

Award Benchmark: Operationalizing the “AI Project of the Year” Award

Project: AIPM Revolution (pmairevolution.com) · Community & Growth stream
Deliverable round: 1 of 3 (Benchmark – Business case – Validation with Ricardo & Antonio) **Status:** Benchmark, **v2 consolidated (Wave 5)**. The concept proposal (purpose, categories, nomination, criteria, jury, comms plan) and the business case are the next rounds. **Last updated:** 2026-06-24 **Coverage: 25 award programs** profiled on **13 dimensions**, organized into **four lenses** (A: Brazilian PM chapters; B: international PM bodies; C: AI / innovation / community awards; D: hackathons and commercial recognition), plus 4 large US and European PMI chapters confirmed to run no juried award of their own (clean negatives, §6.6). Built across six research waves (v1 plus Waves 2, 3, 4 and 6) and consolidated here in **Wave 5**: the per-wave additions are merged into the lens structure, the matrix carries the 13th dimension (Prize & sponsorship), the synthesis (§4) and the picks (§5) are re-done over the full set, and the per-wave validation logs are preserved in the provenance appendix (§6, changelog at §6.1). See `HANDOFF.md` for the wave plan and the full source backlog.

Every factual claim below is grounded in a public source (see per-program Sources and the consolidated list in §7). Figures reflect the best available public sources as of June 2026; where a value could not be confirmed in public sources, it is stated conservatively or noted as not publicly disclosed. No jury sizes, criteria, weights, fees, prizes, or sponsors were invented.

1. Executive summary

We profiled **25 award programs** on **13 dimensions**, organized into four lenses: **A. Brazilian PM chapters** (PMI-SP, PMI-RIO, PMI-DF); **B. international PM bodies** (PMI PMO of the Year / PMOGA, PMI Project of the Year, APM, House of PMO, the PMI UK, Netherlands, Sweden and Madrid chapters, and IPMA); **C. AI / innovation / community awards** (Stevie, BIG, AI Breakthrough, GitHub Stars, Webby, the National AI Awards, ITU AI for Good, the Australian AI Awards, and the community-run Clube da Programação); and **D. hackathons and commercial recognition** (CloudFest, Hack-Nation, Google Cloud’s ADK hackathon, and the commercial Global Recognition Awards). Four large US and European PMI chapters were also confirmed to run no juried award of their own (a useful negative, §6.6), and the v1 items for PMI-SP and PMI-RIO are closed against the recovered editais. The patterns that matter most for designing the AIPM “AI Project of the Year” award:

1. **The strongest models publish a real edital with an explicit scoring rubric.** The clearest references are **PMI-DF’s Prêmio Candango** (8 criteria, scored 1 to 5 each, 40 points max, full public edital, named “Banca Examinadora”, fixed calendar) and the **PMI PMO of the Year Award** (6 weighted criteria summing to 100%, published Nomination Handbook, multi-stage comparative judging). If AIPM publishes a

weighted rubric, it will already be more transparent than most AI-industry awards, which publish named criteria but keep the weights internal.

2. **Two-stage judging is the norm for serious awards.** Both PMI and APM run “written or video submission, then a live virtual presentation to a panel of finalists.” This is a proven, low-cost shape for an online-first award and fits AIPM’s Oct to Dec 2026 online ceremony.
3. **Video is the dominant lightweight submission format.** PMO Global Awards require a 30 to 40 minute video, APM allows an 8 minute video for individuals, and Clube da Programação uses a 1 minute pitch video plus a live Demo Day. Video lets judges see the *real application* of the work, which is exactly AIPM’s “practice-grounded” mandate.
4. **A free, open, national-or-global nomination is a strong fit, though no longer a unique differentiator.** The big paid AI awards (Stevie, BIG, AI Breakthrough, Webby) charge USD 295 to USD 949 per entry, and the free models (PMI-DF Candango, APM entries, GitHub Stars) stand out against them. Among PM bodies the one paid exception is the **IPMA Global Project Excellence Award** (Wave 6), which charges EUR 600 to EUR 4,000 to enter to fund its on-site assessment model (§3.21), the cost AIPM’s online-first model avoids. But Wave 4 found **three free AI-domain awards** (The National AI Awards with an explicit no-pay-to-play policy, ITU AI for Good, Australian AI Awards), so “free” is already practiced in the AI-awards space (see §6.3). A free award still aligns directly with AIPM’s non-commercial mandate and removes the strongest reason a community member would distrust the program; it is table stakes for credibility rather than a stand-alone wedge.
5. **The two judging mechanics to choose between** are an **expert jury** (PMI, APM, Stevie, BIG) versus a **community public vote** (Webby People’s Voice, and the peer-vote variant in PMI-RIO’s Volunteer of the Year). If AIPM ever adds public voting, fraud controls and audited tabulation are the one rule every voting program treats as non-negotiable.
6. **Infrastructure signal:** PMI and APM both run on the same third-party awards SaaS (Award Force, *.awardsplatform.com). Stevie and Webby use hosted entry/judging portals. For a first online edition, a structured form plus a video link plus a shared scoring sheet is enough; a dedicated platform is a scale decision, not a launch requirement.
7. **Hackathons are a different archetype, and “free” has a dark twin (Wave 3).** Time-boxed build competitions judge a thing made under pressure, not a result delivered in a real project: Google Cloud’s ADK hackathon sets the transparency bar (a public, weighted 50/30/20 rubric, §3.24), and CloudFest contributes the cleanest non-commercial idea in the set (no cash to winners; each sponsor’s category fee goes 100% to a charity scholarship, §3.22), while Hack-Nation is the commercial venture-funnel to avoid (§3.23). On the commercial side, Global Recognition Awards (§3.25) shows that “free to enter” can itself be a credential-mill funnel where the

win is free but every usable proof (certificate, logo licence) is paywalled, so AIPM's differentiator must be free end-to-end (badge and certificate included), not merely free to enter.

The single most transferable reference for AIPM is the **PMI PMO of the Year Award** model (open nomination by the project leader, a video submission, a published weighted rubric, a volunteer expert committee, multi-stage elimination to about 5 finalists, announced at an annual event). It maps almost one-to-one onto what the founders already sketched (jury of 5 to 10, about 5 finalists to 1 winner, online ceremony). The caveat is brand independence: borrow the *mechanics*, not the visual identity or naming, to respect the "do not look like a copy of PMI" guardrail.

2. Comparison matrix (at a glance)

Rows are grouped by lens; the # equals the program's profile number (§3.#). The matrix now carries the 13th dimension (**Prize & sponsorship**); the other dimensions are detailed per profile in §3.

Lens #	Program	Owner / type	Free or paid	Submission	Explicit rubric	Jury model	Cadence / ceremony	Prize & sponsorship
1 A	PMI-SP Melhores do Ano (Project / PMO)	PMI SP chapter	free (email entry)	email-only, 3 PDFs, no portal	yes (8 crit × 1-5 = 40) + 30% live audience vote	confidential committee (sigillo) fused with audience vote, 70/30	annual; 1st ed. 2025; PMI-SP Summit, 2-3 Dec 2025	No cash; 2 trophies (org+pro) + digital cert + PMI-SP badge + national pre-qual; no award sponsor
2 A	PMI RIO Projetos Awards / Mel	PMI RJ chapter	free email entry	peer-vote (volunteer); PMO: email, 16-pp dossier	section-mapped; weights not disclosed	peer-vote (volunteer); PMO: committee + Summit	annual; PMO 1st ed. 2025; 20 ^o PMI Rio Summit, 18-19 Sep 2025	No cash; national pre-qual; trophy/sponsor/fee not disclosed

Level #	Program	Owner / type	Free or paid	Submission	Explicit rubric	Jury model	Cadence / ceremony	Prize & sponsorship
	horses do Anodo (Project of PMO)			r		it audience vote		
3 A	PMI-DF Prêmio Candango	PMI DF chapter	free	self-submitted written case + links/video, online form	yes (8 crit × 1-5 = 40)	“Bancada Examinadora” instituted by chapter	annual, winners present at Summit	Recognition only; tiered EVENT sponsors (no single award sponsor); trophy/cash not stated
4 B	PMI PMO of the Year (PMO GA)	PMO Global Alliance / PMI	free	1-page form + 30-40 min video (Business English)	yes (6 weighted, =100%)	volunteer committee, comparative pairwise, multi-stage	annual, PMI Global Summit (Oct)	No cash; recognition + Summit pass + trophy + pins; PMI-funded, no external sponsor
5 B	PMI Project of the Year	PMI global	free	essay ≤2,000 words + sponsor letter	named, weights internal	trained volunteers + SMEs; 2-stage + live session	annual, PMI Global Summit	No cash; PMI trophy + certificate; PMI-funded, no sponsor

Le n # s	Pro gra m	Owner / type	Free or paid	Submi ssion	Explicit rubric	Jury model	Cadence / ceremony	Prize & sponsorship
6 B	AP M PM Aw ard s	APM (UK)	free to enter	writte n 1,500- 2,500 words OR ≤8- min video + evide nce	yes (Outcome s 40% / PM 40% / ...)	anony mous volun teer panel; Steeri ng Group ; 2- stage	annual, in- person gala (Nov)	No cash; trophy per category; named gala sponsors (RPC, CITI, KBR)
7 B	Ho use of PM O	House of PMO (UK)	n/a	none forma l	none	infor mal / peer- passe d troph y	monthly + annual PMO Day	No prize/spons or; peer- passed “Professiona l of the Month” trophy
1 B 7	PMI UK Nat ion al Pro ject Aw ard s	PMI UK Chapte r (with PwC)	free	downl oadab le form by email	stated criteria; weights not published	indust ry exper ts + PMI reps; Pinse nt Maso ns oversi ght (2019)	annual; black-tie London gala, month varies (Nov 2019; Jul 2021)	No cash; trophy at gala; lead partner PwC + category sponsor Stoneseed
1 B 8	PMI Net her lan ds	PMI NL Chapte r (Resear ch with	free, no cash	POYA: Word form, 4- stage;	“outstand ing achievem ents”, no weights	POYA 5-8 judge s + name	annual; POYA continuity (page anchors	No cash; recognition (Research: Gold/Silver/ Bronze

Le n # s	Pro gra m	Owner / type	Free or paid	Submi ssion	Explicit rubric	Jury model	Cadence / ceremony	Prize & sponsorship
	PO YA + Res ear ch Aw ard s	IPMA- NL)		Resea rch: thesis + 1- page letter		d assur ance; Resea rch acade mics + practi tioner s	2022)	medals); no sponsor
1 B 9	PMI Sw ede n Un der 35 Cha nge ma ker Aw ard s	PMI SE Chapte r (Young Profess ionals)	free, no cash	nomin ation via chapt er site	no published rubric	3 categ ory- match ed jurors (incl. an AI- in- delive ry juror)	annual; at Passion for Projects Congress (Mar)	No cash, no fee, no sponsor; recognition at congress
2 B 0	PMI Ma dri d Pro yec to del Año / Vol unt ari o / TF M	PMI Madrid Spain Chapte r	free	docu ment pack (Proy ecto); thesis via unive rsity (TFM)	judged vs PMBOK Guide; weights not published	not publis hed	annual; at the November congress	No cash; Proyecto trophy; TFM in-kind ~USD 267 (membershi ps + CAPM fee); no external sponsor

Le n # s	Pro gra m	Owner / type	Free or paid	Submi ssion	Explicit rubric	Jury model	Cadence / ceremony	Prize & sponsorship
2 B 1	IPMA A Global Project Excellence Award	IPMA (intl PM federati on)	paid (EUR 600- 4,000)	Applic ation Form + Repor t (DOC X) via Awar d Force; Large /Meg a adds on- site visit	yes (PE Model: 3 areas / 9 criteria, scored 0- 100%)	indep enden t traine d PE assess ors; 3 judge s/app licatio n; site visit (Larg e/Meg a)	annual; IPMA Global Awards Gala at the World Congress (2026 Hiroshima, Sep)	Paid entry EUR 600- 4,000; no cash ; Gold/Silver/ Bronze + feedback report; no named sponsor
8 C	Stevie Tech Excellence + AI	Stevie Awards Inc. (fo r- profit)	paid (USD 295- 520)	writte n OR ≤5- min video + 4 Q + links	yes (1-10 scale + Gold/Silv er/Bronz e threshold s)	≥5 judge s per entry; open apply funnel	annual, in- person + online	No cash; Gold Stevie trophy/med al (Winners' Fee applies); self-funded, no prize sponsor
9 C	BIG AI Excellence Awards	Busines s Intellig ence Group	paid (USD 949)	self- nomin ate, show meas urabl e impac t	“objective benchma rks”, no numbers	~120 name d volun teer judge s	annual, PR- only (no gala)	Paid USD 949; glass trophy + cert + media package; no cash; no external sponsor
1 C 0	AI Break through Award	Tech Breakt hrough (media)	paid	self- submi t, evide nce as links	named (6 pillars), no weights	“inde pende nt panel” , opaqu	annual, PR announcem ent	Trophy/ sponsor not published; PR announceme nt only

Leads #	Program	Owner / type	Free or paid	Submission	Explicit rubric	Jury model	Cadence / ceremony	Prize & sponsorship
	ards					e		
1 C 1	GitHub Stars	GitHub (platform)	free	open peer nomination, ≤180 chars	staff selection, no rubric	GitHub team review, sole discretion	annual term, social announce	No cash; physical “Star” + swag + Hall of Fame + perks; GitHub-funded
1 C 2	Webby Awards (incl. AI)	IADAS academy	paid	self-submitted paid entry	jury crit + People’s Voice public vote	5 nominees/candidate by academy; public vote winner	annual, gala (May)	Paid; Webby statuette + badge; no cash; named sponsors (Adobe, WP Engine, Meta...)
1 C 3	Clube Progração	independent community (L. Dubugras)	free	Google Form + 1-min face-on-cam video, then live Demo Day	not published	3 named judges + Demo Day Q&A	per-cohort (weeks); 1st ed. Demo Day 16 Jun 2026, online	US\$10,000 cash (verbatim on site); sponsor/funder not named; payout not disclosed
1 C 4	The National AI Award	Future Tech Events (UK); 2026 with Inform	free (explicit no-pay-to-play)	online nomination form, per category	named criteria, weights internal	independent expert panel +	annual; winners Jun 2026, reception at AI Summit London	No cash; trophy + finalist ticket; free, explicit no-pay-to-play; partners =

Le n # s	Pro gra m	Owner / type	Free or paid	Submi ssion	Explicit rubric	Jury model	Cadence / ceremony	Prize & sponsorship
	s (+ Alc oni cs co- bra nd)	a/Alco nics				code of condu ct		event supporters
1 C 5	ITU AI for Good Imp act Awar ds	ITU (UN agency) + Tech To The Rescue	free , no cash	online form + docs + optio nal multi media (Engli sh)	yes (5 criteria, weighted; weights not published)	mixed panel (acad emia + indust ry + UN), COI recus al	annual (1st 2025); ceremony 8 Jul 2026, Geneva	No cash; trophies + recognition; fee not stated; co- run with Tech To The Rescue
1 C 6	Aus tral ian AI Awar ds	Momen tum Media (AU)	free entry, no cash	online (Awar d Force) + evide nce	named criteria, weights not published	~27- judge panel, indivi dual scorin g	annual (2nd ed. 2025); gala Nov, Sydney	Free entry, no cash; recognition; AWS named partner
2 D 2	Clo udF est Hac kat hon Awar ds (ha ckat hon)	CloudF est / WHD Event GmbH (DE)	free to enter; no cash (spons or fees go 100% to charity)	on- site team build; self- select via pitche s; on- stage showc ase (no Devpo st)	named via 6 award descripti ons, no weights	name d indust ry jury (~9 voting + non- voting secret ary); no COI policy	annual (2026 = 9th ed.); pins + on-stage recognition, no gala	No cash to winners; pins + on- stage; each category sponsor- funded, 100% to charity (Groundbre aker); ~EUR 6k raised

Le #	Program	Owner / type	Free or paid	Submission	Explicit rubric	Jury model	Cadence / ceremony	Prize & sponsorship
2 D 3	Hack-Nation (Global AI Hackathon)	community / MIT-ecosystem hackathon, Devpost	free	online via Devpost; 24h build, then live finalist pitch (Zoom)	not published	shortlist then live pitch to VC/fo under + MIT alumni jury; roster /size not disclosed	recurring (5+ editions); online Demo Day ~1 wk after build	Free; cash + API credits vary by edition (~\$28.5k-35k+; \$150k+ credits); OpenAI-headlined
2 D 4	Google Cloud ADK / Multi-Age Hackathon	Devpost hackathon / Google Cloud (sole sponsor)	free (no purchase necessary); USD 50,000 cash pool	online via Devpost: working project + public repo + diagram + ≤3-min demo video	yes (Technical 50% / Innovation 30% / Docs 20% + ≤1.0 bonus)	single - sponsor internal panel (Google/Devpost); "over 25" stated, 33 named	one-off 2025; winners via Devpost + Google blog, no live ceremony	Free; USD 50,000 cash pool + credits; sole sponsor Google
2 D 5	Global Recognition Award	private for-profit recognition vendor (™)	free to enter & paid to use the win (\$99/\$499)	self-nomination, 10-min 3-step form; win	named criteria + 1-5 scale & "Rasch model" claimed, no weights	named per-category panels (3-5 each); judge	annual rolling intake (2024-2026); no ceremony , emailed result +	No cash; free to "win" but paid proof (\$99/\$499); no external sponsor

Lens #	Program	Owner / type	Free or paid	Submission	Explicit rubric	Jury model	Cadence / ceremony	Prize & sponsorship
	s		USD); no cash prize	delivered by email		self-apply; no aggregate size/COI	paid promo	

3. Per-program profiles

Each profile uses the same **13 dimensions**: (1) owner/type, (2) purpose, (3) eligibility, (4) categories, (5) submission, (6) criteria/rubric, (7) jury, (8) edital/rules, (9) recognition/ceremony, (10) platform, (11) cadence, (12) promotion, and (13) **Prize & sponsorship** (prize type, monetary value per category when any, sponsor when any, and how the prize is handed over). Profiles are grouped by lens and keep **stable identifiers** (§3.1 to §3.25); within Lens B the original PMI/APM bodies (§3.4 to §3.7) are followed by the Wave 2 and Wave 6 chapter and federation additions (§3.17 to §3.21). The dimension-13 backfill detail for the v1 programs is consolidated in §6.7.

