



ONE PLANET  
CITY CHALLENGE

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

# INDICATOR CARDS



Co-funded by  
the European Union







# CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
GHG EMISSIONS AND RISK ASSESSMENT	4
CLIMATE TARGETS & GOALS	20
CLIMATE ACTION PLANS	33
STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION	47
RESULTS MONITORING	52
INFORMATIONAL INDICATORS	57



Co-funded by  
the European Union

Co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or CINEA. Neither the European Union nor CINEA can be held responsible for them.

This document includes the details of the 55 OPCC indicators, 43 indicators that conform the Scoring Criteria and 12 non-scored informational indicators that provide valuable context for internal analysis. For more guidance material, including the OPCC Assessment Framework – Technical Document 2025, visit [panda.org/opcc](https://panda.org/opcc).

## Contributors

**Author:** Rafaella Fonteles (WWF-Sweden) and Gara Tujillo Ferreres (WWF-Sweden).

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

## Contact information

Please contact your national WWF office or WWF's International OPCC Technical Helpdesk (at [opcc-helpdesk@wwf.se](mailto:opcc-helpdesk@wwf.se)) for support and specific questions about the indicators.

# INTRODUCTION

Cities participating in OPCC are evaluated through 55 indicators (43 used for scoring, 12 for information purposes) designed to encourage continuous progress and higher ambition in climate action. They assess efforts related to climate mitigation, adaptation, and energy access and poverty, based on self-reported data.

OPCC cities report climate data via the 2025 CDP-ICLEI Track and States & Regions Questionnaire. See the [Questionnaire Guidance document](#) for details.

The indicators are organized under two main dimensions:

- “Vision”: Assesses a city’s commitment and capacity, including climate risk and energy access and poverty assessment, emissions inventories, targets and goals, and monitoring systems.
- “Impact”: Evaluates the quality and implementation of climate and energy actions.

To reflect the different stages of a city’s climate journey, the indicators are grouped into five thematic areas:

1. GHG Emissions and Risks Assessment
2. Climate Targets & Goals
3. Climate Action Plans
4. Strategy Implementation
5. Results Monitoring

This document presents the Indicator Cards, which detail each scored and non-scored indicator’s title, code, score (if applicable), description, relevant question and columns from the 2025 CDP-ICLEI Track and States & Regions Questionnaire, requirements, scoring rationale, and criteria.







# GHG EMISSIONS AND RISK ASSESSMENT

## AM1 - GHG INVENTORY SUBMISSION

MAX SCORE: 1.3 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for the submission of a city emissions inventory.  
Note: Answer to this question is complementary to filling question 3.1.2/ 3.1.3/ 3.1.4.

**RELEVANT QUESTION [& COLUMNS]:** 3.1.1 [col. 3]

### SCORING RATIONALE:

POINTS	CRITERIA
1.3	If the city has attached and/or provided unrestricted access to it. Includes the following answer options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The emissions inventory has been attached</li><li>• The emissions inventory can be accessed (unrestricted) on the link provided</li><li>• The emissions inventory has been attached and can be accessed (unrestricted) on the link provided</li></ul>
0	Any other option.

## AM2 – INVENTORY DATE

MAX SCORE: 0.4 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for the date of creation of the emissions inventory.

**RELEVANT QUESTION [& COLUMNS]:** 3.1.1 [col. 4]

### SCORING RATIONALE:

POINTS	CRITERIA
0.4	If the city's reported emissions inventory end date is present time +/- 1 year.
0.3	If the city's reported emissions inventory end date is within the last 6 years.
0.1	If the city's reported emissions inventory is older than 6 years.
0	If no inventory.

## AM3 - EMISSIONS SCOPE

MAX SCORE: 2.6 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for the scope (1, 2, and 3) or nature (direct, indirect, and occurring outside jurisdiction) of emissions considered in the city emissions inventory, under the chosen framework (GPC, CRF or other).

**RELEVANT QUESTION [& COLUMNS]:** 3.1.2 [cols. 0-2]/ 3.1.3 [cols. 0-6]/ 3.1.4 [cols. 1-4]

**REQUERIMENTS [OPTIONS]:** Indicator considers various options depending which question city reports to (3.1.2, 3.1.3 or 3.1.4)\*.

Table 1 – Options by question:

	Q3.1.2	Q3.1.3	Q3.1.4
[A]	TOTAL BASIC+ emissions	Total Emissions (excluding generation of grid-supplied energy) – Direct, Indirect, Occurring outside jurisdiction	Stationary Energy, Transportation, Waste, IPPU, AFOLU – Total Figure
[B]	TOTAL BASIC emissions	Total all sectors – Direct	All other options – Total Figure
[C]	Total scope 1, 2, 3 emissions, Scope 1 emissions from generation of grid-supplied energy	Total Stationary Energy and Total Transport – Indirect	Stationary Energy, Transportation, Waste, IPPU, AFOLU – Scope 1 and 2
[D]	Stationary Energy, Transportation, Waste – Scope 1	Total Stationary Energy, Transport, Waste, IPPU, AFOLU – Occurring outside jurisdiction	All other options – Scope 1 and 2
[E]	Stationary Energy, Transportation – Scope 2	All subsectors – Direct	Stationary Energy, Transportation, Waste, IPPU, AFOLU – Scope 1
[F]	Stationary Energy, Transportation, Waste – Scope 3	All subsectors – Indirect	All other options – Scope 1
[G]	IPPU, AFOLU – Scope 1	All subsectors – Occurring outside jurisdiction	Stationary Energy, Transportation, Waste, IPPU, AFOLU – Scope 2
[H]	-	-	Other options – Scope 2
[I]	-	-	Stationary Energy, Transportation, Waste, IPPU, AFOLU – Scope 3
[J]	-	-	Other options – Scope 3

\*The response “Other, please specify” is not counted toward scoring .

## AM3 - EMISSIONS SCOPE

MAX SCORE: 2.6 PTS

**SCORING RATIONALE:** Proposed NON-ADDITIVE (fixed maximum) and ADDITIVE (cumulative) scoring, CAPPED TO 2.6 pts. If a city reports a notation key instead of a numerical value, the response will be scored if the key indicates emissions are Not Occurring (NO) or Included Elsewhere (IE). However, it will not be scored if emissions are marked as Not Estimated (NE) or Confidential (C).

If the city has reported on Q3.1.2:

POINTS	CRITERIA
2.6	If the city reported OPTION A or B. NON-ADDITIVE.
1	Per reported item in OPTION C. ADDITIVE to a max of 2.6 pts.
1	Per option (D, E, F) if the city reported at least one item. ADDITIVE to a max of 2.6 pts.
0.25	Per reported item in OPTION G. ADDITIVE to a max of 0.5 pts. Also ADDITIVE to D,E & F to max of 2.6 pts.
0	Any other option.

If the city has reported on Q3.1.3:

POINTS	CRITERIA
1	Per reported item in OPTION A. ADDITIVE to a max of 2.6 pts.
1	Per option (B, C, D) if city reported at least one item. ADDITIVE to a max of 2.6 pts.
1	Per option (E, F, G) if city reported at least one item. ADDITIVE to a max of 2.6 pts.
0	Any other option.

If the city has reported on Q3.1.4:

POINTS	CRITERIA
2	If the city reported at least one item in OPTION C or D. NON-ADDITIVE.
1	If the city reported at least one item in OPTION A or B. NON-ADDITIVE.
1	Per option (E, G, I) if city reported at least one item. ADDITIVE to a max of 2.6 pts.
1	Per option (F, H, J) if city reported at least one item. ADDITIVE to a max of 2.6 pts.
0	Any other option.



## AM4 - SECTOR COVERAGE

MAX SCORE: 2.6 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for how many sectors (energy, transport, waste, IPPU, and AFOLU) the city has reported emissions for, under the chosen framework (GPC, CRF or other).

**RELEVANT QUESTION [& COLUMNS]:** 3.1.2 [cols. 0-2]/ 3.1.3 [cols. 0-6]/ 3.1.4 [cols. 1-4]

**REQUIREMENTS [OPTIONS]:** Indicator considers various options depending which question city reports to (3.1.2, 3.1.3 or 3.1.4)\*. Refer to Table 1 under indicator AM3.

**SCORING RATIONALE:** Proposed NON-ADDITIVE (fixed maximum) and ADDITIVE (cumulative) scoring, CAPPED TO 2.6 pts. If a city reports a notation key instead of a numerical value, the response will be scored if the key indicates emissions are Not Occurring (NO) or Included Elsewhere (IE). However, it will not be scored if emissions are marked as Not Estimated (NE) or Confidential (C).

