

Emissions Management Software Evaluation Checklist

Use this worksheet to define requirements, run consistent vendor demos, and score platforms against your emissions program. From the Validere 2026 Buyer's Guide.

1. Define your primary use case

Check all that apply. Your top priority should determine which *platform type* you evaluate first.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Corporate GHG inventory (Scope 1, 2, 3 disclosure) | <input type="checkbox"/> Air emissions compliance (facility-level reporting) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Methane & measurement programs | <input type="checkbox"/> Multi-site manufacturing standardization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Supply chain / Scope 3 data | <input type="checkbox"/> Reduction & capital planning / forecasting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> EPA GHGRP reporting | <input type="checkbox"/> State air permit reporting |

Primary platform type to evaluate:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Carbon accounting software | <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial EMS / EHS software |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Operational emissions management | <input type="checkbox"/> Hybrid architecture (multiple platforms) |

2. Seven requirements questions

Answer before scheduling demos. Bring these answers to every vendor conversation.

1. Which emissions programs must the platform support?

2. At what granularity must emissions be managed?

Corporate · Facility · Source · Event

3. Where does source data live today?

Systems · Owners · Update frequency · Known quality issues

4. How often do methodologies and regulatory requirements change?

5. Which review, approval, and investigation workflows must the system support?

6. Do production or capital decisions require emissions forecasting?

7. How should the platform fit your existing technology environment?

ERP · EHS · Historians · Monitoring · Data warehouse

3. Demo script — run this with every vendor

Request a demonstration using *your* asset structure. Do not accept a generic sustainability dashboard tour.

Step 1: Missing source record

Show what happens when a production or activity record is missing. How is the exception flagged, assigned, and resolved?

Notes: _____

Step 2: Methodology or factor change mid-year

Edit a calculation methodology or emissions factor. Show version history and whether prior periods are preserved.

Notes: _____

Step 3: Measurement event requiring investigation

Walk through an observation from detection to investigation, response, documentation, and inventory update.

Notes: _____

Step 4: Drill-down audit trail

Start from a reported value. How quickly can you reach source data, methodology, factors, and approvals?

Notes: _____

Step 5: Multiple reporting outputs

Can one governed dataset support two different reporting outputs without duplicate manual entry?

Notes: _____

4. Capability scoring matrix

Score each vendor 1-5 (1 = poor fit, 5 = strong fit). Use the same scores across all candidates.

Capability	What good looks like	Score	Notes
Data integration	Connects to your historian/ERP; preserves asset hierarchy; traceable updates		
Calculations	Configurable methods; version history; drill-down to factors without custom dev		
QA/QC & exceptions	Exception queue; manage by exception; not a dashboard hiding open issues		
Facility visibility	Facility total → source → activity data quickly		
Regulatory reporting	Multiple outputs from one governed dataset; configurable per program		
Audit trails	Full lineage from report to source; approvals in-system		
Workflows	Reviews, assignments, escalations — not email-only		
Measurement response	Observation → investigation → closure → inventory update		
Forecasting	Scenarios tied to production, assets, capital — not only % targets		
Governance & permissions	Facility-level access; role-based review responsibilities		

VENDOR COMPARISON SUMMARY

Vendor	Platform type	Total score (/50)	Top strength	Top concern

5. Red flags — check any you observed

- Demo used only sanitized sample data
- Cannot show calculation lineage to source data
- Every methodology change requires a custom development project
- Reporting module disconnected from source data
- Validation only possible after export to Excel
- No facility-level permissions or data ownership model
- Measurement data stored but not tied to investigation workflow
- Forecasting limited to corporate reduction glide paths