Lens A: Brazilian PM chapters

3.1 PMI São Paulo Chapter: “Melhores do Ano” (Projeto / PMO), v1 closed in Wave 2

- Owner/type:** PMI-SP, the largest PMI chapter in Latin America (~2,500 members); the award runs under the chapter’s vice-Presidency of Associations and is hosted at the PMI-SP Summit.
- Purpose:** recognize professionals, projects and PMOs in São Paulo state that stood out for excellence, innovation and impact.
- Eligibility:** open to public, private and third-sector organizations operating in SP state; projects with an official close date between 31/07/2024 and 31/07/2025 under a Brazilian CNPJ; PMOs formally structured in SP, all sizes. Not restricted to PMI members. (v1 said “Aug 2024 to Aug 2025”; the edital is precise: 31/07/2024 to 31/07/2025.)
- Categories:** two, **Projeto** and **PMO** (2025 = 1st edition); each category awards both an organization trophy and a professional trophy.
- Submission (v1 closed):** free and email-only to premio@pmisp.org.br (valid only after PMI-SP emails a confirmation back). Three separate PDFs per entry: Formulário de Candidatura, Declaração de Autorização da Empresa, Termo de Aceite do Profissional. The Projeto dossier is page-capped (Resumo up to 2 pp, Detalhamento up to 10 pp, Visão pessoal up to 1 p, anexes up to 6 pp, 22 pp total),

Arial 9, with no embedded links or QR codes. There is no online portal: entry is by email attachment.

6. **Criteria/rubric (v1 closed):** now fully public and weighted. Final score = 70% Comitê de Avaliação + 30% live audience vote at the Summit, minus a time-overrun penalty (0.1 point per 30 seconds past a 10-minute pitch). The committee rubric is 8 criteria, each scored 1 to 5, up to 40 points (Projeto: clarity of description, relevance to the client, innovation/originality, use of methodology/processes/tools, technical and managerial skill, PM leadership, result for stakeholders, result for the organization; PMO: clarity of PMO description, conduction toward PMO best practices, three-year PM-maturity results, three-year org-success results, capacity to overcome challenges, excellence serving internal clients, perceived value, future-evolution potential). The public vote uses 5 criteria, each scored 1 to 5.
7. **Jury (v1 closed):** a “Comitê de Avaliação” of market professionals and academics selected in advance by the PMI-SP team, kept confidential by rule (“mantidos em sigilo”) with no candidate contact, fused with the live Summit audience vote. A conflict-of-interest clause bars any project from an organization linked to the PMI-SP president, the vice-president of Associations, or any organizing-team member. Individual names and panel size are not disclosed by design.
8. **Edital (v1 closed):** two public standalone regulamentos (one per category), each a 15 to 16 page PDF dated 31/07/2025 with a 22/09/2025 retificação, linked from pmisp.org.br/melhores-do-ano-2025 alongside the candidacy form, authorization declaration and acceptance term.
9. **Recognition/ceremony (v1 closed):** at the PMI-SP Summit 2025 (23rd edition), Transamerica Expo Center, São Paulo, 2 to 3 Dec 2025. Project finalists pitch 02/12, PMO finalists 03/12, winners announced on-screen 03/12. Each category awards two trophies (organization + professional): “Melhor Projeto do Ano” + “Melhor Gerente de Projeto do Ano”, and “Melhor PMO do Ano” + “Melhor Gestor de PMO do Ano”. Winners also receive a digital certificate, an exclusive PMI-SP digital badge, promotion across PMI-SP channels, and pre-qualification to the national Prêmio PMI Brasil Melhores do Ano 2026 (scores zeroed and re-judged nationally).
10. **Platform (v1 corrected):** email submission to premio@pmisp.org.br with PDF attachments; no online portal (v1 had assumed “online registration via the Summit/SIGP site”).
11. **Cadence:** annual; 2025 = 1st edition. Calendar (retified 22/09): entries close 30/09/2025; finalists by 03/11/2025; audience vote 02 to 03/12/2025; ceremony 03/12/2025.
12. **Promotion:** chapter site, Facebook, Instagram, Summit microsite.
13. **Prize & sponsorship:** recognition only, no cash. Each winner receives two physical trophies (organization + professional) handed over on stage at the 03/12 Summit, plus a digital certificate and an exclusive PMI-SP digital badge, plus pre-qualification to the 2026 national award. The award itself names no patrocinador in the editais; the broader Summit lists named sponsors (Diamond: Nortrez and monday.com), but those underwrite the event, not the award.

Sources: pmisp.org.br/melhores-do-ano-2025 (award page + document links); [Regulamento_Premio_PMI_SP_Projeto_do_Ano_2025_v4.pdf](#) and [Regulamento_Premio_PMI_SP_PMO_do_Ano_2025-v3.pdf](#) (chapter Google Drive); pmispsummit.com and pmisp.org.br/evento/pmi-sp-summit-2025 (Summit venue/dates); facebook.com/pmisaopaulo announcement.

Why this matters for AIPM: PMI-SP is the rare chapter award that publishes its full rubric AND fuses an expert panel with a live community vote at a fixed 70/30 split, with both the committee criteria (8 × 1 to 5 = 40 pts) and the audience criteria (5 × 1 to 5) written into the public edital. It is a directly reusable template for an AIPM “AI Project of the Year”: an explicit low-points-per-criterion rubric, a transparent committee-plus-community weighting, free email entry (no platform cost), and confidential COI-screened judges, none of which needs a paid SaaS platform.

3.2 PMI Rio de Janeiro Chapter: “Projeto Awards” + “Prêmio PMI-RJ Melhores do Ano 2025 (Projeto / PMO)”, v1 closed in Wave 2

1. **Owner/type:** PMI-RIO (PMI-RJ); runs an internal volunteer-recognition lane (Projeto Awards) AND a market-facing “Prêmio PMI-RJ Melhores do Ano”, whose 2025 edition is the chapter’s 1st, with Melhor Projeto and Melhor PMO categories, feeding the national Prêmio PMI Brasil.
2. **Purpose:** recognize volunteers, partners and teachers (Projeto Awards) and honor the best Project and best PMO in Rio de Janeiro state in 2025 (Melhores do Ano).
3. **Eligibility:** Projeto Awards are volunteer/chapter-centric; the Melhor PMO category is open to any PMO established in RJ state that meets the regulamento and authorizes disclosure of its information (Declaração de Autorização).
4. **Categories:** “Projeto Awards” lists 5 (Volunteer of the Year, Teacher of the Year, Article of the Year, Business Partner of the Year, Volunteer Project of the Year); “Prêmio PMI-RJ Melhores do Ano 2025” has 2 (Melhor Projeto, Melhor PMO).
5. **Submission (v1 closed for PMO):** Volunteer of the Year uses **peer voting**. The Melhor PMO category is email-submitted to premio@pmirio.org.br with the subject line “[Inscrição PMO 2025] Responsável - Empresa” as separate PDFs, page-capped at 16 pp (Seção 1 Identificação e Descrição do PMO up to 2 pp, Seção 2 Boas Práticas up to 3 pp, Seção 3 Resultados e Planos up to 2 pp, Apêndices up to 6 pp, Declaração de Autorização 1 p, Termo de Aceite 2 pp). Deadline 25/07/2025.
6. **Criteria/rubric (partially recovered):** entries first pass a triagem (screening; non-conforming entries are disqualified), then qualified entries are scored on “Gestão de PMO”, mapped to the dossier sections (PMO identification/description, best practices, results and future plans). Per-criterion weights are not exposed in any indexed source.
7. **Jury (v1 closed): peer-voting model** for the volunteer awards (each volunteer rates co-workers in their area; standouts advance); for Melhores do Ano, a two-tier jury, a Comitê de Avaliação of PM specialists plus market professionals and academics, combined with a vote by the audience present at the 20^o PMI Rio

Summit; the committee may request more information and visit the PMO's premises. Committee size and names are not disclosed.

8. **Edital:** a public "Regulamento PMO 2025" PDF dated 09/06/2025; plus a "Guia do Voluntário" for the volunteer lane. (The PDF and award page sit behind a Cloudflare challenge, so they are reachable only via the search index, not direct fetch.)
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** the volunteer Projeto Awards ran in person (2024 edition 12 Dec 2024, Ibmecc Centro, Rio, ticketed via Sympla); the Melhores do Ano PMO award is presented live at the 20º PMI Rio Summit, 18 to 19 Sep 2025, Prodigy Hotel, Centro, Rio (2025 theme "Inteligência Artificial: A reinvenção dos Projetos").
10. **Platform:** internal voting forms (volunteer lane); email submission with PDF attachments (Melhores do Ano); Sympla for event ticketing. No awards SaaS.
11. **Cadence:** annual; the Melhor PMO category is 1st edition in 2025, aligned to the national PMI Brasil cycle.
12. **Promotion:** chapter site, LinkedIn, Sympla, the Summit listing.
13. **Prize & sponsorship:** recognition, not cash. The Melhor PMO winner is pre-qualified to the national "Prêmio PMI Brasil Melhores do Ano 2026" (score reset and re-judged by the national committee). Hand-over is at the live Summit ceremony. No monetary value, trophy/certificate specifics, or named sponsor is exposed in any recoverable source, and whether entry is free or carries a fee is not stated (the regulamento describes only an email submission, with no fee mentioned).

Sources: pmirio.org.br/pagina/120 (award page) and the web-search-indexed text of [pmirio.org.br/uploads/tinymce/files/Regulamento PMO 2025_PMIRIO.pdf](http://pmirio.org.br/uploads/tinymce/files/Regulamento_PMO_2025_PMIRIO.pdf) (dated 09/06/2025); pmirio.org.br/pagina/70 and [/pagina/72](http://pmirio.org.br/pagina/72) (volunteer lane); [sympla](http://sympla.com.br) 20º PMI Rio Summit listing; [sympla](http://sympla.com.br) PMI-RIO 2024 event. (Direct fetch of the PMI-RJ pages returns HTTP 403 with cf-mitigated: challenge, the Cloudflare interstitial that caused the v1 block.)

Why this matters for AIPM: PMI-RIO now gives two reusable mechanics. The **peer-vote** lane is a clean, low-infrastructure way to add a community-vote dimension without a public-voting platform (volunteers vote inside their own area first, then a finalist vote). The Melhores do Ano PMO lane adds a hard 16-page cap that forces concision, a fixed section skeleton that doubles as the rubric, a hybrid expert-committee-plus-live-audience jury, and an upward-nomination tier (the chapter winner feeds the national award, score reset and re-judged) that lets a community award nominate winners upward without claiming the higher body's authority.

3.3 PMI Distrito Federal Chapter: *Prêmio Candango* (strongest BR edital)

1. **Owner/type:** PMI-DF; runs Volunteer of the Year, Melhores do Ano, and the well-documented **Prêmio Candango**.
2. **Purpose:** recognize and stimulate personal, social, innovation and academic projects applying PM practices; strengthen the chapter's community ties.
3. **Eligibility: open nationally;** individuals, companies, nonprofits, and teaching/research institutions with real projects or applied cases concluded in the

window; students may enter with their advisor. **Free registration**, not member-restricted.

4. **Categories:** three: **Inovação, Social** (mapped to UN SDGs 1 to 17), **Universitário** (academic works on PM).
5. **Submission: self-submission** via an online form with Dados pessoais, Dados do Projeto, and Anexos (a zipped folder plus a dedicated field for links to sites, social, YouTube). A structured written case is required (intro, development/results, lessons learned, tools, methodology, indicators).
6. **Criteria/rubric (explicit):** evaluators score **8 criteria, each 1 to 5, for a 40-point max**; category-specific rubric tables, plus mandatory edital requirements (originality, PMBOK adequacy, results, lessons learned).
7. **Jury:** a “**Banca Examinadora**” instituted by the chapter (edital section 5); exact size/composition/COI not disclosed. Phases: registration – classification against requirements – scoring by banca – results published – winners present at the Summit.
8. **Edital: a full public Edital with a 12-section structure** (objective, registration, categories, criteria, prize, banca, cronograma, general conditions, image rights, disqualification). High transparency.
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** 1st/2nd/3rd per category; 1st place presents at the PMI-DF Summit (2025 Summit Nov 5 to 6, Brasília). All entrants get a discount voucher.
10. **Platform:** online registration form (Google Forms used for the 2024 edition).
11. **Cadence:** annual, tied to the Summit. 2025 window: 16/06/2025 to 30/09/2025; Summit 05 to 06/11/2025.
12. **Promotion:** pmidf.org / summit.pmidf.org, LinkedIn, blog, partner ecosystem.

Sources: summit.pmidf.org/wp-content/uploads/Edital-Premio-Candango.pdf;
pmidf.org/premio-candango.

Why this matters for AIPM: this is the **best end-to-end edital template in Portuguese:** free, open nationally, a transparent point-based rubric, named jury, fixed calendar, multiple categories including a Social/SDG one. It is the most directly reusable structure for AIPM's regulamento.

Lens B: International PM bodies

3.4 PMI PMO of the Year Award (PMO Global Alliance / PMI): *best operational analog*

1. **Owner/type:** originated 2018 in PMO Global Alliance, now run as the PMI PMO of the Year Award; global professional-body award.
2. **Purpose:** global benchmark celebrating PMO innovation, business impact and project success.
3. **Eligibility:** PMOs of any industry/country and type; past World winners of the last 3 editions and third-party/consulting nominations are excluded.
4. **Categories:** 6 (World PMO of the Year + 5 regional: Africa, Americas, Asia-Pacific, Europe, Middle East).

5. **Submission: a Lead Nominator** (the PMO leader, with an org-domain email) submits a **one-page form** then a **30 to 40 minute video** (MP4/AVI, Business English) as a download link. No professional production required, content over polish.
6. **Criteria/rubric (explicit weights):** Value Creation & Impact **25%**, PMO Evolution **20%**, Client Service Excellence **15%**, Adherence to Best Practices **15%**, Innovation & Adaptability **15%**, Community Engagement **10%**.
7. **Jury:** a volunteer **Judging Committee** of PMO experts (recruited as volunteers). **Comparative one-on-one judging:** nominees compete pairwise, judges pick a winner per match. Multi-stage: eligibility → Group Stage → Regional Finals (round of 16, quarters, semis) → World Final (5 regional winners). COI: PMI team/contractors and Board members cannot apply or nominate.
8. **Edital:** public **Nomination Handbook** plus Rules and Procedures pages. High transparency.
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** World winner announced at the **PMI Global Summit** (Oct); recognition on PMI channels, a Summit pass, trophies and recognition pins.
10. **Platform:** dedicated awards platform (one-page form online); video by download link via email.
11. **Cadence:** annual. 2026: nominations open 1 Feb, deadline 20 Apr, finalists mid-July, celebrated at the Summit in October.
12. **Promotion:** PMI Global Summit, PMI channels, awards microsites, the global PMO community.

Sources: pmi.org PMO of the Year Handbook PDF; pmoga.pmi.org rules-and-procedures and judge-committee.

Why this matters for AIPM: this is the model that **maps almost one-to-one onto the founders' sketch** (open nomination, video, weighted rubric, volunteer expert jury, multi-stage to a small set of finalists, annual online-ceremony). The comparative pairwise judging is an interesting option for fairness with a small jury.

3.5 PMI Project of the Year + Professional Awards (PMI global)

1. **Owner/type:** PMI; Project of the Year sits inside the broader PMI Professional Awards.
2. **Purpose:** recognize outstanding projects on context/challenge, outcomes and value, and strategic alignment.
3. **Eligibility:** projects completed ≤18 months before the deadline, any region, English only; the Lead Nominator need not be a PMI member; recent evaluators and PMI Board/staff are excluded.
4. **Categories:** **three** project submission categories, re-grounded against the live 2026 entry form in Wave 6: **PMI Engineering/Technology Project Award, PMI Social Project Award, PMI Construction/Infrastructure Project Award** (the entry form states candidates submit under “one of the three categories”), with one overall Project of the Year. A separate **Sustainability Award** exists but as an **Honorable**

Mention run in conjunction with Green Project Management (GPM), not a fourth submission category (Farhad Abdollahyan's report counted four; reconciliation in §6.4). The wider program adds Fellow, Person of the Year, Rising Leader, Distinguished Contribution, PMO of the Year. (v1 labelled the social category "Social Impact"; PMI's exact current term is "Social Project Award".)

5. **Submission:** open nomination (self or peer); a **written essay ≤2,000 words** on the official template, two pages or fewer per criterion (≤20 pages), plus a **sponsor letter** signed by the project sponsor.
6. **Criteria/rubric:** 10 named criteria (Introduction/Summary, Sponsor Letter, Benefits/Value, Schedule, Cost, Scope, Stakeholders, Risk, Change Management, Lessons Learned). **Weights are internal.**
7. **Jury:** trained PMI volunteers + SMEs review and shortlist; finalists join a **1-hour virtual session** (25-min "Story of Success" + Q&A); COI handled via eligibility exclusions. Exact headcount not disclosed.
8. **Edital:** public guidelines, general submission guidelines, downloadable application template, per-award handbooks.
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** announced at the PMI Global Summit; prize/trophy specifics not disclosed.
10. **Platform:** third-party awards platform (Award Force, pmiprofessional.awardsplatform.com).
11. **Cadence:** annual; 2026 window opened 1 Feb 2026.
12. **Promotion:** pmi.org awards hub, winners pages, ProjectManagement.com, the Summit.

Sources: pmi.org/about/awards/project-of-the-year; project-year-application.pdf; pmiprofessional.awardsplatform.com.

3.6 APM Project Management Awards (UK): best public weighted rubric

1. **Owner/type:** Association for Project Management, the UK chartered body ("the PM Oscars").
2. **Purpose:** recognize organizations, individuals and projects across sectors for the past year's achievements.
3. **Eligibility:** open to members and non-members, all countries, English only; project completed or at a major phase ≤12 months before the deadline; demonstrable involvement required.
4. **Categories:** many, grouped into Project Organisations, Projects & Programmes (incl. Technology Project of the Year, Social Project of the Year, Transformation Project of the Year), PMO of the Year, and Individuals, plus a student Challenge and an Education & Research strand.
5. **Submission:** self or peer; project categories = written **1,500 to 2,500 words**; individual categories = written **≤1,000 words OR a video ≤8 minutes** plus up to 4 supporting evidence items. **Free to enter**; the ceremony is paid.
6. **Criteria/rubric (explicit):** **Outcomes and Benefits 40%, Project Management 40%** (Context, Capability, Delivery), remaining **20%** on a criterion whose exact

label is not published. **AI-written entries are banned** and detection tools may be used.