If the city has reported on Q3.1.2:

POINTS	CRITERIA
2.6	If the city reported OPTION A. NON-ADDITIVE.
2.3	If the city reported OPTION B. NON-ADDITIVE.
1	Per reported item in OPTION C. ADDITIVE to a max of 2.6 pts. NON-ADDITIVE beyond OPTION C.
0.5	Per reported item in OPTION D. ADDITIVE to a max of 1 pts. Also ADDITIVE to E,F & G to max of 2.6 pts.
0.5	Per reported item in OPTION E. ADDITIVE to a max of 1 pts. Also ADDITIVE to D,F & G to max of 2.6 pts
0.5	Per reported item in OPTION F. ADDITIVE to a max of 1 pts. Also ADDITIVE to D,E & G to max of 2.6 pts.
0.25	Per reported item in OPTION G. ADDITIVE to a max of 0.5 pts. Also ADDITIVE to D,E & F to max of 2.6 pts.
0	Any other option.

If the city has reported on Q3.1.3:

POINTS	CRITERIA
1	Per reported item in OPTION A. ADDITIVE to a max of 2.6 pts. NON-ADDITIVE beyond OPTION A.
0.25	Per reported item in OPTION B. ADDITIVE to a max of 1 pts. Also ADDITIVE to C & D to max of 2.6 pts
0.5	Per reported item in OPTION C. ADDITIVE to a max of 1 pts. Also ADDITIVE to B & D to max of 2.6 pts

\*The response "Other, please specify" is not counted toward scoring .

## AM4 - SECTOR COVERAGE (CONT.)

MAX SCORE: 2.6 PTS

If the city has reported on Q3.1.3:

POINTS	CRITERIA
0.5	Per reported item in OPTION D. ADDITIVE to a max of 1 pts. Also ADDITIVE to B & C to max of 2.6 pts
0.06	Per reported item in OPTION E. ADDITIVE to a max of 1 pts. Also ADDITIVE to F & G to max of 2.6 pts.
0.06	Per reported item in OPTION F. ADDITIVE to a max of 1 pts. Also ADDITIVE to E & G to max of 2.6 pts
0.06	Per reported item in OPTION G. ADDITIVE to a max of 1 pts. Also ADDITIVE to E & F to max of 2.6 pts
0	Any other option.

If the city has reported on Q3.1.4:

POINTS	CRITERIA
0.5	Per reported item in OPTION A. ADDITIVE to a max of 2.6 pts. NON-ADDITIVE beyond OPTION A.
0.5	Per reported item in OPTION B. ADDITIVE to a max of 2.6 pts. NON-ADDITIVE beyond OPTION B.
0.5	Per reported item in OPTION C. ADDITIVE to a max of 2.6 pts. NON-ADDITIVE beyond OPTION C.
0.5	Per reported item in OPTION D. ADDITIVE to a max of 2.6 pts. NON-ADDITIVE beyond OPTION D.
0.1	Per reported item in OPTION E. ADDITIVE to a max of 0.5 pts. Also ADDITIVE to G & I to a max of 2.6 pts.
0.1	Per reported item in OPTION F. ADDITIVE to a max of 0.5 pts. Also ADDITIVE to H & J to a max of 2.6 pts.
0.1	Per reported item in OPTION G. ADDITIVE to a max of 0.5 pts. Also ADDITIVE to E & I to a max of 2.6 pts.
0.1	Per reported item in OPTION H. ADDITIVE to a max of 0.5 pts. Also ADDITIVE to F & J to a max of 2.6 pts.
0.1	Per reported item in OPTION I. ADDITIVE to a max of 0.5 pts. Also ADDITIVE to E & G to a max of 2.6 pts.
0.1	Per reported item in OPTION J. ADDITIVE to a max of 0.5 pts. Also ADDITIVE to F & H to a max of 2.6 pts.
0	Any other option.



# AM5 - DATA QUALITY

MAX SCORE: 1.7 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for the quality of “Activity data” and “Emissions factors” on the city emissions inventory.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 3.1.1 [col. 14]

**SCORING RATIONALE:** Proposed ADDITIVE scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 1.7 pts [Regardless of the type or scale of inventory].

POINTS	CRITERIA
0.85	If the city has reported 'High data quality' for "Activity data".
0.85	If the city has reported 'High data quality' for "Emissions factors".
0.5	If the city has reported 'Medium data quality' for "Activity data".
0.5	If the city has reported 'Medium data quality' for "Emissions factors".
0.2	If the city has reported 'Low data quality' for "Activity data".
0.2	If the city has reported 'Low data quality' for "Emissions factors".
0	Any other option.

# AM6 - INVENTORY BOUNDARY

MAX SCORE: 1.7 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains scoring for the boundary of the reported emissions inventory.

**RELEVANT QUESTION [& COLUMNS]:** 3.1.1 [col. 5]

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

POINTS	CRITERIA
1.7	Same - covers entire jurisdiction and nothing else.
0.5	Smaller - covers only parts of the jurisdiction, please explain exclusions.
1.7	Larger - covers the whole jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain additions.
0.85	Partial - covers part of the jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain exclusions/additions.
0	Any other option.



## AM7 - GHG COVERAGE

MAX SCORE: 1.3 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains scoring for whether the city emissions reporting covers all seven greenhouse gases listed in the questionnaire.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 3.1.1 [col. 10]

### SCORING RATIONALE:

POINTS	CRITERIA
1.3	7 options (CO <sub>2</sub> , CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O, HFCs, PFCs, SF <sub>6</sub> , NF <sub>3</sub> ).
1.1	3 options (CO <sub>2</sub> , CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O).
0.6	2 options (CO <sub>2</sub> and CH <sub>4</sub> ).
0.4	1 option (CO <sub>2</sub> ).
0	Any other option.

# AM8 - CONSUMPTION-BASED INVENTORY

MAX SCORE: 0.4 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the city has a consumption-based emissions inventory.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 3.2 [col. 1]

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

POINTS	CRITERIA
0.4	Yes, our jurisdiction has a consumption-based emissions inventory to measure emissions from consumption of goods and services.
0.2	No, but development of a consumption-based emissions inventory is in progress and will be reported next year.
0.1	No, but intending to develop and report a consumption-based emissions inventory in the next 2 years.
0	No, and we are not intending to develop and report one in the next 2 years due to lack of financial capacity.
0	No, and we are not intending to develop and report one in the next 2 years due to lack of expertise/technical capacity.
0	No, and we are not intending to develop and report one in the next 2 years due to lack of financial capacity and expertise/technical capacity.
0	No, and we are not intending to develop and report one in the next 2 years due to other higher priorities.
0	No, and we are not intending to develop and report one in the next 2 years due to a reason not listed above, please specify.
0	Other, please specify.



# AA1 - CLIMATE RISK ASSESSMENT

MAX SCORE: 1.2 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the city has named (and it is expected to be attached to the submission) a Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessment.

**RELEVANT QUESTION [& COLUMNS]:** 2.1

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

POINTS	CRITERIA
1.2	Yes, a climate risk and vulnerability assessment has been undertaken.
0.8	No, but we are currently undertaking one and it will be complete in the next year.
0.4	No, but we are intending to undertake one in the next two years.
0	Any other answer.

# AA2 – ASSESSMENT BOUNDARY

MAX SCORE: 2.2 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for the boundary of the city's climate change risk/vulnerability assessment(s) relative to the city boundary.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 2.1.1 [col. 4]

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

POINTS	CRITERIA
2.2	Same - covers entire jurisdiction and nothing else.
0.5	Smaller - covers only part of the jurisdiction, please explain exclusions
2.2	Larger - covers the whole jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain additions
1.6	Partial - covers part of the jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain exclusions/additions.
0	Any other option.

# AA3 - RISK FACTORS

MAX SCORE: 2.6 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for the number of factors covered by the city's climate change risk/vulnerability assessment(s).

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 2.1.1 [col. 6]

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

POINTS	CRITERIA
2.6	If the climate change risk/vulnerability assessment(s) that the city has named/submitted cover all 10 factors.
1.6	If between 6 - 9 options are covered.
0.6	If between 1 - 5 options are covered.
0	If the city's climate change risk/vulnerability assessments are not identified to consider any factors, and no processes have been established, and the city has not named/submitted any assessment.



## AA4 - HAZARD REPORTING

MAX SCORE: 4.5 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for the completeness of information provided for the hazards covered by the city's Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessment(s).

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 2.2 [cols. 1-10]

**SCORING RATIONALE:** If the Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessment(s) that the city has named/submitted include(s):

**[A]** Fully reported hazards, proposed ADDITIVE\* scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 4.5 pts.

POINTS	CRITERIA
3	Identifies at least one hazard (col. 1) , AND Provides an answer to EACH of the columns 2-10 (9 columns**).
0.75	For each additional hazard identified and fully reported.

**[B]** Partially reported hazards, proposed ADDITIVE\* scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 3 pts.

POINTS	CRITERIA
1.5	Identifies at least one hazard (col. 1), AND Provides an answer to SOME of the columns 2-10 (9 columns**).
0.4	For each additional hazard identified and partially reported.
0	Any other alternative.

\*A first hazard in OPTION A can only be combined with ADDITIONAL hazards in OPTION A and/or OPTION B. A first hazard in OPTION B can only be combined with ADDITIONAL hazards in OPTION B.

