

# AWP Project Awards Criteria

*Revised: March 2, 2022*

## Project Awards:

- Small Projects < \$100 Million
- Large Projects >\$100 Million

### Purpose:

- Recognize and promote positive behavior amongst AWP applicators
- Encourage organizations to share their AWP experiences
- Provide meaningful recognition to the project teams and notable or honorable mention teams
- Broaden the outreach of AWP
- Provide a recognition for EPC providers and a way to promote AWP expertise to clients
- Help the industry target high value outcomes from AWP
- Encourage project Stakeholders to collaborate
- Establish standard format for project AWP benefits quantification

### Method:

1. **AWP Scorecard:** Projects self-assess utilizing the existing CII scorecard. As the Awards program evolves and applications increase in volume, 3<sup>rd</sup>-party assessments can and should be used.
2. **Results:** Projects offer evidence of AWP advantages: improvement in safety, commodity installation rates, productivity, time on tools, quality, turnover, etc.
3. **Lesson Learned:** Projects offer their lessons learned and what they will do different next time.
4. **Stakeholders:** The project stakeholders in the owner / EPC and contractor categories are encouraged to provide information on how they implemented AWP on their portion of the project and the impact it had on improving project outcomes. We realize that it may be difficult to get the comments of all team members, as they may have moved on to other projects.

### Scoring criteria:

1. **AWP Scorecard:** is measured as a % of achievable:
  - Overall weighting is 25%
2. **Results:** Has the project provided evidence of results? AWP Judges rate the answer on a scale of 1-10 averaged across all judges, scored as a % of attainable. (evidence is not shared with the public)
  - Overall weighting is 25%
3. **Lessons Learned:** Has the project offered lessons learned that can be shared with the membership?  
Judges Criteria: AWP Judges rate the answer on a scale of 1-10, score averaged across all judges and offered as a %.
  - Overall weighting is 25%.
4. **Stakeholder statements:** AWP judges (3 or more) score each Stakeholder section on a scale of 1-10, averaged across all judges, scored as a % of attainable.
  - Overall weighting is 25%

Note: the judging panel includes practitioners within the AWP community. Controls are in place to prevent a judge from considering an application for a project they were involved in.

## **Project Information**

**Date of application:**

**Project title:**

**Project location:**

**Industry sector:**

**Statement of project scope:**

**TIC:**

**Project contact information and title:**

**Stakeholder input data from (name, title, and company):**

Owner:

Engineering:

Procurement:

Project Controls:

Construction:

**Project phase / completion date:**

*Note: In the following sections, judges reserve the ability to inquire about any scores or supporting detail included by the applicant.*

---

## **Section A - CII AWP Scorecard (attachment)**

**Scorecard results (compliance with AWP standards) = \_\_\_\_\_ X 0.2 =** (remove for application form)

---

## **Section B - Stakeholder questions/statements** (completed by each Stakeholder as possible or collected by project contact with supporting input)

**In regards to your department (Owner, E, P, CM, C, P/C):**

1. How much did you have to change your processes to adapt to AWP? What specifically did you change to implement AWP on this project?
2. How did you communicate AWP to your organization?
3. How did AWP benefit/impede your organization?
4. Did your organization have to collaborate more/less with other teams due to AWP?
5. What would you do different next time (Lesson Learned)?

**Judging criteria** (remove for application form):

Rate each section on a scale of 1 – 10

1. Have all the Stakeholders contributed to the application?
2. Have the Stakeholders expressed an understanding of their contribution to AWP?
3. Have the Stakeholders recognized how their contribution impacts the rest of the AWP process?
4. Did the Stakeholders notice a change in their effectiveness?
5. Your overall sense of Stakeholder engagement?

**Combined results expressed as a % = \_\_\_\_\_ X 0.3 =** (remove for application form)

---

## Section C - Results:

Express the project benefits quantitatively within your ability to share information publicly. Please share project notable results.

Is/did your project experience tangible changes in performance in any of these areas:

### Safety:

• Percentage improvement (TRIR)	
<i>(if information is approved for public disclosure)</i>	
• Baseline (Industry or company average TRIR rate)	
○ This Project	

### Quality:

• Percentage improvement (Non-Conformance Reports)	
<i>(if information is approved for public disclosure)</i>	
• Baseline (Industry average for rate of Non-Conformance Reports)	
○ This Project	

### Cost Performance:

• CPI: (PF)	
-------------	--

### Schedule Performance:

• SPI:	
--------	--

### System Turnover:

• Percentage improvement (Company average for punch list items per system)	
<i>(if information is approved for public disclosure)</i>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline: (Company average for punch list items per system)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This project</li> </ul>	

**Productivity:**

**Note:** Baseline examples can be provided based on Gulf Coast data, but the applicant will need to provide baseline for the region that their project was completed.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage improvement</li> </ul>	
<i>(if information is approved for public disclosure)</i>	
Commodity installation rates for:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Civil</b> (hrs / cu yard): Baseline</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This project</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Steel</b> (hrs / ton): Baseline</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This project</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Pipe</b> (hrs / lf pipe): Baseline (e.g. Gulf Coast average 4.2 hours/lf)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This project</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Electrical</b> (hrs / lf raceway): Baseline</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This project</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Instrumentation</b> (hrs / installed instrument count): Baseline</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This project</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Other:</b> Baseline</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This project</li> </ul>	

**Average diameter inches of weld per welder, per day:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage improvement</li> </ul>	
<i>(if information is available and approved for public disclosure)</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline: (industry average 6)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This project</li> </ul>	

**Scaffold:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage improvement</li> </ul>	
<i>(if information is available and approved for public disclosure)</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline: % of direct hours</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This project</li> </ul>	

**Time on Tools:**

• Percentage improvement	
<i>(if information is available and approved for public disclosure)</i>	
• Baseline: (e.g. Average project direct 37%)	
○ This project	

**Judging criteria:** Has the project demonstrated a quantifiable delta between past performance and project performance with AWP?

1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6 – 7 – 8 – 9 – 10

Not well

Very well

**Combined results expressed as a % = \_\_\_\_\_ x 0.3 =** (remove for application form)

---

**Section D - Lessons Learned:**

- Did your project capture any lessons in these areas that will help future applications of AWP?
  - Front End Planning:
  - Engineering:
  - Procurement:
  - Information Management
  - Document Management:
  - Material Management:
  - Project Controls
  - Construction Management:
  - Construction Execution:
  - System Turnover:
- Can these lessons learned be shared with the AWP community, after any identifying data has been removed?

**Judging criteria:** Has the project captured and shared lessons learned that will help future applications of AWP?

**Note:** the below score will be generated by the judges based on their evaluation of applicant-submitted information.

1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6 – 7 – 8 – 9 – 10

Not well

Very well

**Combined results expressed as a % = \_\_\_\_\_ x 0.2 =** (remove for application form)

**Summary:**

Score from section:

- A, Scorecard (20%) = XX
- B, Stakeholders (30%) = XX
- C, Results (30%) = XX
- D, Lessons Learned (20%) = XX

Overall score: XX

**Judge's comments and recommendations:**