7. **Jury: anonymous volunteer expert panel**; entrants may not contact judges (disqualification); an **Awards Steering Group** governs rule breaches; binding COI/Code-of-Conduct policies. Two-stage for many categories: submission → finalists → **virtual presentation** to a panel.
8. **Edital**: public, detailed per-category pages plus a structured entry form with rules, eligibility, word/video limits, evidence, and criteria tabs.
9. **Recognition/ceremony**: in-person black-tie gala (2025: 17 Nov, London); engraved trophy; winners revealed only at the ceremony.
10. **Platform**: third-party Award Force (apm.awardsplatform.com).
11. **Cadence**: annual; 2025 entries closed ~28 May, finalist presentations early Sept, ceremony 17 Nov.
12. **Promotion**: APM news, community portal, a “winning entry” webinar, finalist/winner PR, social.

Sources: apm.org.uk/apm-awards; apm.awardsplatform.com entry form PDF.

Why this matters for AIPM: APM is the **transparency gold standard** (published weights) and a useful precedent for two things AIPM should decide now: an explicit **anti-AI-ghostwriting rule** for entries, and a **no-contact-with-judges** integrity rule.

3.7 House of PMO (UK): informal recognition, NOT a juried award

1. **Owner/type**: House of PMO, a UK PMO membership body (founded 2013).
2. **Purpose**: community celebration of PMO practitioners, not a competitive juried award. 3 to 8. **Eligibility / categories / submission / criteria / jury / rules**: **none published**. The recognitions found are a peer-passed “Professional of the Month” trophy, a “mini awards ceremony” on International PMO Day, and a closed “The House” competition with no published mechanics.
3. **Recognition**: a physical trophy passed peer-to-peer monthly; community celebration on PMO Day; no gala of its own. 10 to 12. **Platform / cadence / promotion**: no entry portal; monthly + annual; promoted via blog, events, PMO Conference.

Sources: houseofpmo.com; houseofpmo.com/blog/2022/12/11/pmo-awards.

Why this matters for AIPM: a useful **counter-example**. A recognition program with no edital, no criteria and no published jury reads as a private club, not a credible community award. It marks the floor AIPM should stay above.

3.17 PMI UK Chapter (PMI United Kingdom Chapter National Project Awards)

1. **Owner/type**: PMI United Kingdom Chapter (the UK member chapter of PMI), run “in association with PwC”. A national, chapter-run project-management excellence award with a black-tie gala. Distinct from PMI-global awards and distinct from APM’s awards.

2. **Purpose:** to “celebrate outstanding success and recognise excellence in project management across the UK”. Launched in 2019 as part of PMI’s 50th-anniversary year.
3. **Eligibility:** “open to any organisation, team or individual, without the need to be a PMI member”; PMI members and non-members, public and private sector, all sizes. A submission is required (it is a submitted award, not pure nomination).
4. **Categories:** eight in the cycle documented by PMI UK: Project of the Year (Private Enterprise); Project of the Year (Public Sector); PMO of the Year; Innovation in Project Management; Project Management for Social Good; Early in Career Project Professional of the Year; Project Professional of the Year; PMI UK Volunteer of the Year. The count is NOT stable across editions: the 2019 inaugural edition had roughly 11 winner categories (including Teaching Excellence, Project Management Literature, and Young Project Professional of the Year), the 2020 edition had nine (including a one-off Covid-19 response category), and the eight-category structure here is the LinkedIn-published c.2022 cycle.
5. **Submission:** download the application form for the chosen category from the PMI UK awards page, complete it, and email it to awards@pmi.org.uk (per the 2022 edition copy). No third-party SaaS entry portal confirmed; entry is form-by-email. One published closing date was Friday 7 October.
6. **Criteria/rubric:** judges look for “superior performance through the application of project management; organisational results and/or positive impacts on the community”. Each category carries its own requirements. Detailed scoring weights are not published.
7. **Jury:** “a team of leading industry experts”; for 2019 the shortlist was compiled by a panel of industry experts and PMI representatives, with independent oversight of the judging provided by Pinsent Masons. Exact jury size, named judges, recruitment and conflict-of-interest policy are not published.
8. **Edital/rules:** no single standalone rules PDF was located on official sources this run; rules are distributed across the per-category application forms plus the awards page.
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** winners are presented at a black-tie London gala, but the ceremony month varies by edition (the 2019 inaugural ceremony was 14 November 2019; the 2020 edition’s gala was 15 July 2021). Confirmed venue for editions including 2019 and 2024: the Honourable Artillery Company, City Road, London (the 2024 listing of 6:00pm to 10:00pm GMT is snippet-level, since the pmi.org event page 403s to direct fetch). The 2019 ceremony had 41 finalists including HM Land Registry, Dyson, Rolls-Royce, Transport for London and The Open University.
10. **Platform:** entry via a downloadable form emailed to awards@pmi.org.uk; the chapter site hosts category pages and the PMI events listing carries the public-facing event page (403 to direct fetch, facts are snippet-level). No Award Force / Awards Platform SaaS confirmed.
11. **Cadence:** annual; inaugural 2019, continuing in subsequent years (2020, 2022, 2024 confirmed). Status of the most recent (2025/2026) cycle not confirmed this run.

12. **Promotion:** PMI UK Chapter website and events listing, the PMI.org events page, partner/sponsor channels (PwC, Stoneseed), and the official PMI UK LinkedIn article.
13. **Prize & sponsorship:** free entry, no submission fee. Recognition award (trophy/title at the gala); no cash prize per category is published. Lead partner: PwC (“in association with PwC”). Named category sponsor: Stoneseed Ltd sponsored the “Project Professional of the Year” (2020 edition; the Stoneseed pages now 404, the claim survives via indexed titles). How handed over: presented at the black-tie gala at the Honourable Artillery Company. Full per-edition sponsor roster not enumerated.

Sources: pmi.org.uk (awards categories page, academic-awards-and-prizes, sitemap); pmi.org/events/pmi-uk-chapter-national-project-awards (event page, 403 to fetch but indexed); the PMI UK LinkedIn article “The PMI UK National Project Awards” (category list, submission-by-email, criteria, eligibility); projectmanagernews.com “Shortlist Announced For First Ever PMI UK Awards” (2019 PwC sponsor, judging panel, Pinsent Masons oversight, 14 Nov 2019 black-tie at the Honourable Artillery Company, 41 finalists); stoneseed.co.uk award pages (Stoneseed sponsorship, 2020, via indexed titles).

Why this matters for AIPM: a working precedent for a free-to-enter, submission-based national award that is genuinely open to non-members and pairs a corporate lead partner (PwC) with named per-category sponsors (Stoneseed), while keeping submission lightweight (a downloadable form emailed in, no paywalled SaaS portal). It also models a dedicated “Innovation in Project Management” category plus a “Volunteer of the Year” community category, both of which AIPM can mirror for an AI-in-delivery innovation track and a community-recognition track without imposing entry fees. (Disambiguation logged: “The PMi Awards” by the PM Society is an unrelated pharma/marketing award and was excluded; this is also distinct from the PMI Ireland Chapter’s own National Project Awards.)

3.18 PMI Netherlands Chapter (Project of the Year Award + Dutch Project Management Research Awards)

The chapter owns two distinct chapter-level recognition programs, both separate from the PMI-global awards.

A. PMI Netherlands Project of the Year Award (POYA) (the chapter’s own flagship juried project award) 1. **Owner/type:** PMI Netherlands Chapter (a PMI component chapter, non-commercial volunteer body). Independent process assurance is noted as provided by two named individuals (Drake Morse and Kevin Eneje) on the judging-process page. Distinct from PMI-global Project of the Year. 2. **Purpose:** to recognize the best project among submissions, judged on “outstanding achievements in Project Management”. A fuller purpose statement is not published on the public page. 3. **Eligibility:** the page references “standard eligibility criteria” and a separate “Eligibility Criteria” document, but the criteria themselves are not shown inline. Judges are explicitly not required to be chapter members. 4. **Categories:** entries must be “submitted in appropriate categories”, implying more than

one, but the category names are not listed on the public page. 5. **Submission:** a four-stage process. Stage 1 (Nomination): submit via an online application (a downloadable Word form is referenced). Stage 2 (Initial Eligibility Assessment): the POYA team screens each application. Stage 3 (Judging to Short-List): the panel draws up a shortlist of up to three applicants. Stage 4 (Final Selection and Announcement): the winner is announced at the End of Year Event. 6. **Criteria/rubric:** judging covers “outstanding achievements in Project Management”; judges are chosen to cover a wide range of seniority in delivering and overseeing projects across multiple industries (paraphrase of the page, not a verbatim rubric). No numeric rubric or weights are published. 7. **Jury:** “5-8 Judges”, selected for breadth of seniority across industries by experience, role and industry, with a “passion for the delivery of exceptional project performance”. PMI membership not required. Recruitment and conflict-of-interest handling beyond the two named assurance individuals are not detailed. 8. **Edital/rules:** no single standalone public rules PDF was reachable; rules are split across the judging-process page plus referenced “Application Form” and “Eligibility Criteria” documents whose contents are not public. 9. **Recognition/ceremony:** winner announced at the chapter’s “End of Year Event”; the judging-process page references the “End of Year Event for 2022”. The 2023 End of Year event (Scheveningen) named Volunteer-of-the-Year recipients (Nina Kettle, Nicole van der Heijden, Uygur Yaylamis, Madalin Ceausescu) plus raffle prizes; the 2025 reference is a forward-looking gala announcement that mentions an “annual awards ceremony” but names no POYA winner. So the POYA’s recent activity/continuity is unclear. 10. **Platform:** application is a downloadable Word form submitted online; no third-party awards SaaS is named. 11. **Cadence:** intended annual; the most recent explicit POYA reference on the public page is the 2022 cycle. 12. **Promotion:** chapter website (judging-process page) and the chapter end-of-year events. 13. **Prize & sponsorship:** no monetary prize, trophy value, or sponsor is published for the POYA on the official pages checked; recognition is announcement at the End of Year Event.

B. Dutch Project Management Research Awards (chapter thesis/research award, co-run with IPMA Nederland) 1. **Owner/type:** PMI Netherlands Chapter jointly with IPMA Nederland. Current contacts (from the /research-awards page): academic-outreach@pmi-nl.nl and award@ipma.nl. 2. **Purpose:** to highlight outstanding academic research in project, program, or portfolio management, rewarding “a high-quality thesis that aims to improve project management practice through research”. 3. **Eligibility:** Bachelor’s and master’s theses from “Dutch universities and universities of applied sciences (HBO and WO)” (per the /students page); theses may be written in Dutch or English (per /research-awards). 4. **Categories (per the /research-awards page):** Gold, Silver, Bronze, an Audience Choice Award, and Certificates of Recognition. Historically (2019, 3rd edition) it awarded one gold and two silver medals. 5. **Submission:** the thesis plus a short supporting letter from the supervisor (not exceeding one A4 page). Exact deadlines are not stated. 6. **Criteria/rubric:** innovative contribution to PM, potential to improve practice, practical applicability, and quality/relevance of research. Numeric weights not published. 7. **Jury:** “a professional jury consisting of academics and experienced project managers from practice”. Jury size not published. 8. **Edital/rules:** summarized on the chapter Research Awards page and the IPMA-NL/PMI-NL blog; no standalone rules PDF. 9. **Recognition/ceremony:** nominees present their research to an audience, followed by an award ceremony; winners

gain recognition and visibility within the PMI and IPMA networks (a 2019 ceremony was held 28 November). 10. **Platform:** thesis submission via the chapter/IPMA email contacts; no awards SaaS named. 11. **Cadence:** annual (“3rd annual” as of 2019; an edition reported as “Dutch Research Awards 2026”). 12. **Promotion:** PMI Netherlands and IPMA Nederland websites and networks. 13. **Prize & sponsorship:** no monetary prize; the award is recognition/visibility (Gold/Silver/Bronze medals plus Certificates of Recognition). No external sponsor is named.

Sources: pmi-nl.nl/judging-process (POYA process, 5-8 judges, End of Year Event, assurance names); pmi-nl.nl/research-awards (categories, criteria, jury, supervisor letter, contacts); pmi-nl.nl/students (HBO/WO eligibility); pmi-nl.nl/blog/ipma-nl-pmi-nl-master-awards (3rd annual, 2019); pmi-nl.nl/blog/...-2023 (2023 End of Year, Volunteer of the Year); pmi-nl.nl/blog/...-end-of-year-gala-2025 (2025 gala announcement, no POYA winner).

Why this matters for AIPM: the POYA is a clean small-chapter template for a low-overhead juried project award (a downloadable form, a documented four-stage funnel, a 5-8 person panel deliberately spread across seniority and industry, named independent-assurance individuals, no fee, recognition only). The companion Research Awards show a second lever: partnering with a peer body (IPMA) to add an academic/thesis track with an Audience Choice category alongside Gold/Silver/Bronze. The cautionary note is continuity: the POYA page still anchors to a 2022 cycle and recent galas surfaced only volunteer recognition, a reminder that a juried award needs a visibly published annual winner to stay credible.

3.19 PMI Sweden Chapter (Under 35 Changemaker Awards; plus Volunteer of the Year)

The chapter does NOT run a “Project of the Year” / “Årets projekt” and does NOT run a thesis/uppsats award (none found on the chapter site or the Passion for Projects congress site). It runs two of its own recognition programs. 1. **Owner/type:** PMI Sweden Chapter (Young Professionals network). A chapter-run, people-focused recognition award (not a project award, not PMI-global). The page states the awards “gathers and celebrates the rising leaders across Sweden”. 2. **Purpose:** recognize “the rising leaders across Sweden, those who make ideas a reality, who inspire others, who lead change”. Tied to the next generation of project leaders. 3. **Eligibility:** nominees must be under 35; Sweden-focused (the YP network targets ages 20-35). Citizenship/residency requirement not stated. Who may nominate is not stated on the reachable pages (the /Nominate page 404’d this run, likely a closed window). 4. **Categories:** three, all individual: Award for Inspiring Leadership, Award for Sustainability Impact, Award for Outstanding Innovation. 5. **Submission:** by nomination via the chapter site (a live chapter news item, “Nominera Sveriges Under 35 Changemaker”, corroborates that nomination is the entry route). The form/platform, required fields, and deadline could not be confirmed (the /Nominate page 404’d this run). 6. **Criteria/rubric:** no published rubric or weights found. The only criteria-like language is a winner’s self-report (William Meller, Leadership category, on his own site): recognized for “outstanding leadership, unwavering dedication, and ability to inspire both individuals and teams”. That is testimonial language, not a stated scoring rubric. 7.

Jury: 3 jurors for 2025: Daniel Karlsson (AI integration in project management, “leveraging AI tools to enhance project delivery”), Marina Maric (consultancy and PMO expertise), and Dag Duberg (circular construction and sustainability). No description of the judging process, scoring, or conflict-of-interest handling. 8. **Edital/rules:** no standalone rules document found; the program is described across the award page, jury page, and (now-404) nomination page. 9. **Recognition/ceremony:** winners are presented at the Passion for Projects Congress: “Winners will be presented at the Passion for Projects Congress on the 10 March 2025 at Svenska Mässan in Gothenburg” (the 2025 congress ran 10 to 11 March 2025). 10. **Platform:** chapter website pmi-se.org for award/jury content; the specific nomination tool is unconfirmed. 11. **Cadence:** annual. Prior editions referenced for 2022, 2023, 2024, with 2025 the current edition. 12. **Promotion:** PMI Sweden website, LinkedIn, Facebook, YouTube, Instagram, the chapter newsletter, and the Passion for Projects Congress. 13. **Prize & sponsorship:** confirmed negative, no monetary prize, no entry fee, and no cash sponsor. Recognition is presentation at the congress. The award links to “PMI Hours for Impact” and the UN Sustainable Development Goals as thematic framing (the page says it “supports the United Nations 17 Sustainable Development Goals”), not as a cash sponsor.

Second chapter recognition (not a project award): **Årets Volontär (Volunteer of the Year)** is an internal honor for a volunteer who “gjort en extraordinär insats under det gångna året”, presented at the Speakers Dinner the evening before the congress. Recent winners: 2025 Anna Söderström; 2024 Marly Nilsson and Jennie Campbell-Webster; 2023 Lars Rylander; 2022 Julia Gohblit and Jens Korneck. Its criteria, prize, and sponsor are not disclosed.

Sources: pmi-se.org (home; Om-oss; Under-35-Changemaker-Awards-2025; the Jury-2025 sub-page; the Nominera news item; Volontar/Arets-Volontar; Young-Professionals; Kongress); williammeller.com/under-35-changemaker-award-2025-on-leadership/ (winner’s self-report); pmi.org (Passion for Projects congress listing). The /Nominate and 2024-edition pages returned HTTP 404 this run.

Why this matters for AIPM: a live precedent for a community-first, non-commercial, people-focused chapter award with no entry fee and no cash prize, where the “prize” is visibility at the community’s flagship congress. Two reusable points: a small jury seated by stated expertise areas (and notably the 2025 panel explicitly seated an AI-in-project-delivery juror, evidence that chapters already treat AI capability as a judging competency); and a recognition-only, congress-stage hand-over. The cautionary gap is that this program publishes no rubric, weights, or written rules, exactly the transparency AIPM should add.