\*\*For detailed information on the questions and columns in the 2025 CDP-ICLEI Track and States & Regions Questionnaire, please refer to [the Questionnaire Guidance document](#).

# AE1 – ENERGY ACCESS & POVERTY

MAX SCORE: 7.5 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the city has reported an energy poverty and energy access assessment that considers the three key energy attributes (sustainable energy, energy security, and affordable energy).

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 4.1 [col. 1]

**SCORING RATIONALE:** Proposed ADDITIVE scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 7.5 pts

POINTS	CRITERIA
3.75	Assessment that considers sustainable energy
3.75	Assessment that considers energy security
3.75	Assessment that considers affordable energy
0	No energy-related assessment has been undertaken or any other option.



# CLIMATE TARGETS & GOALS



# TM1 – CITY-WIDE EMISSIONS TARGET

MAX SCORE: 0.7 PT

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the city-wide all emissions reduction target reported has a boundary the same or larger than the city\*.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 6.1.1 [col. 3]

**REQUIREMENTS** [OPTIONS]: Answer requirement from Q6.1.1, col. 5.

**[A]** City must have reported one of the following options under *Emissions sources covered by target* (col. 5):

- All emissions sources which are included in the jurisdiction inventory
- All BASIC (GPC) emissions sources which are included in jurisdiction inventory
- All BASIC+ (GPC) emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- All the BASIC+ (GPC) emissions sources plus other indirect emissions (scope 3) included in jurisdiction inventory, please specify other indirect emissions covered
- Direct emissions (scope 1 or “territorial”) and indirect emissions from grid-supplied energy (scope 2) included in jurisdiction inventory

**[B]** City must have reported one of the following options under *Emissions sources covered by target* (col. 5):

- Only energy emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- Only transport emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- Only waste emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- Only IPPU emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- Only AFOLU emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- All direct emissions (scope 1 or “territorial”) included in jurisdiction inventory
- Other, please specify
- Not all emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory are covered by target, please specify exclusions

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

[A] POINTS	[B] POINTS	CRITERIA
0.7	0.25	If the city has reported that their city-wide emissions target for one of the options above has a boundary either the same or larger than their city boundary.
0.35	0.15	If the city has reported that their city-wide emissions target for one of the options above has a boundary either smaller or partial than their city boundary.
0.15	0.1	If the city has reported that their city-wide emissions target for one of the options above is for government operations only.
0	0	Any other answer.

\*In the case of multiple targets being reported, the one with the highest-scoring condition should be considered.

TM2 - SBT ALIGNMENT  
MAX SCORE: 0.7 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the emissions target reported for ‘All emissions sources included in city inventory’ for the city is considered a science-based target (SBT)\*.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 6.1.1 [col. 21]

**REQUIREMENTS** [OPTIONS]: Answer requirement from Q6.1.1, col. 5

**[A]** City must have reported one of the following options under *Emissions sources covered by target* (col. 5):

- All emissions sources which are included in the jurisdiction inventory
- All BASIC (GPC) emissions sources which are included in jurisdiction inventory
- All BASIC+ (GPC) emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- All the BASIC+ (GPC) emissions sources plus other indirect emissions (scope 3) included in jurisdiction inventory, please specify other indirect emissions covered
- Direct emissions (scope 1 or “territorial”) and indirect emissions from grid-supplied energy (scope 2) included in jurisdiction inventory

**[B]** City must have reported one of the following options under *Emissions sources covered by target* (col. 5):

- Only energy emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- Only transport emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- Only waste emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- Only IPPU emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- Only AFOLU emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- All direct emissions (scope 1 or “territorial”) included in jurisdiction inventory
- Other, please specify
- Not all emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory are covered by target, please specify exclusions

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

[A] POINTS	[B] POINTS	CRITERIA
0.7	0.3	If the city-wide emissions target for one of the options above is considered an SBT, AND the OPCC methodology is selected.
0.5	0.15	If the city-wide emissions target for one of the options above is considered an SBT, AND any other methodology is selected (incl. 'Other, please specify', as long as specified).
0.3	0.1	If the city-wide emissions target for one of the options above is NOT considered an SBT, BUT the city is reporting another target that is science-based OR is committed to setting an SBT in the next 2 years.
0	0	Any other answer.

\*In the case of multiple targets being reported, the one with the highest-scoring condition should be considered.

# TM3.1 - NET-ZERO & REDUCTION TARGETS

MAX SCORE: 2.4 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring that assesses the targets reported by the city regarding the achievement of net-zero emissions\*.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 6.1.1 [col. 16]

**REQUIREMENTS** [OPTIONS]:

City must have reported “Yes” under question *Is this a net zero target?* (col. 6)

**[A]** City must have reported one of the following options under *Emissions sources covered by target* (col. 5):

- All emissions sources which are included in the jurisdiction inventory
- All BASIC (GPC) emissions sources which are included in jurisdiction inventory
- All BASIC+ (GPC) emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- All the BASIC+ (GPC) emissions sources plus other indirect emissions (scope 3) included in jurisdiction inventory, please specify other indirect emissions covered
- Direct emissions (scope 1 or “territorial”) and indirect emissions from grid-supplied energy (scope 2) included in jurisdiction inventory

**[X/Y]** City must have reported one of the following options under *Boundary of target relative to jurisdiction boundary* (col. 3):

**[X]**

- Same - covers entire jurisdiction and nothing else
- Larger - covers the whole jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain additions

**[Y]**

- Smaller - covers only part of the jurisdiction, please explain exclusions
- Partial - covers part of the jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain exclusions/additions
- Government operations – covers only emission sources owned and operated by jurisdictions government

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

[A + X] POINTS	[A + Y] POINTS	CRITERIA
2.4	1.6	If the city has at least one target that aims at net-zero within the next 10 years.
2.2	1.3	If the city has at least one target that aims at net-zero by 2040.
1.5	0.8	If the city has at least one target that aims at net-zero by 2050.
0.8	0.5	If the city has at least one target that aims at net-zero after 2050.
0	0	Any other option.

\*In the case of multiple targets being reported, the one with the highest-scoring condition should be considered.

# TM3.2 - NEAR-TERM REDUCTION TARGETS

MAX SCORE: 1.35 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring that assesses the emissions reduction targets reported by the city (excepting Net-Zero targets) in line with the OPCC 1.5 °C Alignment Method\*.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 6.1.1 [col. 16]

**REQUIREMENTS** [OPTIONS]:

**[A]** City must have reported one of the following options under *Emissions sources covered by target* (col. 5):

- All emissions sources which are included in the jurisdiction inventory
- All BASIC (GPC) emissions sources which are included in jurisdiction inventory
- All BASIC+ (GPC) emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- All the BASIC+ (GPC) emissions sources plus other indirect emissions (scope 3) included in jurisdiction inventory, please specify other indirect emissions covered
- Direct emissions (scope 1 or “territorial”) and indirect emissions from grid-supplied energy (scope 2) included in jurisdiction inventory

**[X/Y]** City must have reported one of the following options under *Boundary of target relative to jurisdiction boundary* (col. 3):

**[X]**

- Same - covers entire jurisdiction and nothing else
- Larger - covers the whole jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain additions

**[Y]**

- Smaller - covers only part of the jurisdiction, please explain exclusions
- Partial - covers part of the jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain exclusions/additions
- Government operations – covers only emission sources owned and operated by jurisdictions government

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

[A + X] POINTS	[A + Y] POINTS	CRITERIA**
1.35	0.6	If the city has at least one target compatible with the OPCC 1.5 °C Alignment Method by 2030.
0.7	0.4	If the city has at least one target compatible by 2040.
0.4	0.25	If the city has at least one target compatible by 2050.
0.2	0.1	If the city has at least one target NOT compatible for any year.
0	0	Any other option.

\*To learn more about the OPCC 1.5 °C Alignment Method, refer to the OPCC Assessment Framework – Technical Document 2025.

\*\*The same target should not be scored more than once if it meets several conditions. ONLY the highest scoring condition should be considered.



# TM3.3 - SECTORAL REDUCTION TARGETS

MAX SCORE: 1 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring that assesses the emissions reduction targets reported by the city regarding sectoral targets.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 6.1.1 [col. 16]

**REQUIREMENTS** [OPTIONS]:

**[A]** City must have reported one of the following options under *Emissions sources covered by target* (col. 5):

- Only energy emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- Only transport emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- Only waste emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- Only IPPU emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory
- Only AFOLU emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory

**[X/Y]** City must have reported one of the following options under *Boundary of target relative to jurisdiction boundary* (col. 3):

**[X]**

- Same - covers entire jurisdiction and nothing else
- Larger - covers the whole jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain additions

**[Y]**

- Smaller - covers only part of the jurisdiction, please explain exclusions
- Partial - covers part of the jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain exclusions/additions
- Government operations – covers only emission sources owned and operated by jurisdictions government

**SCORING RATIONALE:** For every sector covered by a sectoral target, the city scores 0.3 pts or 0.15 pts. Total score is capped to 1 pt for cities reporting at least 1 sectoral target for every sector.

