



INSTITUTE OF PROJECT PROFESSIONALS

Reviewer and Assessor Standards

Who may review, independence, what a review must contain, and what counts

This standard governs the people who look at another member's professional record and record a judgement about it. It covers who may hold that role, what relationship they may have with the person reviewed, what a review has to contain, and which reviews count towards a Fellow's annual contribution to the Institute of Project Professionals (IPP).

1. Scope

This standard sets the reviewer and the review: who is authorised, what independence is required, what a review must contain, what makes one approved, and what happens when a reviewer falls short.

- It does not set the competency scale or its levels. IPP-GOV-002 sets those.
- It does not set examination format, pass marks, marking or the assessment appeal route. IPP-ASM-001 sets those, and IPP-ASM-002 sets sitting conditions and malpractice. Nor does it set who assesses a Fellowship application or on what independence terms: that is IPP-ASM-001 section 7, and a Fellowship assessor is a different appointment from the reviewer role this standard governs.
- It does not set the annual CPD requirement or what a contribution unit is. IPP-GOV-003 section 5 and IPP-GOV-008 section 6 set those. This standard says which reviews qualify as the review named there.
- It does not cover complaints. IPP-GOV-006 is the single intake, including a complaint about a review or a reviewer.
- It does not cover conduct. IPP-GOV-001 sets the Code and the sanctions available where a reviewer breaches it.

2. Who may review

Authority to review comes from a role held on the platform and not from a membership grade. Holding a designation does not by itself permit a person to review anybody, and a member without a designation who holds the reviewer role in their organisation may review within it. This is deliberate: a competency profile review is an account of somebody's practice by a person positioned to judge it, and in an employer setting that person is usually their reviewer or a manager.

Role	Who holds it	What they may do
Organisation reviewer	A member with the reviewer role in an organisation, usually the person named as another member's reviewer.	Record a review of, and validate competency levels for, members of the same organisation.
Organisation administrator	A member with tenant or super administrator rights.	The same, within their own organisation, and may assign reviewers within it.
Institute reviewer	IPP staff.	Validate competency levels for individual members who have no organisation reviewer.
Moderator	A second Institute reviewer, not the first.	Decide where two reviewers disagree. Section 6.

- **An Institute reviewer acts only where an organisation cannot.** A member whose organisation has a reviewer is reviewed there. IPP's own reviewers take the members who have nobody, so that two authorities cannot record different validated levels for the same person.
- **Authority stops at the organisation boundary.** A reviewer may not review, validate or read the record of a member of another organisation.

3. Appointment

A reviewer is appointed by an administrator of their own organisation, and the appointment is a record on the member's account rather than a message. The Institute appoints its own reviewers.

- An administrator may pair a reviewer with a member only where both are in that administrator's own organisation.
- A member cannot be appointed as their own reviewer.
- An appointment ends when either person leaves the organisation. The reviewer link is cleared with the seat, so an ended employment does not leave a standing authority over somebody's professional record.

4. Independence

The person judged and the person judging are different people. Everything else in this section follows from that one sentence.

- **Nobody reviews themselves.** A reviewer may not record a review of their own practice, validate their own competency level, endorse their own evidence or sign off their own authority to work. The platform refuses all four.
- **A reviewer declares a relationship that could reasonably be questioned**, including a personal, financial, supervisory or recent commercial one, and does not review where it could. The declaration is recorded in a register held by the Institute and it blocks: a reviewer who has declared a relationship with a member cannot record a review of, or validate a level for, that member until the declaration is withdrawn. Withdrawal is dated and the record is kept.
- **A reviewer does not accept anything of value connected with a review.** IPP-GOV-001 section 5.1 already prohibits inducements that compromise professional judgement; a review is an exercise of professional judgement about another member.
- **Mentoring and reviewing the same person are separate.** Both count as contribution under IPP-GOV-008 section 6 and a Fellow may do both, but not for the same member in the same CPD year. A mentor assessing the person they mentor is judging their own work.

The Institute cannot see a relationship that nobody declares, which is why declaring one is a duty on the reviewer under IPP-GOV-001 and a breach of it is a breach of the Code. The mentoring separation becomes enforceable when mentoring is recorded, which Section 9 states.

5. What a review is, and which ones count

A review is a recorded judgement about another member's practice. Three kinds are recognised, and they are not interchangeable.

