![WWF logo]

ONE PLANET CITY CHALLENGE
ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - ERRATA

CONTENTS

This document summarises any variations from the published methodology that were made for the scoring due to lack of data or other reasons 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.

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 FRAMEWORK - ERRATA

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 the effective climate action, while publicly recognising the most ambitions 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 were 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 platform[1]. 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 FRAMEWORK ERRATA BOOKLET?

OPCC participating cities will complete a pre-screening questionnaire through CDP and ICLEI's unified reporting system[2]. 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.

This booklet details any variations from the published methodology[4] that were made for the scoring due to lack of data or other reasons.

---

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

4   WWF (2019) One Planet City Challenge: Updated Assessment Framework. Available at: http://awsassets.panda.org/downloads/wwf_opcc_2019_updated_assessment_framework.pdf

VARIATIONS FROM PUBLISHED METHODOLOGY

INDICATOR & SCORING CRITERIA	VARIATION FROM PUBLISHED METHODOLOGY
Commitment organisations # of commitment organisations: 1 (1.5), 2+ (2.5)	We score the number of named commitments identified in Q1.1a, rather than the number of commitment organisations (so a city could in theory list several commitments associated with one commitment organisation, and score a point for each commitment rather than a single point for the commitment organisation). This is due to the data available – Q1.1a only asks for the name of the commitment in the questionnaire.
GHG stacked targets towards neutrality Ambition: more than country NDC (5)	Within the questionnaire responses there is no clear response required from cities regarding how the ambition of their targets relates to the country NDC; however there is a question for each type of target relating to whether the target 'aligns to a requirement from a higher level of sub-national government' (Q5.0a column 13, Q5.0b column 11, Q5.0c column 15, and Q5.0d column 14), so this has been used instead for the ambition scoring criteria. Because there are two options of positive response to this ('Yes', and 'Yes, but it exceeds the scale or requirement') we give the full 5 marks for 'Yes, but it exceeds the scale or requirement', and give half marks (2.5) for 'Yes'.
GHG targets aligned with trajectory based on fair-share budget 2030 target: aligned (10) 2050 target: aligned (10)	The calculation for this question has been changed in two respects, although the overall principle remains the same. 1. The published calculation methodology for emissions reduction targets uses the reported total inventory emissions to estimate total emissions in key years (2018 and target start year). As many cities reported a target but not necessarily an inventory, and also to maintain consistency as most targets are reported relative to a baseline rather than relative to the city emissions inventory, we modified this calculation to work from the baseline reported by the city. The exception to this is for fixed level targets (reported under Q5.0b) there is no requirement for the city to report its baseline, and so in these cases, where an inventory had been provided this was used as a proxy baseline for the inventory year. 2. The calculation and assessment of targets required modification to enable the four different types of target reported by cities to be assessed. The only types of target that cannot be assessed by this method are intensity targets reported 'per unit GDP' (as there is not enough information to convert this to a per-capita emissions figure) and intensity targets reported with a metric that falls under the 'Other' category. If a city has only reported an intensity target and it is per unit GDP or 'Other', then it will score zero for this criteria. In the 2019 round of reporting only one city reported an intensity target in terms of GDP (Zhenjiang Municipal People's Government) – but they had also provided a fixed level target which was used for the scoring, and only one city reported an intensity target with intensity unit 'Other' (Melaka Historic City Council) – but in the description of 'Other' the city had responded 'Melaka city council used an absolute GHG target instead of emission intensity as the denominator' – based on this, the city should have reported under Q5.0b for fixed level targets, but it didn't (this would be considered a data validity issue for the automated scoring in the pre-screening tool).
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)	Within the questionnaire responses there is no clear response required from cities regarding how the ambition of their targets relates to the national ambition; however there is a question relating to whether the target *'aligns with a requirement from a higher level of government'* (Q3.2 column 5).), so this has been used instead for the ambition scoring criteria.

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.

WWF

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

together possible ™   panda.org