[A + X] POINTS	[A + Y] POINTS	CRITERIA
0.3	0.15	If the city has at least one sectoral target with a target year > current year.
0	0	Any other answer option, or no sectoral targets reported.

TM4 - RENEWABLE ENERGY TARGETS  
MAX SCORE: 0.8 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This scoring assesses the city's renewable energy/electricity target(s).

**RELEVANT QUESTION [& COLUMNS]:** 7.1 [cols. 9 and 11]

**REQUIREMENTS [OPTIONS]:**

**[A/B/C]** City must have reported one of the following options under *Target type* (col. 1):

	[A]	[B]	[C]
Increase generation of:	renewable energy (all types)	renewable electricity	renewable heating and/or cooling
Increase proportion of:	energy consumed from renewable sources (all energy types)	electricity consumed from renewable sources	heating and cooling consumed from renewable energy sources
Increase installed capacity of:	renewable energy (all energy types)	renewable electricity	renewable heating and/or cooling
Increase consumption of:	-	-	renewable energy in transportation
Reduce generation, consumption and/or installed capacity:	energy from coal or oil and gas/ coal-based or oil and gas-based	-	-
Other target type:	-	-	Other renewable energy target type

**[X/Y]** City must have reported one of the following options under *Boundary of target* (col. 3):

**[X]**

- Same - covers entire jurisdiction and nothing else
- Larger - covers the whole jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain additions

**[Y]**

- Smaller - covers only part of the jurisdiction, please explain exclusions
- Partial - covers part of the jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain exclusions/additions
- Government operations - covers only functions owned and operated by jurisdiction's government

City must have reported the *Metric Numerator* (col. 6), the *Value in Base Year* (col. 9) and the *Value in Target Year* (col. 11), to enable calculation of the relative growth/reduction in renewable energy/electricity:

- If metric numerator is percentage, relative growth/reduction =  $\min((\text{Target} - \text{Base}) / (100 - \text{Base}), 1)$
- For any other metric numerator, relative growth/reduction =  $\min(|\text{Target} - \text{Base}| / (\text{Target} + \text{Base}), 1)$

# TM4 - RENEWABLE ENERGY TARGETS (CONT.)

MAX SCORE: 0.8 PTS

**SCORING RATIONALE:** If the city has reported multiple targets in OPTION B and/or C, the points from the best scored target(s) for each response are added together, capped at 0.8 point. If the city has reported any target in OPTION A, consider the best scored target in this option as the final score (regardless of any other target reported in OPTION B and/or C).

The scoring is proportional to the relative growth/reduction of renewable energy in target year compared to base year levels, up to the maximum values for each OPTIONS. The scoring is calculated as the relative growth/reduction multiplied by the maximum score. [E.g., if the city reports a target in OPTIONS A + Y, with relative growth of 0.8, scoring is  $0.8 \times 0.5 = 0.4$  pts.]

[A + X]	[A + Y]	[B + X]	[B + Y]	[C + X]	[C + Y]
0.8	0.5	0.4	0.25	0.25	0.15
0	Any other answer option or no renewable energy target reported.				

# TM5 - ENERGY EFFICIENCY TARGETS

MAX SCORE: 0.8 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This scoring assesses targets related to the city's energy conservation and efficiency.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 7.1

**REQUIREMENTS** [OPTIONS]:

[A/B/C] City must have reported one of the following options under *Target type* (col. 1):

- [A]
  - Reduction in energy consumption (jurisdiction-wide).
- [B]
  - Increase in energy efficiency (jurisdiction-wide).
  - Increase energy efficiency of buildings (all buildings).
- [C]
  - Increase energy efficiency of buildings, specify building types covered.
  - [Ci] Increase energy efficiency of buildings (residential buildings).
  - [Cj] Increase energy efficiency of buildings (government-owned buildings).
  - [Ck] Increase energy efficiency of buildings (commercial buildings).
  - Other energy efficiency target type, please specify.

[X/Y] City must have reported one of the following options under *Boundary of target* (col. 3):

- [X]
  - Same - covers entire jurisdiction and nothing else
  - Larger - covers the whole jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain additions
- [Y]
  - Smaller - covers only part of the jurisdiction, please explain exclusions
  - Partial - covers part of the jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain exclusions/additions
  - Government operations - covers only functions owned and operated by jurisdiction's government

**SCORING RATIONALE:** Complete score for this indicator will comprise a combination of energy conservation and energy efficiency targets, i.e., A+B or A+C combination [where aggregated C options are capped to 0.3 pts]. Maximum indicator score is capped to 0.8 pts. Maximum scores are capped as follows: A score capped to 0.5 pts; B score capped to 0.3 pts; and C (Ci+Cj+Ck) score capped to 0.3 pts.

[A + X]	[A + Y]	[B + X]	[B + Y]	[C + X]	[C + Y]
0.5	0.25	0.3	0.2	0.15	0.1

0 Any other answer option or no energy efficiency target reported.

# TM6 - GHG COVERAGE IN TARGETS

MAX SCORE: 1.25 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains scoring for whether the city’s emissions reduction target(s) covers all seven greenhouse gases listed in the questionnaire.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 6.1.1 [col. 4]

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

POINTS	CRITERIA
1.25	7 options (CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs, SF6, NF3)*.
1	3 options (CO2, CH4, N2O).*
0.5	2 options (CO2 and CH4).*
0.35	1 option (CO2).*
0	Any other option.

\*Scores are only awarded if the reported gases match the ones listed. For example, if only CH4 is reported (without CO2), no points are given, even if one gas is covered, because CO2 must be included to score.



TA1 - ADAPTATION TIMELINE  
MAX SCORE: 4.1 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring of the scale of the city's adaptation goal(s) - whether they are short, medium or long-term.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 5.1.1 [cols. 2 and 5]

**SCORING RATIONALE:** Proposed ADDITIVE scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 4.1 pts.

POINTS	CRITERIA
4.1	If a city has reported at least one adaptation goal that is for 2050 onwards.
2.5	If a city has reported at least one adaptation goal that is between 2027 and 2050.
1.6	If a city has reported at least one adaptation goal that is between present and 2026.
0.9	If adaptation goals are older than present time but not older than 5 years.
0	If adaptation goals are 6 years or older than present time.
0	If no adaptation goals have target year.

# TA2 - HAZARD COVERAGE

MAX SCORE: 4.15 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the city's adaptation goal(s) cover the most significant hazards faced by the jurisdiction [question 2.2].

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 5.1.1 [col. 3]

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

POINTS	CRITERIA
4.15 x fraction of hazards covered	The scoring is proportional to the fraction of significant hazards covered by adaptation goals, up to a maximum value of 4.15 points. [E.g., if 5 significant hazards are reported in question 2.2, but only 3 are covered by adaptation goals, scoring is $4.15 \times 3/5 = 2.49$ pts.]
0	If none of the most significant hazards faced by the jurisdiction are covered by adaptation goals, or any other option.

# TE1 - ENERGY ACCESS & POVERTY TARGETS

MAX SCORE: 5.25 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring of the scale of the city’s energy related target(s) - whether they are short, medium or long-term.

**RELEVANT QUESTION [& COLUMNS]:** 7.1 [cols. 1 and 10]

**SCORING RATIONALE:** Proposed ADDITIVE scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 5.25 pts.

POINTS	CRITERIA
5.25	If a city has reported at least one energy-related target that is between present and 2030.
3.15	If a city has reported at least one energy-related target that is between 2031 and 2040.
2.1	If a city has reported at least one energy-related target that is for 2041 onwards.
1	If the energy-related target(s) are older than present time but not older than 5 years.
0	If the energy-related target(s) are 6 years or older than present time.
0	If no energy-related target have target year, or none reported, or any other option.





# CLIMATE ACTION PLANS



# PM1 - CITY MITIGATION PLAN

MAX SCORE: 1.95 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the city has attached a climate change mitigation plan.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 8.1

**REQUIREMENTS** [OPTIONS]: If the response to Q8.1 is “Yes, our jurisdiction has a climate action plan or strategy”, the two requirements below apply. If the response is anything else, the requirements do not apply.

**[A]** City must have reported one of the following options under *Climate action plan type* (Q 8.1, col. 1):

- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation, adaptation and energy-related issues).\*
- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation and adaptation).\*
- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation and energy-related issues).\*
- Standalone mitigation plan.

**[X/Y]** City must have reported one of the following options under *Boundary of plan relative to jurisdiction boundary* (Q 8.1, col. 5):

**[X]**

- Same (jurisdiction-wide) - covers entire jurisdiction and nothing else.
- Larger - covers the whole jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain.

