

C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group

Integrated Climate Actions Prioritisation Framework, Process Guide and Tool

Climate Action Prioritisation Case Study

Introduction

This document presents a case study from Medellín developed as part of the C40 Action Prioritisation Tool and Process. The purpose of this case study is to promote learning among cities by featuring an example of action prioritisation process and key takeaways from the case study city. This case study results from a series of interviews with the C40 City Advisor and/or key city staff, as well as a review of supporting materials provided by the case study city.

Medellín

Summary

At the time of case study development, the City of Medellín was in the process of developing CAP actions for its plan and had not yet completed the full action prioritisation process. The city participated as a pilot test city for C40's Action Prioritisation Framework and Tool, and insights from that experience are included throughout this case study.

The purpose of action prioritisation was two-fold in Medellín: to select a shortlist of actions to be included in the CAP and to select among those the actions for near-term implementation. Prior to development of the Action Prioritisation Framework and Tool, the City had already identified CAP actions and performed an initial prioritisation. The City then performed a second prioritisation because they had too many actions and wanted to shorten the list to be included in the CAP. For actions selected for near-term implementation, it was also important to ensure they were selected from other climate change plans in the region. The overarching purpose in prioritising was to support plan implementation. The CAP development team knew that if they want initiatives to receive budget funding and political support for implementation, those actions must be in the plan.

Action Development

As with many other cities, Medellín's first step was to look to other plans in the City and the region to see what applicable actions have been considered. During the first stage of CAP development and action prioritisation in 2017/2018, the City contracted with a local university that helped to review all plans in the region and locally. Through this process, the City and university involved delegates from organizations associated with these plans and organized the delegates into 11 topic area committees. The City then held a workshop where delegates prioritised the actions they considered most important.

During the second phase of action development and prioritisation in 2019, the only participants were the core CAP team, which included City staff from the Environmental Department and the C40 City Advisor. In this phase, the CAP team selected some of the actions that were identified as very important to other plans and considered the City's GHG inventory to ensure CAP actions were developed to respond to the most important emissions sources. The City then facilitated a series of workshops with internal stakeholders from different GHG inventory sectors (buildings and energy, transportation, waste). These workshops included people who will ultimately lead action implementation, and participants were essential in helping the CAP team to understand which actions will have the greatest impact. The CAP team also reviewed reports and other resources from C40, regional plans, and the national government plan (No Carbon Colombia), and took different action ideas from these sources. The City was then preparing to filter these actions to develop a complete list for use in the full prioritisation process.

The City's intent is to validate action prioritisation results again later with public input. Once the list of actions is prioritized the City will include them in the inclusive climate action (ICA) process to better understand their social impacts.

Criteria Selection and Weighting

Before the CAP team started the action rating process, they initially wanted to choose a long list of co-benefit criteria to demonstrate how impactful the CAP actions are beyond GHG reductions. However, the team later realized it was important to narrow this list to consider what is most important in rating climate actions and think critically about what is most relevant for Medellín. This includes air quality and inclusivity, which have a special focus within the city.

Action Rating and Prioritisation

The CAP team divided actions into their corresponding emissions sectors and two team members were responsible for rating energy actions, one rated transportation actions, and one rated the waste actions. They did a practice exercise together to rate 6 actions to collectively understand the rating questions and process. Upon reviewing the exercise results together, they realized the need to be clear about defining actions as a program, policy, or project. They also discovered the importance in ensuring all raters have the same understanding of criteria option definitions.

It should be noted that during case study development, the city was undergoing an administration change, and the CAP team completed the action prioritisation pilot test with only staff from the Environmental Department. The incoming city staff will be responsible for full action evaluation, and while city officers who remain in office could weigh in on the process, to achieve the City's inclusivity goals staff from other departments will also need to participate.

Results

As mentioned above, the City will perform a complete action prioritisation process with multiple city departments following the pilot test, so the initial results from that exercise are not final. However, the CAP team still learned some important lessons based on their initial use of the Tool and are already planning for how the Tool's outputs can help to further CAP development. For example, the team found the co-benefit filter for different action types to be very informative in helping to identify potential action gaps. They also intend to use the feasibility analysis results to help define additional actions to help overcome implementation barriers. The greatest challenge that their small CAP team faced during the pilot test was a lack of deep technical knowledge, particularly in the energy sector actions. The team anticipates that this challenge can be overcome, at least in part, with participation from additional City staff.

Takeaways

- ▶ Evaluation criteria selection should be focused (instead of overly broad) and based on aspects of local importance.
- ▶ It is essential that all action raters have a shared understanding of the rating options and definitions; a practice evaluation session can be used to help identify potential areas of confusion and achieve consensus on definitions.
- ▶ A city can have multiple purposes for prioritisation, such as narrowing down a long list of actions or identifying near-term objectives.