

CS04 / CARBON SOFTWARE SELECTION SCORECARD

Test the workflow. Then choose the tool.

Compare software using the same evidence tasks, explicit weights and non-negotiable requirements.

SESSION	WORK WITH	OUTPUT
90 minutes + vendor trials	Finance, sustainability, IT and the method owner	Recorded shortlist or hold
01 / USE CASE	One reporting method, team and evidence workflow	
02 / MUST-HAVES	Rights, method support, controls and complete exit	
03 / SHARED TRIAL	Same tasks, data, configuration and reviewer	
04 / EVIDENCE	Record demonstrated behaviour and unresolved gaps	
05 / DIAGNOSTIC SCORE	User-chosen weights; complete comparable ratings only	
06 / DECISION	Reject, investigate or scope a limited pilot	

Original procurement aid for carbon-data operations. It does not certify a product, verify an inventory or rank named vendors.

THE DECISION RULE

Scores summarise declared procurement preferences. They are not evidence of compliance, accuracy, assurance or guaranteed ROI. Keep mandatory outcomes, cost assumptions, unsupported criteria and sensitivity beside the total.

FILLABLE WORKSHEET / SCOPE AND EVIDENCE

Build the record.

Use short answers and evidence IDs. Expand long records in the CSV or editable HTML worksheet. Unknown is a valid answer.

01 / What workflow must the tool support?

Name method, users, workload, integrations, review owner and comparison horizon.

02 / Which requirements are non-negotiable?

Define pass evidence for data rights/access, method support, approvals and complete evidence export.

03 / Which criteria matter for this decision?

Choose up to six comparative criteria and an observable task for each. Add rows in the CSV.

04 / What weights will you use?

Use 0-5 and record why, before trials. Keep the same weights across all options.

05 / What will every option demonstrate?

Use the same synthetic/authorised data, tasks, version, reviewer and acceptance criteria.

06 / What happened in each task?

Record evidence IDs, failures, limitations, manual work and total ownership costs over the same horizon.

Keep a saved working copy. Text fields can scroll; use the expandable CSV/HTML for long entries before printing.

A completed worksheet records your assessment. It does not create regulatory approval, assurance or a compliant result.

FILLABLE WORKSHEET / GATES BEFORE SCORES

Compare the same tasks.

One option per copy. Use the same criteria and weights across options. Keep unknown ratings blank and withhold the total.

OPTION / VERSION / TRIAL DATE

MANDATORY GATES / PASS, FAIL OR UNRESOLVED

Criterion / task	Weight 0-5	Rating 0-3	Evidence / limitation

Rating: 0 failed; 1 major workaround; 2 minor limitation; 3 demonstrated as required. Unknown stays blank.

For complete comparable ratings only: score = 100 x sum(weight x rating) / (3 x sum(weights)). Positive total weight required. This PDF does not calculate the total.

DIAGNOSTIC TOTAL / GAPS / WEIGHT SENSITIVITY

DECISION / OWNER / CONDITIONS / REOPEN

A failed gate blocks selection. An unresolved gate holds it. No score is a compliance badge.

FICTIONAL WORKED EXAMPLE

A higher score can still fail the decision.

Two fictional options run the same three tasks. The team has set weights before the trial. All three ratings are observed for this illustration. Other essential gates must also be resolved before any real pilot.

Criterion / weight	Option A	Option B
Evidence traceability / 4	3	2
Exception handling / 3	2	3
Operating effort / 3	1	2
Diagnostic total / 100	70.0	76.7
Mandatory complete-export gate	Pass	Fail

B IS BLOCKED DESPITE ITS HIGHER TOTAL

A may proceed to a scoped pilot only if every essential gate is evidenced as passed. These invented scores illustrate the rule and are not a vendor recommendation.

0 = failed task; 1 = major workaround; 2 = minor limitation; 3 = demonstrated as required. Totals are normalised preference scores, not probabilities or compliance percentages.

FACILITATION AND SOURCES

Use it with the right reviewer.

Suggested workshop timings are planning estimates. Bring source records; assign owners to unknowns. No professional review is implied by completion.

01 Define the decision

Specify workflow, users, reporting method, workload and comparison period. Include a controlled spreadsheet as an option where appropriate.

02 Set non-negotiable gates

Agree authorised access, essential method support, approval controls and a complete usable evidence export before rating.

03 Choose criteria and weights

Pick task-specific criteria and integer weights from 0 to 5 before seeing results. At least one weight must be positive.

04 Run identical evidence tasks

Try source tracing, method/version changes, exceptions, approval, exports and handover with the same scoped data. Record limitations and operating effort.

05 Interpret with discipline

Use 0 failed, 1 major workaround, 2 minor limitation, 3 demonstrated as required. Unknown is not zero. Show totals only for complete common ratings. Failed or unresolved gates still block selection.

PRIMARY REFERENCES / ACCESSED 17 SEP 2026

GHG Protocol Corporate Standard

GHG Protocol Corporate Standard, revised edition

Verification of CBAM emissions

CBAM legislation and guidance

Original dotSuper procurement rubric. No vendor is evaluated, ranked or endorsed. Demonstrated software behaviour does not replace accounting judgement, legal review or independent verification.

Publication gate: Technical, security, procurement and accounting owners must approve use-case-specific gates.

Full URLs, source notes, instructions and review gates are in companion.html and framework-data.json. Original dotSuper artwork; source citations do not imply endorsement.