equivalent.</p> <p>Actions recorded with emissions savings over timescale 'Other' are assumed to be annual.</p> <p>Annual savings are summed as if all actions' annual emissions savings will occur in the same year, every year, to reduce inventory emissions.</p>
<p>Status of mitigation actions In development / developed (1), under implementation or monitoring (2.5)</p>	<p>As for P.02, the responses available to cities are more granular than the scoring criteria. Therefore if more actions are in the implementation stage or beyond (e.g. operation or monitoring and evaluation) than are in the pre-implementation stages (including scoping and pre-feasibility), then the city scores 2.5 points. If the city has more actions that are in pre-implementation stages than those in post-implementation stages, it scores 1.5, and if the city has not reported on the implementation stage of any action then it scores zero.</p>
<p>Climate adaptation plan Plan attached (2.5)</p>	<p>Non-blank responses to the 'Publication title and attach document' response column are assumed to meet the scoring criteria of 'plan attached'.</p>
<p>Stage of implementation of climate adaptation plan In development / developed (1), under implementation (2.5), monitoring (5)</p>	<p>The responses available to cities under Q3.1a are slightly different (more granular) than those indicated in the scoring criteria, so responses grouped to match criteria as follows:</p> <p>Plans that are at 'monitoring stage' or which are 'currently being updated' are considered to both score maximum 5 points, as these responses both reflect mature action plans.</p> <p>If most mature response is either 'plan in implementation' or 'implementation complete', then the city is considered to have an action plan that is under implementation and is awarded 2.5 points.</p> <p>Responses of 'plan in development' or 'plan developed but not implemented' are scored 1 point, and any other answer including blanks score zero points.</p>
<p>Boundary of climate adaptation plan Boundary: smaller (1), partial (2), same or larger (3) than city boundary</p>	<p>If the city has not answered this question for any of the assessments it names in its submission, or if it has not named any climate adaptation plans in Q3.1a, it scores zero.</p>
<p>Alignment with hazards Actions align with hazards (10)</p>	<p>There was no clear specification of what constitutes 'alignment' within the methodology. Each category of hazard that the city's climate adaptation actions covers (in Q3.0) is compared to whether the city identified that hazard as a relevant climate hazard in Q2.1. The ratio of the total number of matched hazards against the total number of hazards identified is expressed on a scale of 1 to 10, with a score of 10 indicating that all of the hazards identified in Q2.1 have at least one corresponding action listed in Q3.0.</p>
<p>Status of adaptation actions In development / developed (1), under implementation or monitoring (2.5)</p>	<p>The responses available to cities are more granular than the scoring criteria. Therefore if more actions are in the implementation stage or beyond (e.g. operation or monitoring and reporting) than are in the pre-implementation stages (including scoping and pre-feasibility), then the city scores 2.5 points. If the city has more actions that are in pre-implementation stages than those in post-implementation stages, it scores 1.5, and if the city has not reported on the implementation stage of any action then it scores zero.</p>

INDICATOR & SCORING CRITERIA	KEY INTERPRETATIONS OR ASSUMPTIONS RELATING TO SCORING CALCULATION
<p>Benefits or improvements from adaptation actions Identified more than 1 benefit with description (2)</p>	<p>As cities can report multiple adaptation actions (and then multiple co-benefits for each action reported), where a city has recorded two or more co-benefits for each of the adaptation actions that it has listed, it is awarded the maximum score of 2 points. Otherwise, its score is determined by the ratio of actions with at least 2 co-benefits mapped, to the total number of actions listed, and a score of between zero and 2 is given based on this ratio.</p>

ONE PLANET CITY CHALLENGE

CITIES

Cities are the epicentre of sustainable development. Working with cities is critical for achieving a sustainable global footprint and conservation of biodiversity.

ECOSYSTEM SERVICES

In the sustainable city, ecosystem services – both in the city and in relation to the world around it – stand for a wide range of benefits.

ECOLOGICAL FOOTPRINTS

Smart, efficient cities can reduce their footprints while raising quality of life.



LEADERSHIP

A strong focus on urban solutions is needed in order to secure a globally sustainable development in the coming decades.

INVESTMENTS AND INNOVATIONS

Sustainable cities require new ways of thinking about and organizing the city's needs, functions and infrastructure.

BRIDGING THE GAP

Cities and their residents will play a critical role in closing the gap between nations' commitments so far and the additional emission reduction needed to keep global warming well below 2 degrees.



Working to sustain the natural world for the benefit of people and wildlife.

together possible. panda.org