



CONTRACTOR OF THE YEAR ASSESSMENT GUIDE

Evaluation Framework for the Project Contractor of the Year (PCoTY) Award 2027

For Stage 1 assessors and Stage 2 judges.

CONTENTS

- Introduction
 - Your job
 - Scoring scale
 - The nine criteria
 - Criterion 9 in detail
 - Comment tips
 - Stage 1: assessors
 - Stage 2: judging panel
 - Exemplary anchors
 - The case-study test
-

INTRODUCTION

This is the Evaluation Framework for the Project Contractor of the Year (PCoTY) Award 2027. It is the formal guide for a rigorous, transparent, and consistent review of every nomination.

The cycle looks for contractors who move **beyond competence toward excellence**: not only fulfilling the contract, but transforming practice through novel approaches, pioneering techniques, and measurable impact others can learn from.

Customer evaluation is separate. Clients score seven operational dimensions on a **0-10 weighted scale**. You score the **nine award criteria on a 0-5 scale**. Do not convert one into the other.

YOUR JOB

Independently score assigned nominations on **nine criteria (0-5)** with a justification on each. Finish by the deadline.

You do: confirm conflict of interest, read the packet (and the customer evaluation if it is available to you), score, comment, submit.

You do not: run eligibility or completeness checks (intake and admins gate that), coach nominees, or share scores with nominees.

Conflict of interest: if you have a conflict, stop and contact the organisers for reassignment. Do not score that nomination.

There is **no Nominee Coach**. Questions go to organisers or admin.

SCORING SCALE

Score	Meaning
0	Not demonstrated / missing evidence
1	Poor
2	Fair
3	Good
4	Very good
5	Excellent

Nine criteria, 5 maximum each. **45 is the highest** a nomination can receive from one assessor or judge.

At least **two independent reviews** per nomination (target three when capacity allows). If two assessors differ by **more than 2 points** on a criterion, the Project Manager moderates. Discuss evidence, not ego.

THE NINE CRITERIA

Score each one. A comment is required.

#	Criterion	Look for	Ask
1	Project Success (outcomes)	Delivery vs baseline; benefits; handover; measurable impact and transformation	Did they deliver? What lasting impact?
2	Agility and Adaptability	Change control; fit to the contracting model (including T&M cash and visibility)	How did they handle change without chaos?
3	Commercial Model (liquidity)	Price realism; milestones; advances and retentions; liquidity on both sides	Fair cash flow for both parties?
4	Legal Soundness	Law and jurisdiction; warranty and liability; privity; fit to the collaboration model	Complete, enforceable, suited to the model?
5	Interface and Governance	Customer-contractor boundary; escalation; decision rights	Clear boundary and working governance?
6	Risk Management (cross-corporate)	Cross-party financial, ops, IP, cyber, regulatory, reputational, geopolitical risks and mitigations	Risks identified and mitigated across the interface?
7	People Development	Investment as % of profit: 0 / 0-5 / 5%+; training and certification evidence	Real investment with delivery impact?
8	Team and Business Acumen	Leadership; customer vs profit balance; code of conduct; anti-corruption; transparency	Integrity and leadership under pressure?
9	Innovation and Industry Advancement	Novelty; industry contribution; knowledge sharing; case-study worth	Would we publish this? Winners typically 4-5 here.

Notes on selected criteria

Agility (2), T&M contracts. Consider billing frequency vs contractor cash-flow needs, rate transparency, client cost visibility, and whether change control stays compatible with the project objectives.

People development (7). Categories are 0%, 0-5%, or 5%+ of net income or profit invested in staff development (technical, organisational, or commercial). Higher investment usually correlates with better delivery and a more capable customer relationship. A 0% with no other evidence of development is a red flag, not a neutral score.

Innovation (9). This is the filter that distinguishes winners from competent performers. High scores on delivery or legal soundness are not enough.

CRITERION 9 IN DETAIL

Use these descriptors when scoring Innovation and Industry Advancement:

Score	Descriptor
0	Not demonstrated / missing evidence
1	Poor. Standard approach, no innovation, no industry contribution
2	Fair. Some novel elements, minor improvements, limited knowledge sharing
3	Good. Solid innovation, some industry relevance, basic knowledge sharing
4	Very good. Significant innovation, industry-relevant, active knowledge sharing, replicable practices
5	Excellent. Groundbreaking approach, advances the profession, extensive knowledge sharing, highly replicable, case-study worthy

Winners typically score **4-5** on this criterion. A 5 is only for work that is groundbreaking or that advances the profession.

COMMENT TIPS

For each criterion: why this score, strengths, gaps, and pointers to evidence (section or artifact). Be objective, consistent, and constructive.

Credo check for winners: excellence, impact, industry contribution, innovation, legacy. Not merely competent delivery.

Red flags: missing evidence, no measurable impact, generic approach, no knowledge sharing, integrity concerns, 0% people development.

Green flags: clear transformation, real innovation, active sharing, strong cross-party risk and integrity, 5%+ people development, case-study worthy.

Silence in the packet is not neutral. If you find nothing for a criterion, record that you found nothing and score accordingly.

STAGE 1: ASSESSORS

1. Confirm no conflict of interest.
2. Read the nomination packet (narrative, artifacts, and customer evaluation if shown).
3. Score criteria 1-9 (0-5) with a comment on each.
4. Submit by the deadline.

You may be asked to join **moderation** if scores diverge. Do not share scores with nominees. Refer them to the organisers.

Intake has already checked eligibility and completeness. You are scoring quality, not chasing missing files. If a required artifact is genuinely absent, that is evidence for the related criterion, not a reason to reopen intake.

STAGE 2: JUDGING PANEL

Shortlisted nominees present **20 minutes** plus **15 minutes of questions**.

Judges:

- Attend the presentation and Q&A.
- **Rescore all nine criteria independently (0-5)**, with strong attention to Criterion 9.
- Use the customer evaluation and the Q&A as input, not as a substitute for their own scores.
- Join outlier moderation (difference of more than 2 points) and final deliberation.

Consensus or a moderated average determines winners. In a stalemate, Oliver F. Lehmann has the deciding vote.

Presentations may be recorded and published, subject to consent.

Once assessor and customer numbers are in, the panel still applies a qualitative lens: does this nomination move past standard expectations?

EXEMPLARY ANCHORS

Standard performance (competence)	Exemplary performance (winner)
Competence: did the job very well	Excellence: did something uniquely valuable
Compliance: had good processes	Impact: created measurable, lasting change
Success: the customer was happy	Industry contribution: shared knowledge and advanced the profession
Standards: followed best practices	Innovation: created new best practices
Project completion: finished the project	Legacy: transformed relationships and left a lasting impact

THE CASE-STUDY TEST

The last practical question for the panel:

Would we want to publish this as a case study?

If the project is competent but does not offer lessons others can use, it is unlikely to win, regardless of how high the base delivery scores are.