3.20 PMI Madrid / PMI Spain Chapter

PMI Madrid Spain Chapter runs several chapter-own recognitions: the project-focused **Premio Proyecto del Año**, the annual **Premio Voluntario del Año**, and a master’s-thesis (TFM) award with the Extremadura branch. (The IMM “Premios de Gestión del Cambio Organizacional” on the chapter calendar are a Grupo IMM collaborator event, not the chapter’s, and are excluded.) 1. **Owner/type:** PMI Madrid Spain Chapter, a nonprofit

chapter registered as an association under Spanish law, based in Alcobendas, Madrid; over 2,600 members (the largest PMI chapter in Spain). Awards are managed by a “Chapter Awards Program” working group. 2. **Purpose:** Premio Proyecto del Año: publicly recognize “alto rendimiento y ejecución ejemplar en la dirección de proyectos”. TFM award: recognize academic works that “supongan una contribución significativa en la Dirección de Proyectos”. Volunteer of the Year: recognize outstanding chapter volunteers. 3. **Eligibility:** Premio Proyecto del Año (2012 bases): projects completed in the prior year; any size/sector (public or private); PM/team based in Spain; PMI membership not required; board members and chapter-contracted projects excluded. TFM award: students who submitted their thesis (Máster de Dirección y Gestión de Proyectos, Universidad de Extremadura) before 15 Sep 2024. 4. **Categories:** Premio Proyecto del Año, one winner plus two finalists (no sub-categories in the 2012 bases). TFM award: two winners. Volunteer of the Year: a single annual recipient. A formal multi-category structure is not published. 5. **Submission:** Premio Proyecto del Año (2012): a documentation pack with eligibility checklists and templates; deadline was 31 Jan 2013. TFM award: thesis via the university by 15 Sep 2024. No online award-submission platform is described; submission appears document/email based. 6. **Criteria/rubric:** Premio Proyecto del Año (2012): efficient application of PM principles aligned with the “Guía del PMBOK” (4th edition). Specific scoring weights not published. TFM award: significant academic contribution to PM; detailed rubric not published. 7. **Jury:** composition, size, recruitment, and COI handling are not published for any of the three programs. 8. **Edital/rules:** Premio Proyecto del Año had written “bases” (referenced in the 2012 announcement), but no standalone current rules PDF was reachable. The TFM announcement links no formal bases document. 9. **Recognition/ceremony:** Premio Proyecto del Año: winner and two finalists published and kept as a permanent record on the website; the award is presented at the chapter’s annual congress in November (XXII Congreso Anual de Directores de Proyectos in 2025). Volunteer of the Year: a published historical winners table (2016-2025). The chapter also runs a “Project Challenge” pitch session at the congress (180-second presentations in 2025), but no formal prize is described for it. 10. **Platform:** the chapter website pmi-mad.org (registration, news, historical winners pages); no dedicated awards SaaS. 11. **Cadence:** Volunteer of the Year is annual (continuous 2016-2025). Premio Proyecto del Año is framed as annual (presented at the November congress) but the latest documented edition this run is 2012, so current continuity is unconfirmed. TFM award labelled “1er concurso” (2024 inaugural); recurrence implied but not confirmed. 12. **Promotion:** chapter website, chapter media/news, and the annual congress. 13. **Prize & sponsorship:** Premio Proyecto del Año: a physical trophy inscribed with the year, chapter name, project name and company name; no cash. TFM award: a non-cash pack valued at about USD 267 (a PMI Global student membership, a PMI Madrid student membership, and the CAPM exam fee), handed to two winners; funded by PMI Madrid and its Extremadura branch with the Universidad de Extremadura. Volunteer of the Year: recognition only. No external commercial sponsor is named for the chapter’s own awards.

Sources: pmi-mad.org (Premios calendar; Premio Voluntario del Año historical winners; PMI-MSC Premio Proyecto del Año 2012 bases; 1er concurso de TFM UEx, Branch Extremadura; XXII Congreso Anual 2025; “Capítulo de Madrid España del PMI”; Organización PMI MAD).

Why this matters for AIPM: PMI Madrid shows a low-overhead, multi-track recognition model a community award can copy: a project-execution trophy judged against a public methodology, an academic-thesis prize delivered as in-kind professional value (membership plus a certification exam fee, not cash), and a single annual congress that carries all of them. The in-kind student-membership-plus-exam-fee prize is a clean precedent for a non-commercial award that wants to give winners career capital rather than money.

3.21 IPMA Global Project Excellence Award (independent assessment + the feedback-report lever)

1. **Owner/type:** the **International Project Management Association (IPMA)**, a nonprofit federation of 70+ national member associations; the Project Excellence (PE) Award is part of the annual IPMA Global Awards program and is assessed against the **IPMA Project Excellence Baseline (PEB) / Project Excellence Model**.
2. **Purpose:** “celebrate outstanding project management achievements... recognising individuals and projects”; specifically, recognize excellence and innovation in the application of project management, assessed against the PE Model.
3. **Eligibility:** any organisation may enter and need **not** be a member of an IPMA association; the project must fulfil the IPMA ICB v4.0 project definition. Completion window: **24 months** (Large/Mega) or **18 months** (Small/Medium) before application; ongoing projects may apply if end results are available to review. Language is not explicitly stated (assessor teams aim to include a native speaker).
4. **Categories / tracks:** **two size tracks: Small/Medium-sized Projects** (budget < EUR 50M) and **Large & Mega-sized Projects** (Large up to EUR 200M; Mega above EUR 200M; the exact Large lower bound is not stated on the page, the EUR 50M figure is the Small/Medium ceiling). The Small/Medium track is further split into **seven** sector/theme sub-categories: IT/Telecommunications; Construction/Engineering/Infrastructure; Change Management/Product Development/Marketing; Social/Regional Development/Community Service; Sustainability; PMO; and Diversity, Equity & Inclusion.
5. **Submission:** an **Application Form** plus an **Application Report** on a provided DOCX template (narratives + documentary evidence), submitted via the Award Force platform (ipma.awardsplatform.com); one submission per applicant per category. 2026 deadlines: Large/Mega Form 28 Apr, Report 29 May; Small/Medium 26 May. For Large/Mega the written application is followed by an on-site assessment.
6. **Criteria/rubric:** the **IPMA Project Excellence Model** (current PEB v1.0/1.0.1, ©2016) with three areas, **A. People & Purpose** and **B. Processes & Resources** (the two “enablers”) plus **C. Project Results** (the “outcome”), across **nine criteria / sixteen sub-criterion scores**. Excellence is scored on a **0 to 100% scale with six anchors (0 / up to 20 / 40 / 60 / 80 / 100)** via published scoring tables (PDCA-based for the enabler areas; satisfaction/results tables for results). No fixed point weights are published; area scores are computed by averaging, so the three areas carry roughly equal weight at the area level. (This is the post-2016 model; the older

1000-point EFQM-style split of 500 enablers + 500 results is the **legacy** version and is NOT the current published structure.)

7. **Jury:** trained, **independent** IPMA Project Excellence Assessors organised into teams of about five (sector knowledge, plus a native speaker where possible); each application is reviewed by **3 judges** of broad experience. For Large/Mega the team conducts an **on-site site visit** with stakeholder interviews, demonstration and observation (2026: 22 to 26 June), holds two judges' meetings, and a Team Lead Assessor consolidates a consensus score. Assessors are independent of all submissions.
8. **Edital/rules:** public award pages per track plus an FAQ on awards.ipma.world; the full **IPMA Project Excellence Baseline** is a published standard on ipma.world. High transparency on both the process and the model.
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** award levels **Gold / Silver / Bronze** plus Finalist recognition; winners are announced at the **IPMA Global Awards Gala** held at the annual **IPMA World Congress** (2026: September, Hiroshima, Japan; 2025: 19 Sep, Berlin).
10. **Platform: Award Force** (ipma.awardsplatform.com), the same awards SaaS used by PMI, APM and the Australian AI Awards (the recurring infrastructure signal).
11. **Cadence:** annual.
12. **Promotion:** IPMA channels, the World Congress, the national member associations, and published winner case write-ups.
13. **Prize & sponsorship: fee-funded, no cash prize.** Entry fees: **EUR 4,000** (Large/Mega; explicitly excluding the assessment-team site-visit travel, which is billed separately; withdrawal penalty 20% before the report, 100% after) and **EUR 600** (Small/Medium; **EUR 300** for the Social/Community Service category). Recognition is the Gold/Silver/Bronze level, the feedback report, and the gala; no monetary prize and no single named sponsor/patron is stated in the official sources, and trophy specifics are not detailed.

Sources: awards.ipma.world (landing; Large & Mega-sized Projects track page; Small/Medium-sized Projects track page; FAQ); ipma.world IPMA Project Excellence Baseline (PEB) standard; ipma.awardsplatform.com (Award Force portal). Researched and adversarially verified 2026-06-24.

Why this matters for AIPM: IPMA contributes the one capability that **no other benchmarked award offers, a written feedback report against published model criteria** returned to every applicant (Large/Mega) or every finalist (Small/Medium), describing strengths and areas for improvement. That turns a recognition event into a **learning-and-improvement process:** it pairs directly with v1's "Story of Success" library idea (§4.3) and Farhad's process stage 8 (feedback and lessons) to give AIPM a **capability-building posture** (developed in round2-concept-inputs.md §9). Two more reusable pieces: a **published, anchored scoring model** (0 to 100% in six bands) that is the rigorous end of the same idea as v1's recommended 1-to-10 scale (best-practice 4.1) and Farhad's 1-to-10 anchors; and a **size-track split** (small/medium vs large/mega) so a small

community project is not judged head-to-head against a mega-project, a fairness lever AIPM can copy by project scale or org size. The cautions: IPMA is the **only PM-body award here that charges to enter** (EUR 600 to EUR 4,000), and its **on-site site-visit** assessment is high-touch and high-cost. AIPM should borrow the independent-assessor-plus-feedback-report rigor but keep its **free, online, video-first** model (best-practice 4.1), not the paid site-visit machinery.

Lens C: AI / innovation / community awards

3.8 Stevie Awards: Technology Excellence + AI categories (most explicit rubric)

1. **Owner/type:** Stevie Awards Inc., a for-profit awards operator.
2. **Purpose:** recognize technology achievements of organizations, teams and individuals worldwide.
3. **Eligibility:** any org or individual, any size; **PAID** (Tech Excellence early-bird USD 520/entry org, USD 295 individual; late fees on top).
4. **Categories:** 30+ across 23 sectors; **AI is a dedicated sector with 15 categories** for 2026 (incl. AI Governance & Safety, Agentic AI Deployment, Generative AI Application of the Year).
5. **Submission:** open self-nomination; **written answers OR a video ≤5 min** to 4 questions, plus up to 10 links and 10 uploads.
6. **Criteria/rubric (explicit): 1 to 10 holistic scale;** average ≥8.0 auto-qualifies; highest per category = Gold, next 45% = Silver, rest = Bronze. No per-criterion weights.
7. **Jury: no fewer than 5 judges per entry;** committees of 10 to 30; recruited via an open apply-on-site form, then assigned by staff; single round. Integrity: claims may be audited.
8. **Rules:** public entry kit, FAQ, judging-criteria and process pages; weights not published.
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** Gold/Silver/Bronze medals + Grand Stevie; in-person and online (“attendance not required to win”).
10. **Platform:** hosted entry + judging portal (secure-platform.com).
11. **Cadence:** annual.
12. **Promotion:** press releases, winners features, social, published judging committees.

Sources: stevies-tech.secure-platform.com (judge-criteria, AI categories, awards-process); tech.stevieawards.com.

Why this matters for AIPM: the **clearest published scoring model** (a simple 1 to 10 scale with transparent medal thresholds and a 5-judge minimum). A 1 to 10 scale is easy to explain to a volunteer jury and to the community, and avoids the false precision of a 100-point grid.

3.9 BIG AI Excellence Awards (Business Intelligence Group): closest “real-world AI application” framing

1. **Owner/type:** Business Intelligence Group, a private awards/media org (program since 2013).
2. **Purpose:** recognize organizations **leveraging AI to solve real-world problems** (application/implementation-oriented).
3. **Eligibility:** orgs, products, teams, individuals; performance from the last 12 months; **PAID, USD 949/nomination.**
4. **Categories:** multi-axis (4 entrant tiers × 46 AI application types × 36 industries), plus “AI for Social Good” and “AI in Ethical Decision-Making”.
5. **Submission:** self-nomination via online form; must show measurable impact. Exact required fields not disclosed.
6. **Criteria/rubric:** “objective scoring benchmarks”, core = demonstrable measurable impact; explicitly contrasts itself with “popularity contests”. No published numeric rubric.
7. **Jury:** volunteer judges; 2025 panel lists ~120+ named judges from major tech firms; recruited via an open “Become a Judge” form; ~1 hour per entry. No published COI policy.
8. **Rules:** a downloadable nomination guide; no standalone public rules PDF.
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** trophy and/or digital certificate, winner logo, press release, blockchain-verified credentials; **PR-only, no in-person gala.**
10. **Platform:** website cart/checkout submission; judges score via email.
11. **Cadence:** annual (2026: deadline Feb 13, winners Mar 24).
12. **Promotion:** website, social, podcast, press releases, marquee past winners.

Sources: bintelligence.com/awards/artificial-intelligence-excellence-awards/; [/judging-panels/2025/](https://bintelligence.com/awards/artificial-intelligence-excellence-awards/judging-panels/2025/); [/become-a-judge/](https://bintelligence.com/awards/artificial-intelligence-excellence-awards/become-a-judge/).

Why this matters for AIPM: the **purpose statement is the closest to AIPM’s** (“real-world problems”, “concrete measurements”, not a popularity contest). Its weak spots (no weighted rubric, no COI policy, no real ceremony, USD 949 fee) are exactly the gaps AIPM can beat at zero cost.

3.10 AI Breakthrough Awards (Tech Breakthrough): clean criteria, opaque jury

1. **Owner/type:** Tech Breakthrough, a market-intelligence/media org.
2. **Purpose:** recognize the most innovative AI products and companies (product/company-innovation framed).
3. **Eligibility:** companies/orgs/individuals worldwide; products at trial/GA after 1 Jan 2024; **fee not published** (do not assume free).
4. **Categories:** ~28 groups / 200+ categories by capability, ops, ~32 verticals, plus Industry Leadership; one winner per category.
5. **Submission:** self-submission; product overviews, specs, case studies, evidence as links; no video.

6. **Criteria/rubric (named framework): six pillars** (Innovation, Performance, Ease of Use, Functionality, Value, Impact); “innovation and impact may carry additional weight”; no numeric weights.
7. **Jury:** “independent panel of industry experts”; size, identities, recruitment, and COI are all undisclosed.
8. **Rules:** no standalone PDF; the Judging Process page is the de facto rules doc.
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** private notification – public announcement; no trophy/ceremony details.
10. **Platform:** online application form; evidence as links.
11. **Cadence:** annual.
12. **Promotion:** “extensive communications campaigns” via its media/analyst network.

Sources: aibreakthroughawards.com/judging-process, [/award-categories](https://aibreakthroughawards.com/award-categories), [/faqs](https://aibreakthroughawards.com/faqs).

Why this matters for AIPM: a cautionary model. Good public criteria, but an anonymous jury with no published composition and an undisclosed fee undermines trust. AIPM should publish its jury and its (zero) cost up front.

3.11 *GitHub Stars: free, open peer nomination*

1. **Owner/type:** GitHub; platform-operated community-advocate recognition.
2. **Purpose:** thank influential developers who give back; recognize unpaid technical leaders.
3. **Eligibility: FREE**, voluntary; nominee = unpaid community advocate with impact in the past 12 months; **no self-nomination**.
4. **Categories:** a single recognition track (membership), not sliced.
5. **Submission: open peer nomination** (“anyone can nominate anyone”, up to 3 nominees); username + **≤180-char rationale** + eligibility acknowledgment.
6. **Criteria/rubric:** staff selection, not community voting; weight/quality of contributions considered; no public weighted rubric.
7. **Jury:** GitHub team review, “sole discretion”; COI rule: membership ends if a Star becomes a GitHub employee/contractor; jury size not disclosed.
8. **Rules:** a public Program Agreement (eligibility, selection, code of conduct, unpaid status).
9. **Recognition:** featured profile, Hall of Fame, a physical personalized “Star”, early previews, speaking opportunities; no public ceremony.
10. **Platform:** public web nomination portal; no public vote tally.
11. **Cadence:** annual term, renewed at discretion.
12. **Promotion:** social announcements, Hall of Fame features.

Sources: stars.github.com/program, [/nominate](https://stars.github.com/nominate), [/terms](https://stars.github.com/terms).

Why this matters for AIPM: the cleanest free open-nomination mechanic (anyone nominates anyone, a tiny rationale field, a published agreement, an explicit unpaid/voluntary ethos). The ≤180-char nomination is a good lightweight front door before a fuller submission.

3.12 Webby Awards (incl. AI): community public-voting model

1. **Owner/type:** IADAS, an industry academy of 3,000+ experts.
2. **Purpose:** recognize excellence on the Internet; 2026 added AI honors.
3. **Eligibility:** orgs/individuals who own the work; work live Oct 2024 to Feb 2026; **PAID**.
4. **Categories:** 8 entry types incl. a new AI type; total count not disclosed.
5. **Submission:** self-submission via paid entry; unlimited entries.
6. **Criteria/rubric:** two tracks. Jury (AI): Concept, Execution, Ethical Practices, Overall Experience (weights not published). **People's Voice = public community vote.**
7. **Jury/voting:** the academy picks 5 nominees per category (audited tabulation); academy vote selects the Webby winner; **People's Voice winner chosen by public ballots** during a voting period, with **fraud detection**.
8. **Rules:** public eligibility/guidelines, judging process and criteria, FAQ, explicit ineligible-entry list.
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** Webby statuettes; "Official Honoree" = under 20% of entries; in-person gala.
10. **Platform:** online paid entry + public-voting platform; externally audited tabulation.
11. **Cadence:** annual.
12. **Promotion:** public Call For Entries, press naming high-profile judges, a public People's Voice campaign mobilizing nominees' audiences.

Sources: webbyawards.com/awarding, [/eligibility-and-guidelines](https://webbyawards.com/eligibility-and-guidelines), [/faq](https://webbyawards.com/faq), [/about/categories](https://webbyawards.com/about/categories).

Why this matters for AIPM: the reference for **if and how to add a community vote**. Two rules are non-negotiable in every voting program: vote among a **jury-vetted shortlist** (not raw nominations), and use **fraud detection + audited tabulation**. The People's Voice also doubles as a distribution engine, since nominees campaign to their own audiences.

3.13 Clube da Programação (independent Brazilian community programming initiative, Laura Dubugras): the lightweight cohort + Demo Day counter-model

1. **Owner/type:** an **independent, community programming initiative** created and curated by **Laura (Fiuza) Dubugras** (a Stanford Master's in Computer Science), not a professional body or company award. It runs as a free cohort-based "club" published through a Beehiiv newsletter (clube-da-programacao.beehiiv.com) with synchronous online classes (Zoom) and a Discord channel. (Laura Dubugras is also publicly known as the partner of Brex co-founder Henrique Dubugras, but the initiative is presented under her own name, not Brex's.)
2. **Purpose:** teach participants to build a real software product/website from idea to working demo over a short cohort, then reward the strongest project; the prize and Demo Day are the capstone that motivates participants to ship and validate a product, not just learn syntax.
3. **Eligibility:** open to the cohort's participants (those who joined the 1st edition's classes); the public posts do not state any membership fee, age limit, or geographic restriction, and the tone is open-community. Participants work individually or in

small teams. To compete for the prize, an applicant must have a working site/product to demonstrate.