**[Y]**

- Smaller - covers only part of the jurisdiction, please explain.
- Partial - covers part of the jurisdiction and adjoining areas, please explain

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

[A + X] POINTS	[A + Y] POINTS	CRITERIA
1.95	1.2	Yes, our jurisdiction has a climate action plan or strategy.
0.7		No, but we are currently undertaking one and it will be complete in the next year.
0.5		No, but we are intending to undertake one in the next two years.
0		Any other answer.

\*If the plan is integrated, PM1, PA1, and PE1 will be evaluated from the same question (8.1).



# PM2 – MITIGATION PLAN COVERAGE

## MAX SCORE: 4.6 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring related to the alignment of action plan sectors, as reported by the city\*, with inventory sectors and IPCC strategies.

**RELEVANT QUESTION [& COLUMNS]:** 9.2 [col. 2]

**SCORING RATIONALE:** This indicator is divided in 2 parts.

### PART 1

POINTS	CRITERIA
3.5 x fraction of sectors covered	The actions that the city is taking are broken down into the five key sectors of stationary energy, transportation, waste, IPPU and AFOLU. The number of sectors covered by the action plan (Q 9.2, col. 2) is compared against the sectors reported in the emissions inventory (Q 3.1.2 / 3.1.3 / 3.1.4). A proportional score is allocated based on how many of the reported inventory sectors have actions reported against them, with a maximum score of 3.5 pts awarded to cities who report actions against all sectors in their emissions inventory. [E.g., if the city reports actions for 2 sectors compared to their 4 inventory sectors, scoring is $3.5 \times 2/4 = 1.75$ pts.]

### PART 2

POINTS	CRITERIA
1.1 x fraction of strategies covered	The actions that the city is taking are broken down into the four IPCC strategies** (i) Spatial Planning, Urban Form, and Infrastructure, (ii) Electrification and Net-Zero Emissions Resources, (iii) Urban Green and Blue Infrastructure, and (iv) Socio-Behavioural Aspects. The actions reported by the city are compared against these strategies. A proportional score is allocated based on how many of the priority strategies have actions reported against them, with a maximum score of 1.1 pts awarded to cities who report actions against all the IPCC priority strategies. [E.g., if the city reports actions for 2 strategies compared to the 4 priority strategies, scoring is $1.1 \times 2/4 = 0.55$ pts.]

\*Cities are allowed to not report all sectors if Notation Keys that justify the absence of data ('Not Occuring - NO') are included in their inventory (3.1.2 / 3.1.3).

\*\*Details on the four IPCC strategies and their corresponding mitigation actions can be found in the IPCC Assessment Framework – Technical Document 2025.

# PM3 - MITIGATION ACTION COMPLETENESS

MAX SCORE: 4.6 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for the completeness of the mitigation actions reported, including whether they have quantified their emissions savings.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 9.2

**SCORING RATIONALE:** If the city has reported at least 1 mitigation action with the following:

**[A]** Fully reported mitigation actions, proposed ADDITIVE\* scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 4.6 pts.

POINTS	CRITERIA
1.7	Identifies at least one mitigation action [Q9.2, col. 2], AND Provides an answer to EACH of the columns [3, 4, 5, 6, (7 or 8 or 9), 11, 14 under question 9.2**].
0.4	For each additional action identified and fully reported.

**[B]** Partially reported mitigation actions, proposed ADDITIVE\* scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 3.4 pts.

POINTS	CRITERIA
1	Identifies at least one mitigation action [Q9.2, col. 2], AND Provides an answer to EACH of the columns [4, 5, 6, (7 or 8 or 9) under question 9.2**].
0.3	For each additional action identified and partially reported.
0	No mitigation action provided.

\*A first mitigation action in OPTION A can only be combined with additional mitigation actions in OPTION A and/or OPTION B. A first mitigation action in OPTION B can only be combined with additional mitigation actions in OPTION B.

\*\*For detailed information on the questions and columns in the 2025 CDP-ICLEI Track and States & Regions Questionnaire, please refer to [the Questionnaire Guidance document](#).

# PM4 - CO-BENEFITS OF MITIGATION ACTIONS

MAX SCORE: 0.85 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the city has identified co-benefits against the mitigation actions that the city has reported.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 9.2 [col. 10]

**SCORING RATIONALE:** If the city has reported at least 1 mitigation action with the following:

POINTS	CRITERIA
0.85	If the city has recorded two or more co-benefits for each of the mitigation actions that it has listed.
0.4	If the city has two or more co-benefits for at least half of the reported actions.
0	Any other answer.

# PA1 - CITY ADAPTATION PLAN

MAX SCORE: 0.95 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the city has submitted a climate change adaptation plan.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 8.1

**REQUIREMENTS** [OPTIONS]: If the answer to Q8.1 is "Yes, our jurisdiction has a climate action plan or strategy", the requirement below applies. If the response is anything else, the requirement does not apply.

- City must have reported one of the following options under *Climate action plan type* (Q 8.1.1, col. 1):
- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation, adaptation and energy-related issues).\*
  - Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation and adaptation).\*
  - Integrated climate plan (addressing adaptation and energy-related issues).\*
  - Standalone adaptation plan.

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

POINTS	CRITERIA
0.95	Yes, our jurisdiction has a climate action plan or strategy [and the city answered one of the above options in Q8.1.1, col. 1].
0.5	No, but we are currently undertaking one and it will be complete in the next year.
0.25	No, but we are intending to undertake one in the next two years.
0	Any other answer.

\*If the plan is integrated, PM1, PA1, and PE1 will be evaluated from the same question (8.1).



# PA2 - ADAPTATION PLAN COVERAGE

MAX SCORE: 0.95 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for the boundary covered by the climate adaptation plan(s) that the city has submitted relative to the city boundary.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 8.1.1 [col. 5]

**REQUIREMENTS** [OPTIONS]: City must have reported one of the following options under *Climate action plan type* (Q 8.1.1, col. 1):

- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation, adaptation and energy-related issues).
- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation and adaptation).
- Integrated climate plan (addressing adaptation and energy-related issues).
- Standalone adaptation plan.

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

POINTS	CRITERIA
0.95	If the city has named at least one climate change adaptation plan that covers the same or larger boundary than the city boundary.
0.6	If the largest boundary of any plan submitted by the city is a partial coverage of the city (i.e. covering part of the city and adjacent regions).
0.3	If the largest boundary of any plan submitted is smaller than the city boundary.
0	If the city has not answered this question for any of the plans it names in its submission, or if it has not named any climate change adaptation plan(s) in question 8.1.1.

# PA3 - ADAPTATION ACTIONS FOR KEY RISKS

MAX SCORE: 3.5 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the adaptation actions set out by the city align with the most significant climate hazards identified by the city.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 9.1 [col. 3]

**SCORING RATIONALE:** Proposed scoring from *Climate hazard(s) that action addresses* (Q 9.1, col. 3) compared to hazards identified in Q 2.2.

POINTS	CRITERIA
3.5 x fraction of hazards covered	Each category of hazard that the city identified as a significant hazard in question 2.2 is checked to see whether the city reported adaptation actions against them. The ratio of the total number of matched hazards is expressed on a scale of 0 to 3.9, with a score of 3.9 indicating that all the hazards identified in question 2.2 have at least one corresponding action listed in question 9.1. [E.g., if the city reports actions against 6 hazards compared to their 8 hazards reported under Q 2.2, scoring is $3.5 \times 6/8 = 2.63$ pts.]
0	If the city has not answered this question or question 2.2 in the questionnaire.

# PA4 - CO-BENEFITS OF ADAPTATION ACTIONS

MAX SCORE: 1.25 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the city has identified co-benefits against the adaptation actions that the city has reported.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 9.1 [col. 7]

**SCORING RATIONALE:** If the city has reported at least 1 adaptation action with the following:

POINTS	CRITERIA
1.25	If the city has recorded two or more co-benefits for each of the adaptation actions that it has listed.
0.6	If the city has two or more co-benefits for at least half of the reported actions.
0	Any other answer.

# PA5 - ADAPTATION ACTION COMPLETENESS

MAX SCORE: 3.1 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for the completeness of the adaptation actions reported, including whether they have estimated the proportion of population and/or ecosystems potentially exposed to increased resilience due to the reported action(s).

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 9.1

**SCORING RATIONALE:** If the city has reported at least 1 adaptation action with the following:

**[A]** Fully reported adaptation actions, proposed ADDITIVE\* scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 3.1 pts.

POINTS	CRITERIA
1.2	Identifies at least one adaptation action [Q9.1, col. 2], AND Provides an answer to EACH of the columns [3, 4, 5, 6, 8, (9 or 10), 11, 14 under question 9.1**].
0.3	For each additional action identified and fully reported.

**[B]** Partially reported adaptation actions, proposed ADDITIVE\* scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 2.3 pts.

POINTS	CRITERIA
0.7	Identifies at least one adaptation action [Q9.1, col. 2], AND Provides an answer to EACH of the columns [3, 4, 5, (9 or 10) under question 9.1**].
0.2	For each additional action identified and partially reported.
0	No adaptation action provided.

