

Scorecard Methodology

The Kooyong Climate Scorecard is based on an expert panel's assessment of the candidates' responses to a detailed questionnaire on climate policy.

The Panel

The five members of the scoring panel were as follows:

Simon Holmes à Court Member	Senior Adviser Climate and Energy College University of Melbourne
Ric Brazzale	Managing Director Green Energy Markets
Assoc Professor Lauren Rickards	Co-leader of the Climate Change and Resilience research program Centre for Urban Research RMIT University
Leigh Naunton	Convenor, Kooyong Climate Change Alliance
Alex Currell	Kooyong Climate Change Alliance

Candidate Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed by the Kooyong Climate Change Alliance with input from members of the expert panel. Sources consulted included the Australian Conservation Foundation's National Agenda (https://www.acf.org.au/our_policy). The questionnaire is divided into seven sections, with multiple questions in each section. The questionnaire sections correspond to the seven scoring categories on the scorecard:

1. Views on climate change and the need for action
2. Greenhouse gas emissions targets
3. Economy-wide policies to reduce emissions
4. Clean energy targets
5. Transition to renewable energy
6. Reduction of transport emissions
7. Coal and gas mining

The questionnaire was e-mailed to all candidates on 11 February 2019, with responses due by 22 February; extensions were granted (at the request of candidates) to 25 February and then to 26 February. Candidates were also asked to answer one supplementary question about the use of carry-over credits from the Kyoto Protocol.

Candidate Responses

Responses were received from all candidates except Jana Stewart (Labor); no request for a further time extension for submission was received from the candidate. Josh Frydenberg (Liberal) submitted an updated response following Government policy announcements on 25 February 2019.

Published Labor Party policy was analysed and aligned with the questionnaire so that the Labor candidate could be scored. Candidates had been advised when the questionnaire was distributed that they would be scored according to published policies if they did not respond.

Question Importance (weighting)

Prior to sending the questionnaire to the candidates, panel members independently assessed the relative importance of the questions within each of the seven questionnaire sections. A set of panel importance scores was developed based on the panellists' assessments and agreed by the panel. Question weights were then assigned, reflecting the percentage contribution of each question to its overall section score.

The Scoring Process

Each panel member scored the candidate responses independently. Questions were scored on a scale of 1 to 5, with half points allowed i.e. there were 9 possible scores for each question. The results of this scoring were analysed, and a consolidated set of scores was produced, taking into account the panel mean and median scores. All panel members reviewed the consolidated scores, resulting in the final agreed set of panel scores.

The final question scores were multiplied by the question weights and the results summed for each questionnaire section. This produced scores for each of the scorecard categories, with possible values between 1 and 5.

Candidate Scores

The final candidate scores were as follows:

Questionnaire Section	Josh Frydenberg Liberal	Jana Stewart Labor	Julian Burnside Greens	Oliver Yates Independent	Angelina Zubac Independent	Bill Chandler Independent
1. Views on climate change	1.50	4.25	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
2. Greenhouse gas emissions targets	1.00	3.80	5.00	4.60	3.40	4.60
3. Economy-wide emissions reduction	1.23	3.27	4.41	4.83	3.49	4.47
4. Clean energy targets	1.00	3.10	4.50	4.50	3.70	4.40
5. Transition to renewables	1.00	3.70	4.65	4.25	3.50	3.63
6. Transport	1.00	3.50	4.83	4.20	4.53	4.85
7. Coal and gas mining	1.00	1.80	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.88

For the scorecard presentation, the scores were colour coded as follows:

Score	Interpretation	Colour
Score less than 2.25	Poor or no response	Red
Score between 2.25 and 3.75	Fair or partial response	Orange
Score greater than 3.75	Good response	Green

In a small number of cases, candidates' scores were close to the cut-off score between the scoring categories. However, the panel agreed that the scorecard gave a fair representation of the candidates' responses to the questionnaire.