4. **Categories:** a **single overall prize** (one winner per edition); no sub-categories are published.
5. **Submission:** a two-step, video-first flow. Applicants first submit a **Google Form** plus a **1-minute video** demonstrating their site/product **with the applicant's own face on camera** (Loom is the recommended free tool). Selected applicants are then invited to a live **Demo Day** to give a **1-minute presentation** followed by jury questions. (1st edition: form deadline 10 Jun 2026 23:59 BRT; selection announced 14 Jun; Demo Day 16 Jun 2026, 20:00 to 21:30 BRT; winner announced 20 Jun.)
6. **Criteria/rubric: no formal weighted rubric or edital is published.** The organizer promised to share “critérios que serão avaliados” (criteria to be evaluated) but the public version describes judging only as the jury asking questions “based on the form responses and the presentation.” The 1st-edition winner rationale that was published emphasized a real validated pain point, a strong user-feedback cycle and real-world validation over building in isolation, which signals an informal real-traction/real-problem lens rather than a scored grid.
7. **Jury:** a **panel of three named judges** for the 1st edition: **Henrique Vaz** (co-founder & CPO, Enter), **Monica Saggioro** (co-founder & investor, Maya Capital), and **Laura Dubugras** (the organizer). At the live final the published recap named two judges present (Vaz and Saggioro); the rules post named all three. No conflict-of-interest policy is published.
8. **Edital/rules: no formal regulamento/edital PDF.** The “rules” are the newsletter posts themselves (a “Como se candidatar ao prêmio de US\$10.000” post setting out the form, the 1-minute-video requirement, the dates, the jury, and the Demo Day format). Transparency is informal: dates, jury and format are public, but criteria, weights, COI and the prize’s funding source are not.
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** an **online Demo Day** (the cohort’s closing Zoom meeting), where selected finalists each pitch for one minute and answer jury questions; the winner is announced shortly after (1st-edition winner: **Tayla Salum** with the project **PMechanic**). Recognition is the cash prize plus the public winner announcement in the newsletter; no physical gala.
10. **Platform:** entirely off-the-shelf and zero-cost: a **Beehiiv** newsletter as the hub, a **Google Form** for entry, **Loom** for the 1-minute video, **Zoom** for classes and the live Demo Day, and **Discord** for the community. No awards SaaS.
11. **Cadence: per-cohort / per-edition**, not a fixed annual calendar. The 1st edition ran as a short cohort over roughly May to June 2026 (synchronous classes culminating in the 16 Jun 2026 Demo Day). Whether and when a 2nd edition runs is not stated.
12. **Promotion:** the Beehiiv newsletter (email + web archive), the organizer’s own social reach (Instagram/LinkedIn) and the cohort’s Discord; promotion is creator-led and community-driven rather than press- or sponsor-led.
13. **Prize & sponsorship:** a **US\$10,000 cash prize** to the single winner, stated verbatim on the official site (“Como se candidatar ao prêmio de US\$10.000”). **The sponsor/funder of the prize is not named in any public source:** none of the

newsletter posts (the how-to-apply post, the deadline reminder, or the 1st-edition closing post) identifies who funds the US\$10,000, and there is no public statement that the organizer self-funds it. **How the cash is handed over is not published:** the rules say only that payout “instructions to be provided to winners after the announcement”. So the headline (a real US\$10,000 cash prize, larger than any benchmarked PM award) is confirmed, but the patrocinador and the disbursement remain to be confirmed with the organizer.

Sources: clube-da-programacao.beehiiv.com (home page; “Como se candidatar ao prêmio de US\$10.000” post; “Gravação da terceira e lembrete do prazo de hoje para concorrer ao prêmio” post; “Gravação da segunda aula e lição de casa” post; “Encerramento da 1ª edição do Clube da Programação” post; “Demo Day” post); Laura Fiuza Dubugras public profiles (instagram.com/lauradubugras; linkedin.com/in/laura-fiuza-dubugras) for the organizer’s identity/credentials.

Why this matters for AIPM: this is the **lightweight, energizing counter-model** to the heavy PM-body editais, and it proves a credible award can run with almost no bureaucracy: a Google Form plus a 1-minute face-on-camera video, a small named jury (3), and a live online Demo Day pitch on a fast per-cohort cadence, all on free off-the-shelf tools (Beehiiv, Loom, Zoom, Discord) at essentially zero platform cost. It is also the **only benchmarked program with a substantial cash prize** (US\$10,000), which is the differentiator Vitor flagged, but it shows the trade-off AIPM must decide on: a cash prize raises the stakes and pulls in serious entrants, yet without a named, accountable sponsor and a published payout mechanism it also raises the “who is paying, and is this fair?” question that an explicit edital and a disclosed patrocinador would answer. The takeaway for AIPM is to keep this model’s lightweight video-first energy and live Demo Day, but pair any cash prize with the one thing Clube leaves implicit: a published rubric and a named, COI-screened sponsor.

3.14 The National AI Awards (UK) + the Alconics co-brand

1. **Owner/type:** two distinct programs the colleague had merged. **The National AI Awards** is run by **Future Tech Events Ltd** (UK, the team behind The National Cyber Awards). **The Alconics** is run by **Informa** (AI Business / The AI Summit Series, “the world’s only independently judged AI Awards”, since 2016). For **2026 they partnered:** the enterprise category is co-branded “**The Alconics AI Enterprise Business of the Year**” inside The National AI Awards, with the AI Summit London as the connected event.
2. **Purpose:** “a benchmark of excellence” celebrating exceptional AI contributions (National); “set the standard for excellence in AI” (Alconics).
3. **Eligibility:** per-category; self-nomination permitted; UK-vs-global scope not stated. The program spans SMEs, startups, individuals, public sector and enterprise (so the colleague’s “focuses on large organizations” overstates the overall scope; only the enterprise category does).
4. **Categories:** ~17 in 2025 (incl. **AI Business of the Year**, AI Adoption, Best Ethical AI Initiative, AI Product/Startup of the Year, sector awards, Alan Turing AI Innovator,

AI Citizen of the Year). The 2026 enterprise category is “**The Alconics AI Enterprise Business of the Year**” (the only literal “Alconics” wording, and only as a category prefix, not a program name).

5. **Submission:** online nomination form via their awards portal; word/video requirements not published.
6. **Criteria/rubric:** per-category criteria are stated, e.g. AI in Business weighs “strategic vision, execution, and tangible outcomes... efficiency gains, revenue impact, customer experience improvements, and workforce enablement.” **Numeric weights not published.**
7. **Jury:** “panel of independent judges” under “a strict code of conduct” (2026 host Zoe Kleinman, BBC); for Alconics, “world-class AI experts, including senior leaders from VCs, academia and enterprise end-users.” Sizes, names, and COI are not disclosed.
8. **Edital/rules:** an “Award Rules” page exists on the platform; full public rules text not retrievable.
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** winners announced online (9 Jun 2026) + a finalists drinks reception (10 Jun 2026) at AI Summit London; Alconics gives a gala at the AI Summit (North America 2025 was 11 Dec 2025, NY).
10. **Platform:** self-hosted portal (awards.thenationalaiawards.com).
11. **Cadence:** annual; National most recent edition 2026; Alconics annual since 2016 (latest standalone North America 2025, then folded into the 2026 London partnership).
12. **Promotion:** AI Summit London co-location, LinkedIn, press; named supporters incl. DataCamp, DSIT, NPCC, Plexal, TechUK, UKRI.
13. **Prize & sponsorship: no monetary prize** for either program (trophy/recognition + a free finalist ticket). **Free to enter**, with an explicit anti-pay-to-play stance (“no fees associated with any stage of the entry/nomination process”). Partners are supporters/sponsors of the event, not cash prize funders.

Sources: thenationalaiawards.com (about, awards, faqs, winners-2025); [london.theaisummit.com new-awards-partnership-for-2026](https://london.theaisummit.com/new-awards-partnership-for-2026); newyork.theaisummit.com/aiconics; [research.reading.ac.uk winner-of-the-national-ai-awards-2026](https://research.reading.ac.uk/winner-of-the-national-ai-awards-2026).

Why this matters for AIPM: two reusable signals. First, **joint vendor + end-user entries** are explicitly allowed (“vendors may submit joint entries with their clients, but the spotlight remains on the business leading the adoption”), which is a clean way for AIPM to gather real delivery-team case studies without turning the award into a vendor showcase. Second, a **credible AI award can be entirely free with a public no-pay-to-play policy**, which directly supports AIPM’s non-commercial mandate (and contradicts the v1 assumption that AI-industry awards are all paid, see §6.3 corrections).

3.15 ITU AI for Good Impact Awards (UN agency, with Tech To The Rescue)

1. **Owner/type: International Telecommunication Union (ITU)**, the UN agency for digital tech, **co-run with the nonprofit Tech To The Rescue**. (The colleague named ITU only; the TTTR co-organizer is a correction.)
2. **Purpose:** “recognize exceptional achievements in AI that contribute to solving global challenges... celebrate innovation, sustainability, and impact-driven solutions” (official Terms and Conditions §3.1).
3. **Eligibility:** SMEs, large corporations, nonprofits, academic/research institutions, government bodies; individuals may apply; global; 18+. **Startups are explicitly NOT eligible** (routed to the separate Innovation Factory). AI must be a “core component.”
4. **Categories:** three, **AI for People, AI for Planet, AI for Prosperity** (loosely the People/Planet/Prosperity “Ps” of the 2030 Agenda), plus a special **Pro Bono Collaboration Award** with TTTR. (“AI for Prosperity” is confirmed verbatim.)
5. **Submission:** online platform; one solution per single category; form + supporting docs + optional multimedia; English. 2026 window: 12 Jan to 15 Mar 2026.
6. **Criteria/rubric:** five criteria, **Innovation, Impact, Sustainability, Contribution to Global Challenges, Ethical Considerations**; the T&C states a **weighted rubric** is used “to ensure objectivity and transparency”, but **the numeric weights are not published**. (This refutes the colleague’s “Scalability / ignore commercial marketing” criteria, which do not appear.)
7. **Jury:** “a Judging Panel comprised of experts from ITU and external partners” (T&C §6.1). The published 2026 panel is **mixed**, academia (Marivate, Dignum, LIANG), industry (Shakir Mohamed, Google DeepMind), and a UN official (Mariya Gabriel, UNESCO); past judges included AWS, Microsoft, Lenovo, UNICEF. COI: disclose-and-recuse, judges cannot enter the category they evaluate; full panel size not fixed/published. (This refutes the colleague’s “entirely academic” claim.)
8. **Edital/rules: a full public 16-section Terms and Conditions PDF** (high transparency).
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** trophies + recognition at the **AI for Good Global Summit** (2026 ceremony 8 Jul 2026, Geneva; 2025 was 9 Jul), plus promotion via ITU + TTTR channels.
10. **Platform:** aiforgood.itu.int; submissions via the official online platform.
11. **Cadence:** annual; 1st edition 2025 (320+ applications, 12 finalists), 2nd edition 2026 live. 2025 winners incl. Digital Green’s Farmer.Chat (AI for Prosperity).
12. **Promotion:** ITU AI for Good + Tech To The Rescue channels; recorded ceremony distributed.
13. **Prize & sponsorship: no cash prize** (trophies + recognition + visibility + networking). No entry fee mentioned. Co-organizer = Tech To The Rescue; no paying commercial sponsor of the awards named. (The **USD 20,000 cash** the colleague may be thinking of belongs to the separate **AI for Good Innovation Factory** startup track, not these awards.)

Sources: aiforgood.itu.int/ai-for-good-impact-awards (+ application-form, 2025 winners, 2026 finalists, Innovation Factory); the official “Terms and Conditions AI for Good Impact Awards 2026” PDF (primary source).

Why this matters for AIPM: this is the **non-profit, independent, UN-grade peer model** the colleague wanted to anchor prestige on, and it is real. The most reusable pieces: a **published rules document with a small, explainable five-criterion rubric** that names Impact, Sustainability and Ethics (close to AIPM’s draft criteria), and a **People/Planet/Prosperity category split** that is a cleaner, less SDG-heavy alternative to PMI-DF Candango’s 1-to-17 SDG mapping. The caveat for AIPM: borrow the *independent, criteria-first* posture, but do not claim an “all-academic” jury, since even ITU runs a mixed panel.

3.16 The Australian AI Awards (Momentum Media)

1. **Owner/type: Momentum Media** (Australian B2B media publisher; event production by Captivate). National black-tie industry awards.
2. **Purpose:** recognize professionals, organizations and AI solutions transforming the Australian economy across banking, law, accounting, wealth, defence, aerospace, cyber, etc.
3. **Eligibility:** “open to all businesses operating in Australia supporting the AI sector”; nomination optional, a submission is required.
4. **Categories:** ~33, split **Individual** (10, e.g. AI Leader / Consultant / Rising Star / Female Leader, each SME and Enterprise; AI Software Engineer; AI Academic/Researcher) and **Organisational/Group** (23, incl. **Best Application of Responsible AI, Best Use of Agentic AI, Best Use of Agentic AI - Start Up, Best Use of AI - Sustainability**, and many AI Innovator - awards). Both colleague-named categories are confirmed verbatim.
5. **Submission:** online account/form (Award Force); supporting evidence allowed (references, testimonials, statistics, video, media coverage, financial/business metrics).
6. **Criteria/rubric:** stated criteria are “growth, business development, diversity, leadership, innovation, business excellence, and contribution to Australia’s AI sector”; judges score each part to a blended total, highest wins. **Weights not published.** (This refutes the colleague’s “judge entirely on long-term operational viability / PM friction points” claim, which does not appear in the methodology.)
7. **Jury:** ~27 judges (mix of AWS leaders, Macquarie University academics, executives, lawyers); several judges score each submission individually. Recruitment and COI protocols not disclosed.
8. **Edital/rules:** no single standalone rules PDF found; rules are spread across the methodology + FAQs.
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** black-tie gala (2025: 5 Nov 2025, Sofitel Sydney Wentworth; 249 finalists from 463 submissions, 33 winners).
10. **Platform: Award Force** (australianai.awardsplatform.com), the same awards SaaS used by PMI and APM (see v1 infrastructure signal).
11. **Cadence:** annual; 2024 inaugural, **2025 = 2nd edition**, 2026 dates TBA.

12. **Promotion:** Momentum Media’s trade titles (Accounting Times, Money Management, The Adviser, Cyber Daily, Space Connect, Australian Aviation) plus the awards site.
13. **Prize & sponsorship: free entry, no cash prize** (recognition only). **AWS is the named industry partner** (and supplies several judges); a fuller “2025 Partners” list exists but is not individually named on the about page.

Sources: australianaiawards.com.au (home, categories, about, methodology, judges, faqs, winners); australianai.awardsplatform.com; momentummedia.com.au launch insight.

Why this matters for AIPM: a live precedent for **dedicated “Responsible AI” and “Agentic AI” categories**, the exact responsible-real-world-application wedge v1 identified as AIPM’s space. It is also a second **free** AI-industry award running on **Award Force**, reinforcing both the “free is viable” finding and the v1 infrastructure note (a structured form + video link + scoring sheet now, Award Force later if it scales). The caution mirrors the others: its published criteria are generic business-excellence language, not the deep PM-change-management rubric the colleague described, so AIPM still has open space to own a genuinely practice-grounded rubric.

Lens D: Hackathons and commercial recognition

3.22 CloudFest Hackathon Awards (the sponsor-to-charity, no-cash model)

1. **Owner/type: WHD Event GmbH** (Cologne, Germany), the operator of the CloudFest conference, runs it under the “CloudFest Hackathon” banner led by **Carole Olinger** (CloudFest Head of Hackathon). It is an on-site, time-boxed open-source build event held inside the CloudFest cloud and web-hosting industry conference (Europa-Park, Rust, Germany). The “Hackathon Awards” are the recognition structure of that hackathon, not a standalone awards program.
2. **Purpose:** “Shaping the Future of Open Source”: collaborative, not-for-profit, interoperable open-source projects addressing the sustainability of the open web (sustainable funding, maintainer wellbeing, resource-efficient infrastructure, ethical AI, underrepresented communities). The awards “celebrate innovation, collaboration, and the spirit of open-source development” and explicitly double as a charity-fundraising vehicle; the framing is a “friendly competition” that “has never been about competition for its own sake.”
3. **Eligibility:** participants are accepted hackathon attendees (industry professionals worldwide plus open-source community guests), selected by application with motivational statements. 2026 scale (recap): about **101 attendees from 20 countries across 10 projects** with 18 project leads. Awards go to project teams, not individuals. The official site publishes no formal eligibility criteria, applicant counts, or age/nationality restrictions. (An earlier “400+ applications for ~130 spots” figure is not supported for 2026: the 130 was the 2022 edition’s peak attendance, and 2026 actual attendance was about 101.)
4. **Categories: six award categories** (2026): Overall Winner (#CFHack2026); Tech Visionary Award (most innovative technical implementation); Dream Team Award

(teamwork, collaboration, communication); Social Media Master Award (most social-media buzz during the hackathon); Pitch Perfect Award (most compelling presentation); Breaking Barriers Award (inclusive design, breaking down barriers for teams and end users). One project can sweep multiple awards (2026: the SWORD / Universal Access Browser Extension took Overall plus Dream Team plus Pitch Perfect).

5. **Submission:** team and project based, on-site. Before the event, participants browse project pages and join Mattermost channels to reach leads; at kickoff, project leads give two-minute pitches and attendees self-select into a project; teams build over the event days; on the final day project leads submit showcase slides (deadline 14:30) and teams present on stage (Presentation of Results 14:45), with live demos streamed on YouTube. There is no external code-submission portal (no Devpost); the “submission” is the on-stage showcase.
6. **Criteria/rubric:** no formal scored rubric with numeric weights is published. The de facto criteria are the six award-category definitions themselves (innovation and technical implementation, teamwork, social-media buzz, presentation quality, inclusive design). No points scale, per-criterion weighting, or scoring sheet appears on the official site.
7. **Jury:** a named industry jury votes on winners, and the official awards page states the structure: **Lucas Radke** (Automattic / WordPress VIP) as President of the Jury plus **eight voting members** (incl. Thomas Maroschik, TYPO3; Milos Krasojevic, Supermicro; Devin Sears, Bluehost/Yoast; Dr. Claudia Bornemann, Groundbreaker Talents; Marco Keul, hosttest; Bob Dunn, Open Channels FM; Simon Kraft, Patchstack; Alain Schlessler), with **Carole Olinger as a non-voting secretary** (so about nine voting members plus one secretary). The same official page labels three of those jurors (Radke, Kraft, Schlessler) as “Hackathon project mentor”. The exact voting and scoring procedure is not published, and there is no stated conflict-of-interest policy, a real gap given that one juror represents the scholarship beneficiary (Groundbreaker Talents) and three are also project mentors who may vote on projects they mentored.
8. **Edital/rules:** no formal public competition rulebook or terms document. Transparency is moderate to high on structure and outcomes (a public Hackathon Awards 2026 page lists every category, its named sponsor, and the jury; an attendee guide documents the results-presentation flow; a recap blog and a partnership prospectus exist), but there is no published rubric and no published eligibility ruleset.
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** winners are recognized on stage at the closing “Presentation of Results” (22 March 2026), all teams on stage, live-streamed on YouTube. Recognition is non-monetary: custom-designed **award pins** (shown on the awards page), plus trophies per one secondary source, plus a feature on the hackathon website. There is no separate gala; the ceremony is folded into the hackathon’s closing showcase.
10. **Platform:** on-site at Hotel Krønassår, Europa-Park, Rust, Germany; coordination via project pages on hackathon.cloudfest.com and Mattermost; final demos live-streamed on YouTube. No third-party submission platform.