\*A first adaptation action in OPTION A can only be combined with additional adaptation actions in OPTION A and/or OPTION B. A first adaptation action in OPTION B can only be combined with additional adaptation actions in OPTION B.

\*\*For detailed information on the questions and columns in the 2025 CDP-ICLEI Track and States & Regions Questionnaire, please refer to [the Questionnaire Guidance document](#).

# PE1 - CITY ENERGY PLAN

MAX SCORE: 3.4 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the city has submitted an energy-related plan.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 8.1

**REQUIREMENTS** [OPTIONS]: If the answer to Q8.1 is "Yes, our jurisdiction has a climate action plan or strategy", the requirement below applies. If the response is anything else, the requirement does not apply.

- City must have reported one of the following options under *Climate action plan type* (Q 8.1.1, col. 1):
- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation, adaptation and energy-related issues).\*
  - Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation and energy-related issues).\*
  - Integrated climate plan (addressing adaptation and energy-related issues).\*
  - Standalone energy-related plan.

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

POINTS	CRITERIA
3.4	Yes, our jurisdiction has a climate action plan or strategy [and the city answered one of the above options in Q8.1.1, col. 1].
1.8	No, but we are currently undertaking one and it will be complete in the next year.
0.9	No, but we are intending to undertake one in the next two years.
0	Any other answer.

\*If the plan is integrated, PM1, PA1, and PE1 will be evaluated from the same question (8.1).



# PE2 – ENERGY PLAN COVERAGE

MAX SCORE: 3.35 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for the boundary covered by the energy-related plan(s) that the city has submitted relative to the city boundary.

**RELEVANT QUESTION [& COLUMNS]:** 8.1.1 [col. 5]

**REQUIREMENTS [OPTIONS]:** City must have reported one of the following options under *Climate action plan type* (Q 8.1.1, col. 1):

- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation, adaptation and energy-related issues).
- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation and energy-related issues).
- Integrated climate plan (addressing adaptation and energy-related issues).
- Standalone energy-related plan.

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

POINTS	CRITERIA
3.35	If the city has named at least one energy-related plan that covers the same or larger boundary than the city boundary.
2.2	If the largest boundary of any plan submitted by the city is a partial coverage of the city (i.e. covering part of the city and adjacent regions).
1.3	If the largest boundary of any plan submitted is smaller than the city boundary.
0	If the city has not answered this question for any of the plans it names in its submission, or if it has not named any energy-related plan(s) in question 8.1.1.

# PI1 - SYNERGIES IN ACTION PLANS

MAX SCORE: 1.5 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the actions within the city's plan have positive synergy.

**RELEVANT QUESTION [& COLUMNS]:** 8.1.1 [col. 12], 9.1 [col. 15], 9.2 [col. 15]

**SCORING RATIONALE:** Proposed ADDITIVE scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 1.5 pts.

POINTS	CRITERIA
0.5	If the city has selected "Plan assesses synergies of actions" (Q 8.1.1, Col. 12)
0.5	If the city has reported at least one adaptation action (Q 9.1) that contributes to the jurisdiction's energy access and/or poverty objectives (Q 9.1, Col. 15)
0.5	If the city has reported at least one mitigation action (Q 9.2) that contributes to the jurisdiction's energy access and/or poverty objectives (Q 9.2, Col. 15)
0	No positive synergies, or any other option.

PI2 – COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT  
MAX SCORE: 3 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the reported plan(s) is(are) based on community engagement and consultation, particularly with marginalized and frontline groups.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 8.1.1 [col. 9]

**REQUIREMENTS:** City must have reported a climate action plan under Q8.1.

**SCORING RATIONALE:** Proposed ADDITIVE scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 3 pts\*

POINTS	CRITERIA
2.3	If the city has engaged at least 3 groups.**
1.5	If the city has engaged less than 3 groups.**
0.35	Additional points if the city has engaged vulnerable population groups.
0.35	Additional points if the city has engaged indigenous peoples.
0	If the city has no group engaged, or any other option.

\* Scores for reporting vulnerable population groups and/or indigenous peoples are ADDITIONAL and are only awarded if the organization has reported at least one other community/organization option.

\*\* The response “Other, please specify” is counted as a group, if the organization has specified the group engaged.

An aerial photograph of a dense urban landscape, likely in Hong Kong. The image shows a mix of high-rise residential and commercial buildings, interspersed with green spaces and trees. A winding road with traffic is visible, cutting through the urban fabric. The overall scene depicts a highly developed, compact city environment.

# STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION



# IM1 - MITIGATION ACTION PROGRESS

MAX SCORE: 16.2 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for the implementation status of the mitigation actions the city has reported.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 9.2 [col. 12]

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

POINTS	CRITERIA
16.2	More than 7 actions are in the implementation stage or beyond (e.g. operation).
12.5	Between 4 and 7 actions are in the implementation stage or beyond (e.g. operation).
6.3	Between 1 and 3 actions are in the implementation stage or beyond (e.g. operation).
0	If the city has not reported any actions in the implementation stage or beyond.



# IA1 - ADAPTATION ACTION PROGRESS

MAX SCORE: 13.2 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for the implementation status of the adaptation actions the city has reported.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 9.1 [col. 12]

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

POINTS	CRITERIA
13.2	More than 7 actions are in the implementation stage or beyond (e.g. operation).
10.2	Between 4 and 7 actions are in the implementation stage or beyond (e.g. operation).
5.1	Between 1 and 3 actions are in the implementation stage or beyond (e.g. operation).
0	If the city has not reported any actions in the implementation stage or beyond.

I11 - EQUITABLE CLIMATE ACTION  
MAX SCORE: 7 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the city actively ensures the equitable distribution of climate action opportunities and benefits.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 1.4 [cols. 1 and 4]

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

POINTS	CRITERIA
7	If city assesses wider opportunities in all climate actions [ <b>Column 1</b> ] <b>AND</b> outlines that the city collects data (climate actions implementation and impact of climate actions), engages with communities, designs or implements actions that address the needs of frontline communities, undertakes wider benefits and/or equity assessments for its climate actions, and/or works to ensure climate actions align with UNDRIP and/or national laws pertaining to Indigenous rights [ <b>more than 3 options in Column 4</b> ].
6	If city assesses wider opportunities in all climate actions [ <b>Column 1</b> ] <b>AND</b> outlines that the city collects data (climate actions implementation and impact of climate actions), engages with communities, designs or implements actions that address the needs of frontline communities, undertakes wider benefits and/or equity assessments for its climate actions, and/or works to ensure climate actions align with UNDRIP and/or national laws pertaining to Indigenous rights [ <b>at least 3 options in Column 4</b> ].
5	If city assesses wider opportunities in many or some actions [ <b>Column 1</b> ] <b>AND</b> outlines that the city collects data (climate actions implementation and impact of climate actions), engages with communities, designs or implements actions that address the needs of frontline communities, undertakes wider benefits and/or equity assessments for its climate actions, and/or works to ensure climate actions align with UNDRIP and/or national laws pertaining to Indigenous rights [ <b>less than 3 options in Column 4</b> ].
3.5	If city assesses wider opportunities in many or some actions [ <b>Column 1</b> ] <b>AND</b> outlines that the city collects data (climate actions implementation and impact of climate actions), engages with communities, designs or implements actions that address the needs of frontline communities, undertakes wider benefits and/or equity assessments for its climate actions, and/or works to ensure climate actions align with UNDRIP and/or national laws pertaining to Indigenous rights [ <b>at least 1 option in Column 4</b> ].
2	If city assesses wider opportunities in all, many or some actions [ <b>Column 1</b> ] <b>BUT</b> does not that the city collects data (climate actions implementation and impact of climate actions), engages with communities, designs or implements actions that address the needs of frontline communities, undertakes wider benefits and/or equity assessments for its climate actions, nor works to ensure climate actions align with UNDRIP and/or national laws pertaining to Indigenous rights [ <b>no options in Column 4</b> ].
0	If the city does not currently assess wider opportunities [ <b>Column 1</b> ].

# II2 - COLLABORATION ON CLIMATE ACTION

MAX SCORE: 5.6 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the city actively collaborates with national government, business, and/or civil society on climate-related issues.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 1.6 [cols. 1 and 5]

**SCORING RATIONALE:**

POINTS	CRITERIA
5.6	If city reports examples of collaboration with at least 3 stakeholders.
2.8	If the report examples of collaboration with 1 or 2 stakeholders.
0	If the city does not report examples of collaboration with at least 1 stakeholder.





# RESULTS MONITORING



# MM1 - MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF MITIGATION PLANS

MAX SCORE: 7.2 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether a process for monitoring, evaluation and updates has been established for the city's climate change mitigation plan.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 8.1.1 [col. 6]

**REQUIREMENTS** [OPTIONS]: City must have reported one of the following options under *Climate action plan type* (Q 8.1.1, col. 1):

- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation, adaptation and energy-related issues).\*
- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation and adaptation).\*
- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation and energy-related issues).\*
- Standalone mitigation plan.

