

ClimateWise member scoring methodology

Each sub-principle has three levels of evidence against which members are scored as follows:

Six points	All three levels of evidence are provided
Five points	All three levels of evidence are partially provided
Four points	Two levels of evidence are provided
Three points	Two levels of evidence are partially provided
Two points	One level of evidence is provided
One point	One level of evidence is partially provided
Zero points	No evidence is provided

An **additional two points** are available against each Principle for demonstrating planned activities. This is intended to encourage members to provide evidence of proposed activities and initiatives to drive improvements against each Principle.

Member scores are also weighted based on their organisation type to reflect the need for prioritisation of efforts on the most material areas.

Members are also exempt from responding to certain sub-principles based on their organisation type. These exemptions are summarised below:

A Professional bodies and associations	1.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2
B Insurers	None
C Brokers	4.1, 4.2
D Risk modellers	1.3, 1.4, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2
E Loss adjusters	4.1, 4.2
F Reinsurers	3.2, 3.3

Members can also exempt themselves from up to a further four sub-principles, providing a justifiable explanation is provided.

Scoring process

1. Detailed review of ClimateWise submissions

Members submitted their reports and supporting documents to CISL which are in turn reviewed and scored by PwC analysts using the methodology described above.

2. Distribution of initial feedback

An initial feedback template was shared with each member showing the initial score against each of the six Principles and highlighting areas of where further clarification could be provided.

3. Discussions with members

Following the distribution of initial feedback, all members were given the opportunity to participate in a call to discuss their initial score, provide clarifications and submit additional documentation relevant to the clarifications discussed.

4. Reassessment of scores

Some member scores were then amended as a result of the discussions with members and the review of additional relevant documentation.

5. Distribution of final feedback and scores

A final feedback template was then shared with each member including a breakdown of the final score, a high-level summary of key strengths and areas for development, and a summary of performance relative to other members.