11. **Cadence:** annual; **2026 is the ninth edition** (20 to 22 March 2026), confirmed by the hackathon homepage and the recap. The 2026 edition has concluded.
12. **Promotion:** through the CloudFest conference channels (dedicated hackathon site with project, awards, agenda and attendee-guide pages, a partnership prospectus PDF, CloudFest blog recaps, a YouTube live stream) and ecosystem partners' own coverage. The Social Media Master Award itself incentivizes participant-driven promotion (#CFHack2026).
13. **Prize & sponsorship:** an **inverted prize model**, the most distinctive in the benchmark. Winners receive **NO cash**; the prize is non-monetary recognition (award pins; trophies per one source; on-stage recognition; a website feature). Instead, **each award category is bought by a sponsor whose payment goes entirely to charity**. Carole Olinger (in the Open Channels FM interview, verbatim): "these categories are sponsored by our hackathon partners and they give a certain amount of money to sponsor each category to get some additional brand exposure. And this money goes 100% to Groundbreaker." The beneficiary is **Groundbreaker Talents**, a residential Software and AI Engineering scholarship for young women facing economic barriers in **Sub-Saharan Africa** (the awards page localizes this to Uganda); the stated goal is to "raise enough money for one full scholarship." Named 2026 category sponsors: Overall Winner = Greyd; Tech Visionary = Hostinger; Dream Team = TYPO3; Social Media Master = Marko Heijnen and Jamf; Pitch Perfect = Andreas Biberacher and Back Office Plus (backoffice.plus); Breaking Barriers = 4businessIT. For participants the hackathon is effectively free (accommodation and amenities arranged), with optional paid add-ons (about EUR 98 for early arrival, EUR 47.50 for an evening buffet). The recap cites about **EUR 6,000 raised** for Groundbreaker in 2026; the per-category sponsorship amount is never quantified, and the EUR 6,000 total is a recap figure, not on the awards page.

Sources: hackathon.cloudfest.com (hackathon-awards-2026; hackathon-awards; attendee-guide; landing); cloudfest.com/blog CloudFest Hackathon 2026 recap; cloudfest.com/charity (Groundbreaker Talents); openchannels.fm interview with Carole Olinger (the "100% to Groundbreaker" quote and the EUR 6,000 recap figure). Researched and adversarially verified 2026-06-24.

Why this matters for AIPM: CloudFest is the cleanest fit for the founders' **non-commercial** guardrail in the entire set. Winners get zero cash, and 100% of sponsor money is redirected to a charity scholarship, which decouples sponsorship (brand exposure) from winner enrichment and neutralizes the "pay-to-win / commercial-capture" risk that a cash "AI Project of the Year" would carry. It is also **practice-grounded** (working, not-for-profit, interoperable open-source builds demoed live) and **community-first** (team-based, public project pages, live-streamed demos, a charity that funds underrepresented technologists). The reusable lever is the **sponsor-to-charity structure**: AIPM can accept sponsors WITHOUT putting cash in a winner's hands. The cautions are equally clear: judging transparency is the weak point (no published rubric or weights, no formal rulebook, an unaddressed conflict of interest where a juror represents the beneficiary charity), so AIPM should be more defensible than this benchmark by

publishing a rubric and rules; the Social Media Master Award rewards promotional buzz, a visibility-over-substance pull AIPM should avoid for its core award; and the model is conference-bound and on-site, a poor template for an open, remotely-submittable award.

3.23 *Hack-Nation (Global AI Hackathon) (the MIT-ecosystem venture funnel)*

1. **Owner/type: Hack-Nation**, a community and student-led hackathon initiative “rooted in the MIT ecosystem”, run in collaboration with the **MIT Sloan AI Club** and MIT alumni clubs (the MIT Alumni Association lists an “Alumni Jury for Global AI Hackathon”; the fourth edition was organized with the MIT Club of Northern California and the MIT Club of Germany). One secondary source calls it a nonprofit; the legal entity and founders are not named on the official pages reviewed. It is a startup-flavored builder hackathon, not a project-management body. (Disambiguation: this is **NOT** the unrelated “Global AI Hackathon” run by MIT RAISE and the App Inventor Foundation; that program’s team-size bands, App Inventor tooling, and embargoed-country list do not apply here.)
2. **Purpose:** bring “builders, developers, and creators from around the world to ship real solutions in an intense 24-hour build sprint”, positioned as “the starting line for your next AI venture”. The emphasis is turning ideas into working prototypes and ventures under startup-like pressure, with mentorship, investor exposure, and venture incubation. Building-oriented but explicitly venture-creation in intent, not recognition of applied AI inside delivered projects.
3. **Eligibility:** open globally and free. Devpost eligibility requires participants to be above the legal age of majority in their country of residence and from “all countries/territories, excluding standard exceptions”; team-based; reported reach of 60+ to 115+ countries. Team-size limits are not stated on the official pages reviewed.
4. **Categories:** multiple tracks rather than a single award, reported as a **Corporate Track** (teams solve problem statements from corporate partners) and an **Open / Venture Track** (open-ended startup-potential ideas), with focus areas in AI automation, healthcare, intelligent agents, and business applications. The canonical track list varies by edition.
5. **Submission:** online via Devpost (hack-nation.devpost.com) plus a Hack-Nation project platform (projects.hack-nation.ai). Teams build from scratch to a containerized, functional AI solution within about **24 hours**; top teams are then selected as finalists to present live to a judge panel (registration closes before the build window). The exact required artifacts (repo, video, deck) are not fully enumerated on the official pages reviewed.
6. **Criteria/rubric:** no official weighted rubric is published on the pages reviewed. A Devpost listing surfaced only a single placeholder tag (“Energy”, which is a topic tag tied to one judge’s interest, not a scoring criterion). Submissions are described as “vetted by an international panel of founders, operators, and cross-border investor networks covering 115+ countries”. No numeric weights are published; the full criteria set is undisclosed and edition-dependent.

7. **Jury:** two-stage (shortlist and vetting to finalists, then a live finalist pitch to a panel described as “founders, operators, and cross-border investor networks”, with venture-capital representation such as Greylock named only in third-party descriptions). The MIT Alumni Association separately runs an “Alumni Jury for Global AI Hackathon”. One judge name surfaced (“Fridolin Haugg”, Harvard), but it rests on that judge’s own LinkedIn post, not an official roster, so it does not establish a named, sized jury. Jury size, full composition, and conflict-of-interest policy are not published.
8. **Edital/rules:** no single consolidated public rules document was retrievable; the official site (hack-nation.ai) is JavaScript-rendered and returned only its title to fetching, so the most structured public terms live on the Devpost listing. Transparency is moderate to low and edition-dependent (prize totals, track names, criteria, and jury rosters differ across editions and are not centrally codified).
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** winners are recognized at a live online “Final Pitches” / Demo Day about a week after the build (final pitches over Zoom, events via Luma). Recognition includes cash and API-credit prizes, Venture Track invitations, investor exposure, and access to venture-incubation programs. MIT and MIT Sloan AI Club branding lends prestige.
10. **Platform:** online and global; submission and listing on Devpost plus Hack-Nation’s own project platform; final pitches over Zoom; some editions add in-person satellite hubs.
11. **Cadence: recurring and frequent** (roughly monthly to quarterly editions), NOT annual and NOT one-off; at least four to five numbered editions ran across 2025 to 2026 (a first edition in July 2025; a second with MIT Sloan and OpenAI; a fourth; a fifth on Devpost; a July 2026 flagship). Edition numbering is internally inconsistent across sources.
12. **Promotion:** heavy multi-channel (Devpost, LinkedIn, Instagram, YouTube demos, Luma, MIT Sloan AI Club and alumni-club channels, Google Developer Groups campus chapters, opportunity aggregators); “MIT-backed” and named sponsors (OpenAI and others) are the core hooks.
13. **Prize & sponsorship: free to enter** (the “registration is free and open to everyone” wording is from the hack-nation.ai marketing page; the Devpost entry is gated by an application form, not a fee). Prizes are **cash plus API credits**, sponsor-funded, and vary by edition, so they are best recorded as an attributed range, not a single number: the best-documented Devpost listing states “\$28,500 in prizes” (a \$3,500 cash Winner Prize for one winner plus a \$25,000 “OpenAI API Credits” prize whose Devpost amount field confusingly reads “\$25,000 in cash”, a source ambiguity) on top of a “\$150K+ in API credits” pool; marketing for other editions cites “\$30,000+” or “\$35,000+” in prizes and a \$150K to \$160K credit pool. A reported per-place split (\$2,500 / \$1,500 / \$1,000) appears only in search summaries and could not be confirmed. Confirmed partners across editions: **OpenAI** (the headline credits, the only partner clearly tied to a prize), GitHub, Lovable, DSV Gruppe, Masters’ Union, Databricks, plus Cursor, Supabase, Vercel, ElevenLabs in other editions; Akamai, ScaleAI, and Greylock could not be confirmed. Which sponsor funds which track is not stated except OpenAI.

Sources: hack-nation.ai (JavaScript-rendered, title only), /hackathon, /partnership; hack-nation.devpost.com; projects.hack-nation.ai; Luma event pages; alumcommunity.mit.edu (Alumni Jury for Global AI Hackathon); secondary aggregators (opportunitiesforyouth.org, techpression.com, internshala.com, startupresearcher.com); Hack-Nation LinkedIn and Instagram. Researched and adversarially verified 2026-06-24.

Why this matters for AIPM: useful as a contrast, not a model. The reusable signals are **partnership-borrowed prestige** (a named MIT Sloan and alumni jury confers legitimacy cheaply, a lever AIPM could copy with a named academic or expert jury), **fully sponsor-funded prizes on free entry** (viable non-self-funded economics), and a clean **two-stage shortlist-then-live-pitch Demo Day** format. But on the founders' guardrails Hack-Nation is mostly the opposite of AIPM: it is **commercial and venture-creation oriented** (startups, investor exposure, a venture track), it **rewards 24-hour built-from-scratch prototypes and ideas** rather than applied AI inside delivered real projects (against practice-grounded), and its prestige is **borrowed from MIT** rather than original. Big sponsor cash plus API credits also set an expectations bar AIPM should deliberately not chase (non-commercial). Net: mine the partnership-prestige and Demo-Day mechanics; reject the prototype-hackathon substance and the commercial framing.

3.24 Google Cloud ADK / Multi-Agents Hackathon (the transparency gold standard)

1. **Owner/type:** a corporate developer-marketing hackathon. **Sole sponsor: Google LLC** (Mountain View, CA); administered by **Devpost, Inc.** (New York). The seed URL (googlecloudmultiagents.devpost.com) resolves to the event titled "**Agent Development Kit Hackathon with Google Cloud.**" It is a vendor-run product-promotion competition for Google's open-source Agent Development Kit (ADK) and Google Cloud, not a project-management or practitioner-impact award.
2. **Purpose:** drive adoption of Google's open-source ADK and Google Cloud by having developers build autonomous multi-agent AI systems across four focus areas (automating complex processes; data analysis and insights; customer service and engagement; content creation and generation). A developer-engagement exercise, not a recognition of delivered practice.
3. **Eligibility:** above the age of majority in the jurisdiction of residence (at least 20 in Taiwan); void in Italy, Quebec, and a list of sanctioned territories; employees and contractors of Google, Devpost, or involved organizations are ineligible, as is anyone with a real or apparent conflict of interest. Teams allowed, **maximum four members** with one appointed Representative. The project must be **newly created during the contest period** and built using ADK.
4. **Categories:** submission focus categories (each project fits one): Automation of Complex Processes; Data Analysis and Insights; Customer Service and Engagement; Content Creation and Generation. Prize categories: **four Regional Winners** (North America; Latin America; Asia Pacific; Europe, Middle East and Africa), **one Grand Prize** (highest-scoring overall), and **three Honorable Mentions**.
5. **Submission:** online via Devpost. Required: a URL to the working project, a text description, a public code-repository URL, an architecture diagram, and a demonstration video (no longer than three minutes, public on YouTube or Vimeo, in

English or subtitled). Optional score-boosting artifacts: a published blog or video about building with ADK (up to 0.4 pts), a contribution to the ADK open-source repo (up to 0.4 pts), and use of Google Cloud or Google AI models (up to 0.2 pts).

6. **Criteria/rubric:** an **officially published, weighted, multi-stage rubric**. Stage One is a pass/fail viability screen; **Stage Two is scored 1 to 5 and weighted (Technical Implementation 50%, Innovation and Creativity 30%, Demo and Documentation 20%)**; Stage Three adds up to 1.0 bonus point for the developer contributions above, for a stated final range of 1 to 6. The weights are published on the rules page (nothing left to confirm on the split).
7. **Jury:** a panel drawn from the sponsor. The Devpost “Get to know the judges” update states “**a panel of over 25 judges**”, while the listing names **33 individuals** with titles (predominantly Google developer advocates, customer engineers, solutions architects, and product managers); the rules define judges as **employees of the sponsor or Devpost** (so Google or Devpost staff), with no external or independent judges named. The exact total is not reconciled (over 25 stated, 33 named), and no per-judge conflict-of-interest policy is published beyond the entrant-side ineligibility rules.
8. **Edital/rules:** a **full public “Official Rules” document** on Devpost, highly transparent on eligibility, team rules, the contest period, submission requirements, the three-stage weighted judging, IP and licence terms, prize structure and delivery, tax forms, and governing law. The gaps are the unreconciled judge count and the absence of a per-judge conflict-of-interest disclosure.
9. **Recognition/ceremony:** winners announced online. The Devpost “And the winners are” update announced winners on **14 July 2025**; a Google Cloud Blog results-and-highlights post (2 September 2025) wrote up the broader ADK hackathon results (it reported 10,400+ participants and 477 projects, figures that appear to belong to a wider/related ADK event, a conflation flagged). Non-cash recognition for winners includes Google social promotion and a “virtual coffee with a Google team member”. No in-person or live-streamed ceremony is confirmed.
10. **Platform: Devpost** (registration, submission intake, judging workflow, winner publication), the hackathon-specific analog to an awards SaaS like Award Force; demo videos on YouTube/Vimeo and code on public repos.
11. **Cadence:** a **one-off 2025 edition** (contest period 12 May to 23 June 2025; judging 24 June to 9 July; winners 14 July 2025). No recurrence is stated; Google runs other, distinct ADK and agent hackathons that are not editions of this one.
12. **Promotion:** through the Devpost listing (reported 10,000+ registrants), Google Cloud Blog posts, a CloudOnAir event page, and developer-advocate social channels. Promotion is Google-marketing and developer-community driven.
13. **Prize & sponsorship: free to enter** (“NO PURCHASE NECESSARY TO ENTER OR WIN”); the sole sponsor is Google, with Devpost as administrator. The listing states a **USD 50,000 cash pool** (the rules state no aggregate figure; it is derivable from the line items). Per category, all amounts in USD: **Grand Prize**, \$15,000 plus \$3,000 in Google Cloud credits plus a one-year Google Developer Program Premium subscription plus a virtual coffee and social promotion; **each of four Regional Winners**, \$8,000 plus \$1,000 in credits; **each of three Honorable Mentions**,

\$1,000 plus \$500 in credits. (Cash sums to exactly \$50,000; credits are additional.) All categories are funded by the single sponsor, with no separate per-category patrons. Delivery: cash to the winner, the team's Representative, or the organization within 60 days of completed forms; winners sign an eligibility and publicity release, may need a W-9 or W-8BEN, and bear wiring and exchange fees and their own taxes.

Sources: googlecloudmultiagents.devpost.com (Official Rules; listing; "Get to know the judges" and "And the winners are" updates), the authoritative source for this listing's prizes, rubric, and judges. (The two cloud.google.com ADK-hackathon blog posts describe a different and earlier, broader ADK event and are not relied on for this profile's prize pool, administrator, or judge facts.) Researched and adversarially verified 2026-06-24.

Why this matters for AIPM: the reusable signals are strong. A **fully public Official Rules document with an explicitly weighted, multi-stage rubric** (50/30/20 plus a capped bonus) is the transparency standard AIPM should match or beat; free entry aligns with the "free" guardrail; the submission package (a working artifact plus a public repo plus an architecture diagram plus a short demo video) is a low-friction, verifiable **evidence model** that keeps judging practice-grounded; and the **regional prize buckets** are a clean global-fairness mechanic. The cautions are equally instructive: this is a **vendor product-marketing hackathon**, so prizes are a funnel to drive ADK and Google Cloud adoption (the antithesis of AIPM's non-commercial, vendor-neutral guardrail), and the rubric even rewards "use of Google Cloud tech" as bonus points; "newly created during the contest period" optimizes for **greenfield demos**, not deployed practice with measured outcomes; and a single-sponsor, all-employee jury with no independent judges and an unreconciled count is a conflict-of-interest caution AIPM should beat by publishing exact jury size and independence. Net: borrow the transparency, the weighted rubric, the evidence package, and free entry; reject the commercial framing, the greenfield-demo bias, and the closed vendor jury.

3.25 Global Recognition Awards (the free-to-enter, pay-for-the-proof model)

1. **Owner/type:** a private commercial awards business trading as "**Global Recognition Awards**" (trademarked). The official site names no owner, founder, or parent (the about page states only "established 2018"); secondary press names a CEO, Jethro Sparks, and some sources say founded 2020 / headquartered Singapore, conflicting with the site's "2018". It is a for-profit recognition vendor, not a professional body, NGO, university, or community of practice.
2. **Purpose:** positioned as "third-party verification and credibility that demonstrate the legitimacy of a business", "validation that no amount of self-promotion can replicate". In practice the purpose is to manufacture a marketing credential (logo, certificate, write-up) that the winner then pays to use: recognition-as-a-product.
3. **Eligibility:** broad and effectively open (companies and individual leaders "across all sectors" worldwide); application is self-nomination via a "10-minute", three-step online form. No membership, country, or practice prerequisite is stated, and concrete eligibility thresholds are not published.