**SCORING RATIONALE:** Proposed ADDITIVE scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 7.2 pts.

POINTS	CRITERIA
3	If the city has reported at least one climate mitigation plan with annual monitoring or more frequently than annually.
2	If the city has reported at least one climate mitigation plan with monitoring every 1-3 years.
1	If the city has reported at least one climate mitigation plan with monitoring every 3-5 years or every 5+ years.
3	If the city has reported at least one climate mitigation plan with annual evaluation or more frequently than annually.
2	If the city has reported at least one climate mitigation plan with evaluation every 1-3 years.
1	If the city has reported at least one climate mitigation plan with evaluation every 3-5 years or every 5+ years.
3	If the city has reported at least one climate mitigation plan with annual updates or more frequently than annually.
2	If the city has reported at least one climate mitigation plan with updates every 1-3 years.
1	If the city has reported at least one climate mitigation plan with updates every 3-5 years or every 5+ years.
0	If no monitoring, evaluation or update processes are in place.

\*If the plan is integrated, MM1, MA1, and ME1 will be evaluated from the same question (8.1.1).



# MA1 - MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF ADAPTATION PLANS

MAX SCORE: 6.3 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether a process for monitoring, evaluation and updates has been established for the city's climate change adaptation plan.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 8.1.1 [col. 6]

**REQUIREMENTS** [OPTIONS]: City must have reported one of the following options under *Climate action plan type* (Q 8.1.1, col. 1):

- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation, adaptation and energy-related issues).\*
- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation and adaptation).\*
- Integrated climate plan (addressing adaptation and energy-related issues).\*
- Standalone adaptation plan.

**SCORING RATIONALE:** Proposed ADDITIVE scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 6.3 pts.

POINTS	CRITERIA
2.6	If the city has reported at least one climate adaptation plan with annual monitoring or more frequently than annually.
1.6	If the city has reported at least one climate adaptation plan with monitoring every 1-3 years.
0.6	If the city has reported at least one climate adaptation plan with monitoring every 3-5 years or every 5+ years.
2.6	If the city has reported at least one climate adaptation plan with annual evaluation or more frequently than annually.
1.6	If the city has reported at least one climate adaptation plan with evaluation every 1-3 years.
0.6	If the city has reported at least one climate adaptation plan with evaluation every 3-5 years or every 5+ years.
2.6	If the city has reported at least one climate adaptation plan with annual updates or more frequently than annually.
1.6	If the city has reported at least one climate adaptation plan with updates every 1-3 years.
0.6	If the city has reported at least one climate adaptation plan with updates every 3-5 years or every 5+ years.
0	If no monitoring, evaluation or update processes are in place.

\*If the plan is integrated, MM1, MA1, and ME1 will be evaluated from the same question (8.1.1).

# ME1 - MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF ENERGY PLANS

MAX SCORE: 4.5 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether a process for monitoring, evaluation and updates has been established for the city’s energy-related plan.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 8.1.1 [col. 6]

**REQUIREMENTS** [OPTIONS]: City must have reported one of the following options under *Climate action plan type* (Q 8.1.1, col. 1):

- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation, adaptation and energy-related issues).\*
- Integrated climate plan (addressing mitigation and energy-related issues).\*
- Integrated climate plan (addressing adaptation and energy-related issues).\*
- Standalone energy-related plan.

**SCORING RATIONALE:** Proposed ADDITIVE scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 4.5 pts.

POINTS	CRITERIA
2	If the city has reported at least one energy-related plan with annual monitoring or more frequently than annually.
1.2	If the city has reported at least one energy-related plan with monitoring every 1-3 years.
0.6	If the city has reported at least one energy-related plan with monitoring every 3-5 years or every 5+ years.
2	If the city has reported at least one energy-related plan with annual evaluation or more frequently than annually.
1.2	If the city has reported at least one energy-related plan with evaluation every 1-3 years.
0.6	If the city has reported at least one energy-related plan with evaluation every 3-5 years or every 5+ years.
2	If the city has reported at least one energy-related plan with annual updates or more frequently than annually.
1.2	If the city has reported at least one energy-related plan with updates every 1-3 years.
0.6	If the city has reported at least one energy-related plan with updates every 3-5 years or every 5+ years.
0	If no monitoring, evaluation or update processes are in place.

\*If the plan is integrated, MM1, MA1, and ME1 will be evaluated from the same question (8.1.1).

# MI1 - OVERSIGHT OF CLIMATE RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES


MAX SCORE: 4.5 PTS

**DESCRIPTION:** This section contains the scoring for whether the city actively oversees climate-related risks and opportunities.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 1.3 [col. 1]

**SCORING RATIONALE:** Proposed ADDITIVE scoring for cities, CAPPED TO 4.5 pts.

POINTS	CRITERIA
1.5	If city has mechanisms in place to inform government on climate related issues. Relates to Rows 1 & 2.
1.5	If city has mechanisms in place to consider climate-related issues. Relates to Rows 3-6.
1.5	If city has mechanisms in place to assign responsibilities on climate related issues. Relates to Rows 7 & 8.
1.5	If city has other processes in place different to the previous. Relates to Row 9.
0	If city does not have processes in place or does not know of processes in place. Relates to Rows 10 & 11.

A woman with dark hair and colorful beaded earrings is speaking into a microphone. She is wearing a brown long-sleeved top and light-colored pants. In the background, two men are visible: one in a white shirt and another in a yellow shirt and red cap. The setting appears to be an indoor community meeting with a plain wall and a fluorescent light fixture.

# INFORMATIONAL INDICATORS

# T01 - ADDITIONAL CLIMATE TARGETS

## INFORMATIONAL INDICATOR

**DESCRIPTION:** This section assesses any other relevant target(s) reported by the city for Waste management, Water security/quality, AFOLU, Food Policy, and/or Air Quality, which is not included as part of the official OPCC scoring.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 7.1 [col. 1]

**RATIONALE:** The indicator should identify the presence of any additional climate target(s).

RESULT	CRITERIA
Keyword(s)	The categories* in which the city has reported relevant targets are displayed as one or more Keywords ("Waste", "Water", "AFOLU", "Food", and/or "Air Quality"), listed as comma-separated values when multiple categories apply.

\*For detailed information on the different categories of target types in the 2025 CDP-ICLEI Track and States & Regions Questionnaire, please refer to [the Questionnaire Guidance document](#).



# T02 - STEPPING-STONE TARGETS

## INFORMATIONAL INDICATOR

**DESCRIPTION:** This section assesses whether the city has reported stepping-stone\* GHG emissions reduction targets every five years.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 6.1.1 [col. 16]

**REQUIREMENTS:** Answer requirement from Q 6.1.1, col. 1 (*Select a reference ID for the target*). City must have reported more than one target.

**RATIONALE:** The indicator should identify if the city meets the criteria in a binary way (Response/No), and the response should provide information on the Target Years of each target that comply with the conditions below, separated by comma.

RESULT	CRITERIA
Target Years (separated by comma)	If the city has set emissions reduction targets at most 5 years apart each other, distinct and in ascending order (regardless of the emissions sources or boundary used)**.
No	If the city has NOT set emissions reduction targets that comply with the conditions above.

\*Stepping-stone targets are intermediate goals that indicate progress towards a long-term objective,

\*\*Multiple targets reported for the same year (e.g., two targets in 2030) do not count as separate steps toward a long-term goal.

# T03 - 100% RENEWABLE ENERGY TARGET

## INFORMATIONAL INDICATOR

**DESCRIPTION:** This section checks for the presence of target(s) leading to 100% Renewable Energy in the target year.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 7.1 [col. 14]

**REQUIREMENTS** [OPTIONS]: Answer requirement from Q 7.1, col. 1 (*Target type*). City must have reported one of the following options:

- [Renewable energy generation target]
  - Increase generation of renewable energy (all energy types)
  - Increase generation of renewable electricity
  - Increase generation of renewable heating and/or cooling
  - Other renewable energy generation target type, please specify
- [Renewable energy consumption target]
  - Increase proportion of energy consumed from renewable sources (all energy types)
  - Increase proportion of electricity consumed from renewable sources
  - Increase proportion of heating and cooling consumed from renewable energy sources
  - Other renewable energy consumption target type, please specify
- [Renewable energy installed capacity target]
  - Increase installed capacity of renewable energy (all energy types)
  - Increase installed capacity of renewable electricity
  - Increase installed capacity of renewable heating and/or cooling
  - Other renewable energy installed capacity target type, please specify

**RATIONALE:** The indicator should identify if the city meets the criteria in a binary way (Response/No), and the response should provide information on the percentage of total energy that is renewable in target year and the target year reported.

RESULT	CRITERIA
Value in % (Target Year)	If the city has reported at least one target* to achieve >= than 90% renewable energy in target year.
No	If the city has NOT reported any target to achieve >= than 90% renewable energy.

