

SFPUC STRATEGIC SUSTAINABILITY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND SCORING METHODOLOGY

This text explains the methodology SFPUC uses to evaluate and “score” our annual strategic sustainability performance. Under “Plan→Target→Perform→Assess”, you can click on any of SFPUC’s annual sustainability performance reports to access that year’s individual KPI data, performance scores and trends.

Normalizing Performance Data

Normalizing data is the process of representing data against a driver or strong determinant or correlator of performance. For instance, the amount of water distributed by the SFPUC is a driver that has a direct impact on energy use. Thus when looking at efficiency measures, for instance, data can be presented as energy use per million gallons of water delivered. Normalization also facilitates trend analysis as it helps hold the variable operating factors constant. SFPUC normalizes all data where appropriate in order to facilitate evaluation and to benchmark and trend performance results over time.

Performance Trends

With multiple years of sustainability data now “banked” for the majority of our KPIs, we have begun trending our performance results for the value it can add to benchmarking, risk analysis and long term strategic planning. Note that to keep the results realistic for actual budgeting and planning purposes, SFPUC trends only its data results; we do not trend our scores.

Performance Scoring and Profile

Why do we score our annual performance data? To provide stakeholders a snapshot of our annual performance and transparency in progress. We acknowledge that there is a degree of subjectivity in the scoring and expect that this will diminish as we build a track record, monitor data trends over time and secure third party accounting of our annual sustainability performance scope including data, evaluations, scoring, reporting and use of results.

To enable a consistent, methodical assignment of scores, we continue to score our annual data results for each KPI using a generic ordinal scale from 1 to 5 (graphic 1 below). This scale is a snapshot yet surfaces specific KPI progress, reversals and continuity in performance prior to calculating the average for the associated objective. It allows us to evaluate and benchmark performance against our prior performance and future targets, and against industry peers in both private and government sectors while also taking into account local to international rules and regulations and industry standards and best practices. It also enables us to average the scores for each of our six sustainability categories. In the case of KPIs with multiple scores, we average those scores first and round up or down from .5 to provide the average score for that objective.

Please note for evaluation and scoring purposes, we define the term “average” and the score of “3” as what’s required of ourselves and all industry peers, including meeting all specific federal, state and local rules, regulations and industry best practice. To express it another way, achieving a score of 4 or 5 means that SFPUC exceeds requirements and/or excels in and/or leads best practice for that KPI. Thus, the dark green bulls-eye target for every KPI is a performance score of “5”.

An additional note is that we include in our scoring those qualitative KPIs that are supported with enough information to provide a basis for assessment. An example is GM1.4, “Management is held accountable for project and division performance through audits and performance reports.” Here, we compare and benchmark against the previous years’ performance to determine whether there has been improvement toward annual targets and the objective of driving accountability and transparency. Note, however, that we do not include in our scoring the few KPIs that are primarily process or input oriented, or include elements so variable that scoring is not yet useful. An example is GM5.2, “Support and initiate local, state and federal policy actions that support SFPUC’s mission.”

Finally, in cases where SFPUC is assessing data for the first time, we consider the data a baseline and will assign a score of “3” with the following exception: we’ll assign a higher or lower score if a new KPI shows performance that can be benchmarked against evidence that we are performing above or below applicable standards and/or relative to peer and industry practice.

SCORING CRITERIA		1	2	3	4	5
Impact		Negative impact		Average/No impact	Positive impact	Significantly positive impact
Performance	via peers (/via self)	Does not meet requirements		Meets requirements	Exceeds requirements	Significantly exceeds requirements
	baseline	Baseline data with no benchmark(s) will score 3				
Practice		Does not meet best practice		Meets best practice	Leads best practice	Significantly leads best practice

Performance Profile

This Profile allows us to assign a relative score to the evaluation of performance for each KPI. Then we average the KPI scores for each objective to establish an overall score for that objective. The term "average" in this case refers only to performance levels based on this relative scale from 1 to 5.