4. **Categories:** 26+ claimed (entrepreneurs, innovative companies, small businesses, plus industry verticals including an “AI Awards” track, healthcare, cybersecurity, ESG, and more). Categories function as SEO surface area rather than a curated taxonomy; the full canonical list is not enumerated on a single official page.
5. **Submission:** self-nomination through a “10-minute”, three-step online form (basic info, select category, submit achievement details); winners are “announced by email”. No portfolio, evidence pack, or verifiable deliverable is required. (You can also “apply to be a judge” through a separate form.)
6. **Criteria/rubric:** the methodology page claims a **1-to-5 grading scale** (“1 minimal, 5 exceptional or world-class”) and references “the Rasch model” for a linear measurement scale, plus “8 objective measurement criteria” that are never enumerated; the criteria language even differs between pages (an academic-flavored list versus a business-flavored one). No per-criterion weights are published. (The “blockchain-verified” and “69% rejection rate” claims often quoted appear only in third-party PR, not on any official page.)
7. **Jury:** the site **does publish named per-category “Judging Panel 2025” pages**, each listing about **three to five judges** with affiliations and bios (for example an AI and Machine Learning panel naming individuals from PlusAI, Meta, and a university). What is missing is an **aggregate jury size**, any vetting transparency, and any conflict-of-interest or independence policy; judges are openly recruited via an “Apply to be a Judge” form whose only stated reward is “a certificate of appreciation suitable for framing”. A third-party review alleges an **\$800 applicant fee** charged to accepted judges, which, if true, would further undercut the “independent” framing; it is unverified (the review site was unreachable).
8. **Edital/rules:** no single binding public ruleset. Information is fragmented across marketing pages; fee amounts are not stated inline on the FAQ or pricing pages but only on individual product pages. A five-stage pipeline (Nomination, Screening, Shortlisting, Evaluation, Announcement) is described, but there is no auditable ruleset, published jury-roster total, or governance disclosure.
9. **Recognition/ceremony: no ceremony.** The win is delivered as an email; everything tangible is a **paid add-on** (a digital certificate, a personalized write-up on the GRA site, an interview placement, and a licence to use the trademarked winner’s logo dated to the year). Marketing leans on borrowed-masthead testimonials and notable-name “winners”, none confirmed as participatory.
10. **Platform:** a self-hosted marketing and e-commerce site (globalrecognitionawards.org) with the application form, per-product purchase pages, winner write-up pages, and the judge-application page. No third-party submission platform.
11. **Cadence: annual**, presented per calendar year (the logo is dated to the year), with **continuous rolling intake:** each category closes “two weeks from the date the first entrant in your category applies” (FAQ), and results return on a short timeline (about 14 days). Cohorts confirmed for 2024, 2025, and 2026.
12. **Promotion:** an SEO and placed-media flywheel where the product is itself promotion (winner write-ups, interview placements, and press-style articles on third-party outlets that double as link-building). Quantified marketing claims

(“12,400+ winners”, a “72% surge in client inquiries”) are self-reported and unverified.

13. **Prize & sponsorship:** the core finding. There is **NO cash prize** in any category, and entry and “winning” are **free** (“free to enter... there are no fees to pay in this regard”). The revenue model is **paid upgrades sold AFTER the win is announced:** confirmed official prices, both one-off charges in USD, are a **Digital Certificate at \$99** (a certificate plus a licence to use the award title in promotions) and a **Professional Pack at \$499** (certificate plus title licence plus a personalized write-up plus a published interview “on CEO Weekly or your money back”). Secondary sources cite other figures (“\$110” certificate, “\$1,000+” media placements, physical trophies and plaques) that are not on the official product pages and conflict with the \$99/\$499 prices; no official page confirms any physical trophy. There are **no named external sponsors or patrons;** the operator self-funds and monetizes winners directly. Verdict: free to enter and to be named a winner, but **paid to obtain any usable proof of the win** (certificate, logo licence, write-up, interview).

Sources: globalrecognitionawards.org (home; gra-methodology; apply-to-be-a-judge; logo; about-us; pricing-may-2025; professional-pack; winners-emblem-pack; awards-categories; faq; per-category judging-panel-2025 pages); secondary press (unfinishedman.com, techcabal.com) for the PR-only claims; Trustpilot (unreachable, HTTP 403) for the alleged judge fee. Researched and adversarially verified 2026-06-24.

Why this matters for AIPM: this is AIPM’s **sharpest negative benchmark**, the canonical “what NOT to be”. It looks juried (named criteria, a 1-to-5 scale, a “Rasch model”, a five-stage pipeline) but fails almost every founders’ guardrail. **Non-commercial:** it monetizes winners (\$99 and \$499 packs) and bundles the logo licence behind a paywall, so the recognition is a product, not a gift. **Free:** “free to enter” is a funnel, since the only free thing is an email and you must pay for any usable proof, the inverse of AIPM’s promise. **Community-first:** there is no community, no ceremony, no peer cohort, only a transactional buyer relationship. **Practice-grounded:** self-nomination with no required evidence and no verifiable deliverable. The reusable **cautions** are concrete: publish a real binding ruleset and a named jury with a conflict-of-interest policy (the absence is what makes a program read as a mill); never gate the proof-of-win (logo, certificate) behind payment, and say so explicitly to differentiate; do not recruit judges by open self-application with no vetting; and avoid statistical-jargon credibility theatre (“Rasch model”, “blockchain-verified”) that cannot be audited. The one thing GRA does that AIPM can legitimately reuse is a **published selectivity figure** to signal rigor, but only when the underlying jury and rules are genuinely transparent, which here they are not.

4. Synthesis: implications for the AIPM “AI Project of the Year” award

This synthesis consolidates all **25 benchmarked programs** (the v1 13; the three Wave 4 AI-domain awards; the four Wave 2 PMI chapters; the Wave 6 IPMA award; and the three

Wave 3 hackathons plus the commercial Global Recognition Awards) and absorbs the four per-wave mini-syntheses into one integrated view; the underlying per-wave validation and reconciliation logs are preserved in the provenance appendix (§6.2 to §6.8). Section 4.1 is organized around **reusable operating mechanics, ranked by how directly AIPM can copy them at zero cost**, then mapped to each founder guardrail (original, non-commercial, practice-grounded, community-first) and the fixed parameters (online ceremony, jury of 5 to 10, about 5 finalists to 1 winner, launch in 2026). The discipline of the whole benchmark applies here: where the field is silent it is stated as not publicly disclosed, and no jury size, weight, fee, prize, or sponsor is invented.

The headline finding leads with differentiation. Across the 25 programs, two things together are owned by *no* benchmarked award: (a) recognizing **responsible, real-world AI application inside delivered project work** (not a model, a tool, a 24-hour prototype, or a generic business-excellence story), and (b) returning **criteria-anchored feedback that builds the practitioner’s capability** rather than only handing out a trophy. The PM bodies (PMI, PMOGA, APM, IPMA, the chapters) own rigorous delivery rubrics but say nothing about AI. The AI-industry awards (Stevie, BIG, AI Breakthrough, Webby, National AI Awards, ITU, Australian AI) reward AI products and innovation but judge against generic business-excellence language. The hackathons judge greenfield builds under time pressure. Only IPMA returns a written feedback report, and it is paid, on-site and high-cost (§3.21). The white space at the intersection (responsible AI-in-delivery plus capability-building feedback, free and online) is exactly where AIPM should plant its flag. That is the wedge that keeps AIPM from reading as either a PMI copy or a credential mill.

4.1 Best practices to adopt (ranked by zero-cost copyability)

The mechanics are listed from “copy verbatim, no spend” down to “copy in spirit, with a decision attached”. Each names the strongest exemplars across all 25 programs and tags the guardrail it serves.

1. Publish a real edital with an explicit, ideally weighted, rubric (the cheapest trust-builder). *Original, community-first.* This is the single most copyable mechanic and it costs nothing but discipline. Exemplars span every lens: **PMI-DF Prêmio Candango** (8 criteria, each 1 to 5, 40-point max, a full 12-section public edital, §3.3); **PMI-SP Melhores do Ano** (8 committee criteria × 1 to 5 = 40 points, with the public-vote criteria, 5 × 1 to 5, also written into the public edital at a fixed 70/30 committee-plus-audience split, §3.1); **PMOGA** (6 weighted criteria summing to 100%: Value Creation and Impact 25%, PMO Evolution 20%, Client Service 15%, Best Practices 15%, Innovation 15%, Community Engagement 10%, corroborated verbatim against the 2026 handbook with no drift, §3.4/§6.5); **APM** (the published-weights gold standard: Outcomes and Benefits 40% / Project Management 40% / remaining 20%, §3.6); **IPMA** (the rigorous end: a 0-to-100% scale in six anchored bands against the Project Excellence Model, §3.21); and now a **hackathon** sets the bar too, **Google Cloud’s ADK hackathon** publishes a full Official Rules document with a weighted multi-stage rubric (Stage 2 = Technical 50% / Innovation 30% / Demo and Docs 20%, plus a capped ≤1.0 bonus, §3.24). For *scale of grid*, a simple **1-to-10-per-criterion scale** (Stevie’s holistic 1 to 10 with transparent medal thresholds and a 5-judge minimum, §3.8; matched by Farhad’s 1-to-10 anchors and the v1 recommendation) is easier for a volunteer

jury than a 100-point grid or IPMA's six-band model. The decisive caution from §6.8: PMI **affirmatively declares its Project-of-the-Year weights proprietary**, so AIPM can already out-transparent PMI simply by publishing its weights.

2. Run a two-stage, video-first online process (written or evidence, then a live finalist pitch). *Practice-grounded, online ceremony.* This is the proven low-cost shape for an online-first award and it maps directly onto the founders' "about 5 finalists to 1 winner plus online ceremony" sketch. It is the norm across the serious awards: **PMOGA** (one-page form then a 30-to-40-minute video, multi-stage elimination to 5 finalists, §3.4); **PMI Project of the Year** (written essay then a roughly one-hour virtual finalist "Story of Success" plus Q&A, §3.5); **APM** (written 1,500 to 2,500 words OR a video ≤8 minutes for individuals, then a virtual presentation, §3.6); **Clube da Programação** (a form plus a 1-minute pitch video, then a live online Demo Day, §3.13); and the hackathon Demo-Day variant (Google Cloud ADK and Hack-Nation both shortlist then run a live pitch, §3.24/§3.23). **Video is the dominant lightweight submission format** because it lets judges see the *real application*, which is exactly the practice-grounded mandate. The evidence package to copy is Google Cloud ADK's (a working artifact plus a public repo plus an architecture diagram plus a ≤3-minute demo video, §3.24), generalized away from code to any AI-in-delivery case, paired with Farhad's evidence pack adding an AI-governance/ethics review and adoption data (round2-concept-inputs.md §5). Cost stays near zero: a structured form plus a video link plus a shared scoring sheet is enough for year one.

3. Keep it free end-to-end, and say so explicitly (free entry is table stakes; free proof is the wedge). *Non-commercial.* Free entry is no longer a differentiator: across the 25 it is the norm for PM-body and several AI-domain awards (**Candango, PMI-SP, PMI-RIO, PMI UK, PMI Netherlands, PMI Sweden, PMI Madrid, GitHub Stars, APM** to enter, plus the three Wave 4 AI awards: **The National AI Awards** with an explicit no-pay-to-play policy, **ITU AI for Good, Australian AI Awards**, §6.3), and PMI itself runs a dozen-plus awards with no application fee (§6.8). The paid set is **Stevie** (USD 295 to 520), **BIG** (USD 949), **AI Breakthrough** (fee unpublished), **Webby**, and the one paid PM-body exception, **IPMA** (EUR 600 to 4,000, to fund its on-site assessment, §3.21). The sharper lesson comes from the negative case: **Global Recognition Awards** is "free to enter and to win" but paywalls every usable proof (a USD 99 Digital Certificate, a USD 499 Professional Pack, the logo licence, §3.25). So AIPM's differentiator must be **free through the credential itself**, with the badge, certificate and logo use bundled into the free win, and it should state this explicitly to separate itself from the credential-mill model.

4. Publish a named jury plus an explicit conflict-of-interest rule (a low-cost credibility move). *Original, credible.* Governance is cheap and it is what separates a real award from a mill. Copy the concrete rules: PMI's **automatic-decline COI rule** (any nomination submitted by an active or recent evaluator is automatically declined, §6.8); **APM's** integrity stack (an anonymous volunteer expert panel, an Awards Steering Group, and a binding **no-contact-with-judges** rule that disqualifies, §3.6); **PMI-SP's** confidential COI-screened committee that bars any project linked to chapter leadership (§3.1); **PMOGA's** exclusion of PMI staff/contractors and Board members from applying or nominating (§3.4); and **ITU's** disclose-and-recuse rule where judges cannot enter the category they evaluate (§3.15). The negatives are instructive: **AI Breakthrough** runs an

anonymous panel of unpublished composition (§3.10); **CloudFest** names its jury (President Lucas Radke plus eight voting members plus a non-voting secretary, about nine voting) but leaves a real unaddressed COI, a juror represents the beneficiary charity and three jurors also mentor projects they vote on (§3.22); **Google Cloud ADK** ran an all-employee single-sponsor jury with no independent judges and an unreconciled count (“over 25” stated, 33 named, §3.24); and **Global Recognition Awards** recruits judges by open self-application with no vetting (§3.25). Publish an exact jury size, its independence, and a COI policy, and beat every benchmark on this.

5. Add an explicit anti-AI-ghostwriting rule for entries. *Original, credible.* **APM** bans AI-written entries and reserves the right to use detection tools (§3.6). For an AI award this is both ironic and essential to protect credibility, it pairs with the no-contact-with-judges integrity rule, and it costs nothing to state in the edital.

6. Reward durable change and real adoption over model novelty (the scoring philosophy). *Practice-grounded.* The most-cited convergence in the benchmark: **BIG’s** purpose statement (“real-world problems”, “concrete measurements”, explicitly “not a popularity contest”, §3.9) is the closest of any program to AIPM’s, and it aligns with the Wave 4 “Change Blueprint” finding (§6.3), reframed as “**reward durable change and real adoption over model novelty**” (the large-org and data-only framing of the original was struck). The Australian AI Awards confirm the *category* is already viable (live “Best Application of Responsible AI” and “Best Use of Agentic AI” categories, §3.16). Operationalize it by weighting outcomes/impact, adoption/change management, and responsible-AI governance highest, the shape Farhad’s draft rubric already takes (45% of points on those three, round2-concept-inputs.md §4). The anti-pattern is the hackathon greenfield bias (“newly created during the contest”, §3.24), which rewards prototypes, not deployed practice with measured outcomes.

7. Return a written feedback report to every finalist (the capability-building lever, the one genuinely new mechanic). *Community-first, practice-grounded.* **IPMA** is the only one of the 25 that returns a **written feedback report against published model criteria** to every applicant (Large/Mega track) or every finalist (Small/Medium track), turning a recognition event into a learning-and-improvement process (§3.21). Once a published rubric exists (best practice 1), criteria-anchored feedback is cheap to produce. Paired with a public “**Story of Success**” library of finalist cases (extending PMI’s 25-minute Story-of-Success format, §3.5/§4.3) and Farhad’s process stage 8 (feedback and lessons, round2-concept-inputs.md §6/§9), this is AIPM’s **most defensible community-first differentiator** against any paid AI-industry award, and it feeds the parallel case-study-repository initiative.

8. Accept sponsors without putting cash in a winner’s hands (the sponsor-to-charity model). *Non-commercial.* **CloudFest** is the cleanest non-commercial idea in the whole set: winners get no cash; each award category is bought by a sponsor for brand exposure and **100% of that money goes to a charity scholarship** (Groundbreaker Talents; about EUR 6,000 raised in 2026 per the recap, §3.22). This decouples sponsorship from winner enrichment and neutralizes the “pay-to-win / commercial-capture” risk a cash “AI Project of the Year” would carry. It pairs with the field’s confirmed prize norm: **no benchmarked**

nomination-and-rubric program awards a cash purse (the deliverable is a trophy/medal/statuette plus a publicity/credentialing package, §6.7); the only cash sits in the hackathons (Google Cloud ADK's USD 50,000 pool, §3.24; Hack-Nation's sponsor-funded cash plus API credits, §3.23), which AIPM should not chase. One honest correction to the prior "PM-body awards carry no commercial sponsor and no cash" reading (§6.8): it holds for PMI's core juried categories but not the PMIEF Kerzner Award, which is commercially sponsored by International Institute for Learning (IIL) with a prize valued up to US \$9,000 (§6.8). AIPM can note the precedent but does not need it.

9. Give winners career capital, not money, and reuse existing assets for recognition. *Community-first, non-commercial.* **PMI Madrid's** in-kind prize (a PMI student membership plus a CAPM exam fee, about USD 267, §3.20) is a clean precedent for handing winners career value instead of cash. Pair a small physical or digital token with a **Credly-style badge** (the project already has badge designs) plus a digital certificate, a press write-up and a finalist "Story of Success" slot, the publicity package the whole field uses at zero cost. A purely PR-only "recognition" with no ceremony (BIG announces by press release, §3.9; GRA emails the result, §3.25) wastes the community value that is AIPM's whole point, so make the live online ceremony the community moment, not an afterthought.

10. Add a fairness/size-track split, and consider a lightweight upward-nomination or joint-entry mechanic. *Community-first.* **IPMA** splits **small/medium vs large/mega** (with seven Small/Medium sub-categories) so a community-scale project is not judged head-to-head against a mega-project (§3.21); AIPM could split by project scale or org size rather than ape PMI's industry-sector split, keeping smaller practitioners competitive. **PMI-SP/PMI-RIO** model an **upward-nomination tier** (a chapter winner feeds the national Prêmio PMI Brasil, score reset and re-judged, §3.1/§3.2), a way to nominate winners upward without claiming a higher body's authority. **The National AI Awards** allow **joint vendor + end-user entries** with the spotlight kept on the practitioner leading the adoption (§3.14), a clean way to gather real delivery-team case studies without becoming a vendor showcase, which also widens the funnel beyond large enterprises (the Wave 4 correction: keep the evidence-of-real-deployment bar, drop the large-org framing, §6.3). These are Round 2 decisions, not year-one defaults.

