



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.

It exists because IPP-GOV-008 Issue 5, issued on 10 August 2026, made an approved competency profile review count as a contribution unit. From that moment the Institute was counting a record that no published standard defined. A record that counts towards an obligation has to withstand the person who benefits from it, and this one is now relied on by the grade whose holders are most likely to be reviewers.

1. What this standard owns

It owns 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 owns those.
- It does not set examination format, pass marks, marking or the assessment appeal route. IPP-ASM-001 owns those, and IPP-ASM-002 owns sitting conditions and malpractice.
- 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 own those. This standard says which reviews qualify as the review named there.
- It does not own complaints. IPP-GOV-006 is the single intake, including a complaint about a review or a reviewer.
- It does not own conduct. IPP-GOV-001 owns 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, not from a grade. 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 rather than a Fellow.

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.

- **A grade is not authority.** Holding FIPP does not by itself permit a person to review anybody. Conversely, a member without a designation who holds the reviewer role in their organisation may review within it. The draft that preceded this document assumed Fellows were the reviewers, and the platform has never worked that way.

- **Institute reviewers reach individual members only.** A member who has an organisation reviewer is reviewed by that organisation, not by the Institute, 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. This has been true of validation since the tenant check was added; it became true of recording a review on 10 August 2026.

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 appointment names the reviewer and the member reviewed. Both must be in the appointing administrator's organisation.
- A member cannot be appointed as their own reviewer. Until 10 August 2026 the platform permitted it, which would have made every independence rule below unenforceable at the point it mattered most.
- 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. This is a duty on the reviewer under IPP-GOV-001, and the Institute does not currently hold a register of declarations. Section 9.
- **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 first two are enforced by the platform: nobody can review themselves, and a declared relationship stops that reviewer acting on that member until it is withdrawn. The Institute cannot detect a relationship nobody declares, which is why declaring one is a duty on the reviewer and a breach of it is a breach of IPP-GOV-001. 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.
- **Counting is automatic and is not self-declared.** A Fellow does not assert their reviews; the Institute counts the records. What a Fellow sees on the platform is the count of what the platform holds, which is never the whole obligation, because mentoring and standards contributions are recorded by the Institute. 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 owns 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. Until 10 August 2026 a return was recorded in the same field as a confirmation, so the record read as a validation by the person who had declined to validate.
- **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. Until 10 August 2026 it was filed under the reviewer's, so a review could sit in the reporting of an organisation the member had nothing to do with.
- 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 IPP-DAT-001 section 6. 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. What is not 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.

- **Nothing detects an undeclared relationship.** A reviewer can declare one and it blocks, but the Institute cannot see a relationship that nobody declares. The register makes the duty in Section 4 recordable and enforceable once it is declared; it does not make it detectable.
- **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 yet 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.
- **There is no Fellowship assessment.** The draft this replaces described a Fellowship professional discussion assessed by two authorised assessors. That process does not exist. Fellowship entry is by the route in IPP-GOV-003 section 4.1, and this standard does not describe an assessment that has not been built.
- **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 issue and date are recorded in the IPP Document Register (IPP-REG-001).

Nothing in Section 9 is a reason to weaken the sections above it. This standard states what IPP requires of a reviewer; the distance between that and what the platform can currently detect is the work, not the standard.