Kind	What it is	Counts as a contribution unit
Annual	The scheduled review of a member's competency profile against the framework, covering the whole profile.	Yes
Ad hoc	A substantive review outside the cycle, for example on a change of role or before a validation.	Yes
Check-in	A shorter conversation recorded against the member's record. Not a review of the profile.	No

- **A review must be recorded to exist.** A conversation that leaves no record is not a review and cannot be counted by anybody.
- **An approved competency profile review, for the purposes of IPP-GOV-008 section 6, is an annual or an ad-hoc review recorded by an authorised reviewer against a member other than themselves.** That is the whole definition, and the platform counts exactly that. A check-in is recorded and is not counted.
- **The Institute counts reviews from the records, and a Fellow does not declare them.** The count a Fellow sees on the platform covers the reviews the platform holds. It is not the whole obligation: mentoring and standards contributions are recorded by the Institute and added to it. IPP-GOV-008 section 6.

6. Validating a competency level

Recording a review and validating a level are different acts with different consequences. A validated level is published on the member's Passport and is what an employer relies on, so it carries requirements a review does not.

- **A rationale is required**, of at least thirty characters, and it is kept with the validated level. A validation with no stated reason is an assertion, and an assertion is what the validated level exists to replace.
- **The level must be one of the five on the published scale.** IPP-GOV-002 sets the scale.
- **A reviewer may send an area back for more evidence instead of validating it.** The return carries the same rationale requirement, is recorded against whoever made it, and is distinguishable from a validation.
- **The member has one reply.** After a validation the member may record a response once, and it is kept with the record. It does not change the validated level; it means the record is not one-sided.

6.1 Disagreement

Where a member disputes a validated level, the route is IPP-GOV-006. A second reviewer who was not involved in the original decision considers it, and their decision stands. A reviewer does not moderate their own decision.

7. Records and confidentiality

- Every review records who reviewed whom, of what kind, when, and the reviewer's notes. Every validation records the level, the reviewer, the time and the rationale.
- A review is filed under the organisation of the member reviewed, not the reviewer's.
- A reviewer sees what they need for the task and no more. A member's CPD reflections marked private are not visible to a reviewer or an administrator, and evidence is visible for the areas under review.
- A reviewer does not copy, retain outside the platform, or reuse anything they see in the course of a review.
- Reviews and validations are retained for as long as the member's account is open and are covered by MS-LEG-004 section 7. A member's erasure removes the reviews recorded about them.

8. When a reviewer falls short

Reviewer authority is a role, and a role can be withdrawn without touching the person's membership.

- **Withdrawal of the role** is a matter for whoever appointed it: an organisation administrator for an organisation reviewer, the Institute for an Institute reviewer. It ends the authority and does not affect the person's grade.
- **Grounds** are a substantiated breach of Section 4, a pattern of validations that cannot be reconciled with the evidence, or a breach of confidentiality under Section 7.
- **Conduct** is separate and is IPP-GOV-001. Recording a review of somebody the reviewer has not reviewed, or recording one to gain a contribution unit, is a breach of the Code as well as grounds to withdraw the role.
- **Challenge** follows IPP-GOV-006, and the person deciding a challenge was not involved in the decision challenged.

9. Not yet built

Stated on the face of the standard, because a requirement nothing supports is a requirement in name only. This section empties as the work is done, and nothing in it weakens the sections above.

- **Nothing detects an undeclared relationship.** The register in Section 4 records and enforces a declaration once it is made. It cannot make a relationship nobody declares visible.
- **There is no training or calibration.** A reviewer is appointed by an administrator and may validate immediately. There is no initial briefing, no benchmark case, no standardisation record and no periodic recalibration.
- **Sampling checks the decision, not the reviewer.** A month's validations are sampled and reviewed, which finds a decision that cannot be reconciled with its evidence. It does not aggregate by reviewer, so a pattern across one reviewer's decisions is visible only to somebody who reads the sample and notices.
- **Mentoring is not a product.** Section 4 separates mentoring from reviewing for the same member in the same year, and the platform cannot enforce that because it holds no

mentoring record. IPP-GOV-008 section 12.2 states the same gap from the other side.

- **The Fellowship assessment is not held on the platform.** Fellowship is assessed under IPP-ASM-001 section 7 by a professional discussion with two assessors, on a portfolio, a case study and a reflective statement. The application, its endorsers and its decision are recorded; everything else is arranged and recorded by the assessment team outside the platform.

- **Withdrawal of a reviewer role is manual.** An administrator can remove the role; nothing records why, and nothing retains the fact that it was withdrawn once it has been.

10. Review

Reviewed annually by the Governance Board, and on any change to the contribution units in IPP-GOV-008 section 6, to the competency scale in IPP-GOV-002, or to who the platform authorises to review. Its edition, revision and date are on its cover.