\*In case multiple targets comply with rule, return the value and year of the one with largest % describe (most ambitious target).

# T04 - SCOPE 3 EMISSIONS TARGETS

## INFORMATIONAL INDICATOR

**DESCRIPTION:** This section assesses whether the city includes emissions occurring outside the jurisdiction boundary as a result of in-jurisdiction activities (Scope 3 emissions) in its targets.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 6.1.1 [col. 5]

**RATIONALE:** The indicator should identify if the city meets the criteria in a binary way (Yes/ No).

RESULT	CRITERIA
Yes	<p>If the city has reported a target that includes one of the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All emissions sources which are included in the jurisdiction inventory* (<i>confirm that city included Scope 3 in inventory</i>)</li><li>• All BASIC (GPC) emissions sources which are included in jurisdiction inventory* (<i>confirm that city included Scope 3 waste in inventory</i>)</li><li>• All BASIC+ (GPC) emissions sources included in jurisdiction inventory* (<i>confirm that city included Scope 3 in inventory</i>)</li><li>• All the BASIC+ (GPC) emissions sources plus other indirect emissions (scope 3) included in jurisdiction inventory, please specify other indirect emissions covered</li></ul>
No	<p>If the city has NOT reported a target that includes any of the options above and/or did NOT include Scope 3 in inventory.</p>

\*Cities inventories may consider notation keys as part of their scope 3 reporting. However, at least scope 3 waste emissions should be reported with numerical values (i.e., a notation key is not enough).

# T05 - EU/NDC ALIGNMENT

## INFORMATIONAL INDICATOR

**DESCRIPTION:** This section assesses the targets reported by the city regarding the achievement of emissions reductions in line with the EU Green Deal [only for EU cities].

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 6.1.1

**REQUIREMENTS:** The city must be located in a European Union (EU) member country.

**RATIONALE:** The indicator should identify if the city meets the criteria\* in a binary way (Yes/ No).

RESULT	CRITERIA
Yes	If the city has at least one target compatible with the EU Green Deal by 2030.
No	If the city has NO target compatible with the EU Green Deal by 2030

\*This indicator checks if a city's target aligns with the EU Green Deal by estimating 2005 emissions using national CO<sub>2</sub> growth rates, applying the required 2030 reduction, and comparing it to the city's target year emissions.

# T06 - CARBON CREDIT USE

## INFORMATIONAL INDICATOR

**DESCRIPTION:** This section assesses whether the city plans to use carbon credits to meet targets and how transparently the city reports them.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 6.1.1 [col. 7]

**RATIONALE:** The indicator should identify if the city meets the criteria using a three-tiered response, as follows:

RESULT	CRITERIA
Yes, not quantified	If at least one target includes: “Yes, but the number of credits required has not been quantified”.
Yes, quantified	If at least one target includes: “Yes, and the number of credits required has been quantified”.
No	If neither of the condition above is met.

# P01 - OTHER CLIMATE PLANS

## INFORMATIONAL INDICATOR

**DESCRIPTION:** This section assesses whether the city has submitted any other climate-related plan, policy and/or strategy for Waste management, Biodiversity, Water security/quality, AFOLU, Food Policy, and/or Air Quality, which is not included as part of the official OPCC scoring.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 8.2 [col. 1]

**RATIONALE:** The indicator should identify if the city planning contemplate relevant areas of action (Waste management, Biodiversity, Water security/quality, AFOLU, Food Policy, and/or Air Quality).

RESULT	CRITERIA
Keyword(s)	The relevant areas of action* in which the city has reported plans, policies and/or strategies are displayed as one or more Keywords ("Waste", "Biodiversity", "AFOLU", "Water", "Food", and/or "Air Quality"), listed as comma-separated values when multiple categories apply.

\*For detailed information on the different areas of action in the 2025 CDP-ICLEI Track and States & Regions Questionnaire, please refer to [the Questionnaire Guidance document](#).



# P02 - PROCUREMENT & EMISSION STANDARDS

## INFORMATIONAL INDICATOR

**DESCRIPTION:** This section checks for the inclusion of standards to reduce emissions from the jurisdiction's procurement and purchases of goods and services.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 8.4 [col. 1]

**RATIONALE:** The indicator should identify for the inclusion of strategies or standards using a three-tiered response, as follows:

RESULT	CRITERIA
Yes	The jurisdiction has reported a strategy or standard.
No	The jurisdiction has NOT reported a strategy or standard.
N/A	The jurisdiction DO NOT KNOW if the jurisdiction has a strategy or standard.

# P04 - IPCC SUB-STRATEGY ALIGNMENT

## INFORMATIONAL INDICATOR

**DESCRIPTION:** This section checks the alignment of actions' types, as reported by the city, with IPCC entry point sub-strategies.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 9.2 [col. 2]

**RATIONALE:** The action types reported by the city are assessed against two categories: (i) Urban Form Actions and (ii) Energy Transition Actions\*. The indicator should identify if the city meets the criteria using a four-tiered response, as follows:

RESULT	CRITERIA
Yes, many	If the city has reported 3 or more actions in both categories.
Yes, some	If the city has reported 3 or more actions in one category.
Yes, a few	If the city has reported 1-2 actions in any category.
No	If the city has NOT reported any action in any category.

\*Urban Form Actions focus on city planning and design to create compact, accessible, and sustainable communities. Energy Transition Actions target reducing emissions through cleaner energy, efficient technologies, and low-carbon infrastructure.

# P05 - FOSSIL FUEL PHASE-OUT & DECARBONIZATION

## INFORMATIONAL INDICATOR

**DESCRIPTION:** This section checks if the city has actionable plans for reducing its carbon footprint, specifically through plans for phasing out fossil fuels in energy and decarbonizing investments.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 9.2 [col. 2], and 9.4 [col. 1]

**RATIONALE:** The indicator should identify if the jurisdiction has plans for reducing its carbon footprint, using a three-tiered response, as follows:

RESULT	CRITERIA
Yes	The jurisdiction has reported both a plan for decarbonising their investments (any option applies) AND any action in action type "Phasing out the use of fossil fuels in energy (e.g. closing coal plants, banning expansion of fossil fuel reserves and new fossil fuel energy generation etc.)".
Somewhat	Either the jurisdiction has reported a plan for decarbonising their investments (any option applies) OR any action in action type "Phasing out the use of fossil fuels in energy (e.g. closing coal plants, banning expansion of fossil fuel reserves and new fossil fuel energy generation etc.)".
No	The jurisdiction has NOT reported any of the plans/actions mentioned above.

# P06 - PUBLIC PLAN AVAILABILITY

## INFORMATIONAL INDICATOR

**DESCRIPTION:** This section assesses whether reported plans are publicly available.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 8.1.1 [col. 4]

**REQUIREMENT** [OPTIONS]: Answer requirement from Q 8.1.1, col. 4 (*Confirm attachment/link provided to plan*). City must have reported one of the valid options:

- The plan can be accessed (unrestricted) on the link provided.
- The plan has been attached and can be accessed (unrestricted) on the link provided.

**RATIONALE:** The indicator should identify if the jurisdiction has reported publicly available plans using a three-tiered response, as follows:

RESULT	CRITERIA
Yes	If the city has reported both valid options for all reported plans.
Somewhat	If the city has reported at least one valid option for any of the reported plans.
No	If the city has NOT reported any valid option.

# IO1 - OTHER CLIMATE PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

## INFORMATIONAL INDICATOR

**DESCRIPTION:** This section reflects the implementation status of climate-related plans, policies and/or strategies reported in PO1.

**RELEVANT QUESTION** [& COLUMNS]: 8.2 [col. 4]

**RATIONALE:** The indicator should identify the extent of plan implementation using a three-tiered response, as follows:

RESULT	CRITERIA
Post-implementation	If the city has more actions that are in the post-implementation stage than are in the implementation stages.
Implementation	If the city has more actions that are in implementation stages than those in post-implementation stages.
N/A	If the city has not reported on the implementation stage of any action, or unclear classifications.



Co-funded by  
the European Union



Co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or CINEA. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

**OUR AIM IS TO SUPPORT THE  
CREATION OF ONE PLANET  
CITIES ACROSS THE GLOBE.  
CITIES WHERE ALL PEOPLE  
THRIVE WITHIN THE  
ECOLOGICAL LIMITS OF OUR  
ONE AND ONLY PLANET.**

© 2025

© 1986 Panda symbol. WWF - World Wide Fund for Nature (Formerly World Wildlife Fund)

© "WWF" is a WWF Registered Trademark.

WWF, Avenue du Mont-Bland, 1196 Gland, Switzerland

Tel. +41 22 364 9111. Fax. +41 22 364 0332

For contact details and further information, please visit our international website at  
[www.panda.org/opcc](http://www.panda.org/opcc) or email [opcc@wwf.se](mailto:opcc@wwf.se).

Back cover photograph: Pexels / Ciprian Boiciuci (CC0)



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

together possible [panda.org](http://panda.org)