Scoring/Ranking the Relative 'CO2/GHG Impact' of Work Plan 'Objectives

It is desirable to rank/score Work Plan 'Objectives' by their relative impact on Cobourg's CO2/GHG emissions, if/when the 'Objective' is achieved.

Update for discussion:

How:
With a system that scores/ranks the GHG Emissions impact of each Work Plan 'Objective' when achieved, relative to the other Work Plan 'Objectives'.

When achieved, the Emissions impact of the SCCAC's 'Objectives' are likely all **Positive.**
As discussed at the last meeting, the 'Objectives' of other Advisory Committees could certainly have **Negative** Emissions impact when achieved.

As discussed previously, a simple Emissions ranking system could use:
'POSITIVE: High-Medium-Low'
or
'NEGATIVE: High-Medium-Low'

The objective is not to have a complex sophisticated ranking; it is to have a usable approach now that is much better than none, in order to help Committees prioritize their numerous Work Plan 'Objectives'/Actions.
Over time, if the system can be made more objective as well as usable, even better.

Initially and annually, the 'Lead' or team for a Work Plan 'Objective' would recommend a High-Medium-Low rank for the 'Objective' relative to the other 'Objectives' on the Committee Work Plan.
They would explain their reasons to the other Committee Members.
After questions and discussion, a majority vote could decide the relative Impact Ranking for now.

The Committee would use this Emissions ranking as one of their inputs to deciding or adjusting the priority of the numerous Work Plan 'Objectives'.

To set better relative priorities among 'Objectives', it would be desirable to also rank all the 'Objectives' by their relative 'Cost-To-Achieve' in volunteer-time, Staff-time and money.

Combining the 'Emissions' scores and 'Cost-To-Achieve' scores would be a better way to help prioritize Committee Objectives.

When of interest, I can recommend a method to quantify/objectify the combination of Emissions and Cost-To-Achieve scores.

Warren