4.2 Pitfalls to avoid

- **No edital / no published criteria / anonymous undisclosed jury.** Reads as a private club, not a community award. The floor cases: **House of PMO** (a peer-passed trophy with no edital, no criteria, no published jury, §3.7) and **AI Breakthrough** (clean public criteria but an anonymous panel of unpublished composition and an undisclosed fee, §3.10). AIPM must stay above this floor.
- **Free-to-enter, pay-for-the-proof (the "dark twin" of free).** **Global Recognition Awards** is the benchmark's sharpest "what NOT to be": it looks juried (named per-category panels of 3 to 5, a 1-to-5 scale, a "Rasch model" claim, a five-stage pipeline) but monetizes winners (USD 99 / USD 499 packs) and paywalls the logo licence (§3.25). "Free entry" alone is not a differentiator and can be a credential-mill funnel. AIPM must be free end-to-end and say so.

- **Statistical-jargon credibility theatre.** GRA's unauditable "Rasch model" and PR-only "blockchain-verified" / "69% rejection" claims that appear on no official page (§3.25) are credibility theatre. A published selectivity figure can signal rigor, but only when the jury and rules are genuinely transparent.
- **Pay-to-enter. Stevie, BIG, AI Breakthrough, Webby** and, among PM bodies, **IPMA** (EUR 600 to 4,000) conflict with the non-commercial mandate. Do not even partially gate behind a fee, and do not copy IPMA's paid on-site site-visit machinery (the high-touch, high-cost reason it charges, §3.21). Borrow IPMA's independent-assessor plus feedback-report rigor; the free, online, video-first model is the right scale for a first edition.
- **Cash prizes and a greenfield-demo bias (the hackathon traps).** The hackathon archetype judges a build produced under time pressure, not an applied result delivered in a real project, so it is not an apples-to-apples peer. Three specific pulls to avoid: large sponsor **cash plus API-credit prizes** that set an expectations bar AIPM should not chase (Hack-Nation, §3.23; Google Cloud ADK, §3.24); the **"newly created during the contest"** rule that rewards prototypes over deployed practice (Google Cloud ADK, §3.24), the opposite of practice-grounded; and a **vendor-tilted rubric** that rewards using a sponsor's own technology (Google Cloud ADK awards bonus points for using Google Cloud, §3.24). Anchor eligibility on completed or operationalized, vendor-neutral work (round2-concept-inputs.md §2).
- **Visibility-over-substance incentives.** CloudFest's Social Media Master Award (§3.22) rewards promotional buzz; keep that pull out of the core award.
- **Public voting without fraud controls.** If AIPM ever adds a community vote, the one rule every voting program treats as non-negotiable applies: vote on a **jury-vetted shortlist** (**Webby's** academy picks 5 nominees per category before the public vote, §3.12; **PMI-SP/PMI-RIO** fuse a confidential committee with a live-audience vote, §3.1/§3.2), with **fraud detection plus audited tabulation** (**Webby**), never on raw nominations.
- **Scope creep into many categories in year one.** The programs that run many categories (**APM, Stevie, Australian AI** about 33, **AI Breakthrough** 200+) have years of operational muscle. The benchmark and Farhad both land on **2 to 3 categories maximum**, or one overall award plus 1 to 2 special recognitions, for a first edition (§4.4, round2-concept-inputs.md §3).
- **Continuity neglect. PMI Netherlands' POYA** page still anchors to a 2022 cycle and recent galas surfaced only volunteer recognition; **PMI Madrid's** Proyecto del Año has full bases only for 2012 (§6.7). A juried award needs a visibly published annual winner and rubric to stay credible. AIPM should commit up front to publishing each year's winner, jury and rubric.

4.3 How to differentiate (stay original, not a PMI copy and not a credential mill)

- **Own the responsible-real-world-AI-in-delivery wedge** (original + practice-grounded). No benchmarked PM award owns it yet; the AI-industry awards have AI categories (even "Best Application of Responsible AI" and "Best Use of Agentic AI" at the Australian AI Awards, §3.16) but judge against generic business-excellence language, not project-delivery rigor; the hackathons judge greenfield builds. AIPM's

rubric should sit precisely at that intersection (for example Impact/Outcomes, Responsible-AI/Ethics, Innovation, Project-Management Rigor, Community/Knowledge-sharing), anchored on the “Change Blueprint” principle (reward durable change and real adoption over model novelty, §6.3) generalized beyond data-ops to any AI-in-project-delivery case. The Australian precedent proves the framing is category-viable but unowned at depth, which makes the wedge real but time-limited, reinforcing “launch before competitors in 2026”.

- **Be the capability-building award, not just a recognition award** (community-first). Returning IPMA-style **criteria-anchored feedback to every finalist** (§3.21), publishing a **“Story of Success” library** of finalist cases (extending §3.5), and taking a **publishable-case-study consent** at entry (round2-concept-inputs.md §2) is a posture **no benchmark combines**. It is the most defensible community-first differentiator and converts the award into a pipeline of publishable community case studies (round2-concept-inputs.md §1, §9). Borrow IPMA’s independent-assessor-plus-feedback-report rigor without its paid on-site machinery.
- **Borrow mechanics, never branding**. Copy the *process* from PMI/PMOGA (open nomination by the project leader, a video, a published weighted rubric, a volunteer expert committee, multi-stage elimination to about 5 finalists, the comparative pairwise judging option worth raising for a small jury), IPMA (feedback report, size-track split), APM (published weights, anti-ghostwriting, no-contact rule), and the PMI Award Force / “PAIT” infrastructure pattern (a draft-then-final online flow with a single named Lead Nominator, §6.8), but use **AIPM’s own naming, visual identity, categories and criteria**. The founders’ guardrail is about *perception of copying*, which lives in branding and category names, not in the underlying process. Award Force is a scale decision, not a launch requirement (a structured form plus a video link plus a scoring sheet runs year one; the same SaaS is used by PMI, APM, IPMA and the Australian AI Awards, the recurring infrastructure signal).
- **Differentiate on “free end-to-end”, not “free to enter”**. Because free entry is now table stakes (§6.3), the credible non-commercial wedge is bundling the badge, certificate and logo use into the free win (the inverse of Global Recognition Awards, §3.25), and stating the zero cost explicitly as a positioning line, optionally underwritten by the **CloudFest sponsor-to-charity** model (§3.22) so sponsors can fund recognition without a cash prize. Owner-funded recognition is credible on its own: PMI’s global awards carry no external sponsor, and named sponsors in the field appear only where there is a gala to underwrite (§6.7).

4.4 Open questions to resolve in the concept proposal (next round)

These remain the Round 2 agenda (also tracked in round2-concept-inputs.md); each is now informed by the fuller 25-program field. 1. **Categories**: one overall “AI Project of the Year”, or a small set? The benchmarks and Farhad converge on **2 to 3 maximum** (or one overall plus 1 to 2 special recognitions) for a first edition. Candidate framings: the ITU **People / Planet / Prosperity** split (§3.15, cleaner than Candango’s 1-to-17 SDG mapping) or the Australian AI Awards’ **Responsible AI / Agentic AI** axis (§3.16); consider a fairness split by project scale or org size (IPMA, §3.21) rather than industry sector. 2. **Eligibility scope and window**: global from day one (AIPM is international), or piloted? Completion

window 12, 18, or 18-to-24 months (PMI ≤18 §3.5; IPMA 18/24 by track §3.21; Farhad 18 to 24)? Require AI as a meaningful component beyond proof-of-concept, with publishable-case-study consent; allow joint vendor + end-user entries with the spotlight on the practitioner (National AI Awards, §3.14)? 3. **Nomination model:** self-nomination, open peer nomination (GitHub Stars' ≤180-char front door as a lightweight first gate, §3.11), joint vendor-plus-client (§3.14), or a mix? Single named "Lead Nominator" with a draft-then-final flow (§6.8)? 4. **Jury composition and COI:** drawn from the ambassadors, external experts, or a mix? Benchmark steer: a **mixed**, not all-academic, panel (ITU is mixed, §3.15; PMI Sweden already seats an AI-in-project-delivery juror, §3.19), **5 to 10** members (PMI Netherlands runs 5 to 8, §3.18; CloudFest about 9, §3.22), calibrated before scoring and screened for COI (the auto-decline rule §6.8 plus disclose-and-recuse §3.15) when an ambassador's own project enters. 5. **Community vote:** a jury-vetted-shortlist "People's Choice" with audited tabulation and fraud controls (Webby, §3.12), the lower-infrastructure PMI-SP/PMI-RIO fused committee-plus-live-audience model (§3.1/§3.2), or jury-only for year one? 6. **Scoring rubric:** which 5 to 8 criteria and weights, and which grid? A 100-point, 7-criterion weighted grid (Farhad, precise but heavier) versus a **1-to-10-per-criterion** scale on 5 to 8 criteria (Stevie/PMI-DF, easier for a volunteer jury). Draft starting point converging v1, Farhad and PMOGA: Impact/Outcomes, Responsible-AI/Ethics and Human-in-Command, Innovation, PM Rigor and Delivery, Adoption/Change, Community/Knowledge-sharing, weighting outcomes plus adoption plus governance highest. Publish the weights (out-transparenting PMI, which declares its weights proprietary, §6.8)? 7. **Platform:** a structured form plus a video link plus a shared scoring sheet for year one, or a paid awards SaaS (Award Force) for scale? A business-case question; Award Force is a scale decision, not a launch requirement (§6.8). 8. **Recognition, feedback and sponsorship:** badge (Credly, reuse existing designs) plus certificate plus a live online ceremony slot plus a finalist "Story of Success" publication, all free. Will every finalist receive a written, criteria-anchored **feedback report** (IPMA, §3.21)? Any non-cash, in-kind career-capital prize (PMI Madrid model, §3.20)? If sponsors are accepted, use the **CloudFest sponsor-to-charity** decoupling (§3.22) so no cash reaches winners.

5. Vitor's 3 picks for the ambassador benchmark exercise

The ambassador action is to bring **3 award examples** to the team benchmark (a 3-day timeline). Re-justified against the fuller **25-program field**, the three picks below still hold, one per lens, each owning a different lesson AIPM needs (best edital template, best operational analog, best lightweight community model) and each pre-cleared against the founders' guardrails (original, non-commercial, practice-grounded, community-first) and the fixed parameters (online ceremony, jury of 5 to 10, about 5 finalists to 1 winner, launch 2026). No swap is warranted: the new programs from Waves 2, 3, 4 and 6 added depth (IPMA's feedback report, CloudFest's sponsor model, Google's transparency, the chapter and AI-award sweeps) but none unseats a primary pick, so the strongest new levers are folded into the refreshed honorable mentions and the cautions.

1. **PMI-DF Prêmio Candango** (Brazilian chapter): *best edital template*. Across all 25 programs it is still the best end-to-end regulamento: free, open nationally (*non-*

commercial), a transparent 8-criteria 1-to-5 / 40-point rubric and a named “Banca Examinadora” (*original/credible*), a fixed calendar, a full 12-section public edital, and a Social/SDG category. The wider field only sharpens why it leads: PMI-SP (§3.1) matches it on rubric transparency and adds a fused 70/30 committee-plus-audience model, and PMOGA (§3.4) and APM (§3.6) publish weights too, but Candango remains the cleanest single *Portuguese-language, copy-ready* document AIPM can adapt as its own edital, and it does it free with no SaaS. *Maps to:* original, non-commercial, community-first.

2. **PMI PMO of the Year Award / PMOGA** (international): *closest operational analog*. It maps almost one-to-one onto the founders’ sketch: open nomination by the project leader, a video submission, a **published weighted rubric** (six criteria summing to 100%, re-confirmed verbatim against the 2026 handbook in §6.5), a volunteer expert committee, multi-stage comparative elimination to about 5 finalists, an annual online-friendly ceremony. It shows AIPM how to run the whole pipeline (*practice-grounded*; the online-ceremony / 5-finalists / 5-to-10-jury parameters). The 25-program field reinforces rather than unseats it: IPMA (§3.21) is more rigorous but paid and on-site, the AI-industry awards keep weights internal, and the hackathons judge the wrong thing. The comparative pairwise judging is a fairness option worth raising for a small jury. The one caveat is brand independence: borrow the **mechanics**, not the visual identity or naming, to respect “do not look like a copy of PMI” (*original*). *Maps to:* jury of 5 to 10, about 5 finalists to 1 winner, online ceremony, practice-grounded.
3. **Clube da Programação** (Laura Dubugras, community; profiled at §3.13): *best lightweight community model*. The counter-model for tone: a form plus a 1-minute video, a small named jury (3 judges), and a live online “Demo Day” pitch with Q&A on a fast cadence. It proves a credible, energizing award can run with almost no bureaucracy, the right tone for a *community-first* first edition and the opposite end of the spectrum from IPMA’s heavy machinery, which is exactly why the field’s heavyweights would over-engineer a launch edition. **One honest caveat to surface at the table, now that the field is fuller:** per the project’s own intake note, Clube paired its award with a **USD 10,000 cash prize and a sponsor (still to be confirmed)**, a tension with the *non-commercial* guardrail. That makes it a productive discussion piece, not a model to copy wholesale: bring it for the low-bureaucracy Demo Day shape, then use CloudFest’s sponsor-to-charity structure (below) as the answer for how to take sponsorship without a winner cash prize. (Its rubric is not published, a gap AIPM should beat by publishing one.) *Maps to:* community-first, online ceremony, launch 2026.

Why not swap one. The three still beat the strongest newcomers for *this* exercise because each owns a different lens and a different lesson. IPMA (§3.21) is the most important new program overall, but it is paid (EUR 600 to 4,000) and high-touch (on-site site visits), so it teaches a single reusable lever rather than a whole template, and it belongs in the honorable mentions. Google Cloud’s ADK hackathon (§3.24) sets the transparency bar but is a vendor product-marketing build competition, off-archetype for a delivered-project

award. Global Recognition Awards (§3.25) is the sharpest negative, better raised as a cautionary contrast than as one of three exemplars. The one defensible swap to flag, not make: if the group wants a fourth slot, add IPMA for the feedback-report lever.

Honorable mentions, refreshed to surface the strongest new levers across all 25 (raise these if the group wants a specific angle): - **IPMA Global Project Excellence Award** (§3.21): the **feedback-report capability-building lever**, a written, criteria-anchored report returned to every applicant/finalist, the one mechanic no other of the 25 programs offers, plus a published anchored 0-to-100% scoring model and a **size-track split** for fairness. Caveat: it is the only paid PM-body award (EUR 600 to 4,000) and uses costly on-site visits, both of which AIPM should *not* copy; borrow the rigor, not the machinery. - **CloudFest Hackathon Awards** (§3.22): the **sponsor-to-charity, no-cash model**, winners get no cash and 100% of each sponsor's category fee funds a charity scholarship, the cleanest answer in the set to "how do we accept sponsors without a cash prize that distorts the award". Caveat: its judging transparency is weak (no published rubric, an unaddressed jury COI), so AIPM should be more defensible than the model it borrows from. - **Google Cloud ADK / Multi-Agents Hackathon** (§3.24): the **transparency gold standard**, a full public Official Rules document with an explicit weighted 50/30/20 rubric (plus a capped bonus), a verifiable evidence package (working artifact plus public repo plus architecture diagram plus a short demo video), and regional prize buckets for global fairness. Match or beat its transparency. Caveat: a vendor product-marketing hackathon with a closed all-employee jury and a greenfield-demo bias, all of which AIPM must avoid. - **AI-domain angle, if asked specifically: BIG AI Excellence Awards** (the "real-world AI application, not a popularity contest" purpose closest to AIPM's, §3.9) and **Stevie** (the clearest published 1-to-10 scale with transparent medal thresholds and a 5-judge minimum, §3.8). Both are paid, the exact gap a free AIPM award exploits. **ITU AI for Good** (§3.15) is the free, independent, UN-grade, criteria-first peer model (a published five-criterion rubric, a People/Planet/Prosperity split) if the group wants a prestige reference, with the caveat to promise an independent, published-criteria jury, not an "all-academic" one. The **Australian AI Awards** (§3.16) add a live precedent for dedicated "Responsible AI" and "Agentic AI" categories, the exact wedge AIPM is claiming. - **The "what NOT to be" exhibit: Global Recognition Awards** (§3.25), the free-to-enter / pay-for-the-proof credential mill (Digital Certificate USD 99, Professional Pack USD 499, paywalled logo licence, no ceremony, unauditable "Rasch model" theatre). Bring it to define, by contrast, what AIPM's free-end-to-end, transparent, community-first promise actually means.

6. Provenance, validation log, and wave changelog

This appendix preserves the per-wave validation and reconciliation work behind the profiles above, so the consolidated synthesis (§4) reads as one document while nothing verified is lost. The benchmark was built in six research waves; each wave's "net finding" is now folded into §4 and the matrix, and the audit detail (claim-by-claim validations, category reconciliations, and the dimension-13 backfill) lives here. The verbatim extracts of the two shared external inputs are in `incoming/colleague-study.md` (the Wave 4

colleague study) and incoming/farhad-benchmark.md (Farhad Abdollahyan's Wave 6 report).

6.1 Wave changelog

Wave	Scope	Result
v1 (Wave 1)	Initial 13 programs across three lenses + the founders' guardrails; set up the wave plan and added dimension 13 (Prize & sponsorship)	13 programs (§3.1 to §3.13 in the stable IDs: the three BR chapters, PMOGA, PMI PoY, APM, House of PMO, Stevie, BIG, AI Breakthrough, GitHub Stars, Webby, Clube)
Wave 2	PMI US + Europe chapter sweep; close the v1 PMI-SP / PMI-RIO items	4 European chapter awards added (§3.17 to §3.20); 4 US/EU chapters confirmed to run no award (§6.6); PMI-SP and PMI-RIO editais recovered and folded into §3.1/§3.2
Wave 3	Hackathons + traditional/commercial recognition	3 hackathons + Global Recognition Awards added (§3.22 to §3.25, Lens D); PMI awards-platform process note (§6.8)
Wave 4	Incorporate and validate a colleague's AI-domain study	3 AI-domain awards added (§3.14 to §3.16) after claim-by-claim validation (§6.2/§6.3)
Wave 6	Incorporate Farhad Abdollahyan's benchmark	IPMA Global Project Excellence Award added (§3.21); PMI Project-of-the-Year category count reconciled (§6.4); PMOGA criteria corroborated (§6.5); award-design content routed to round2-concept-inputs.md
Wave 5	v2 consolidation (this document)	Merged all wave additions into the four-lens structure; rebuilt the matrix with the Prize & sponsorship column; profiled Clube da Programação (§3.13); re-wrote the synthesis (§4) and the picks (§5) over the full 25; preserved the per-wave logs here

6.2 Wave 4: colleague-study validation (claim by claim)

Program	Colleague claim	Verdict	Note
Alconics / National AI Awards	one program named “The Alconics (The National AI Awards)”	Refuted (nuance)	Two companies (Informa vs Future Tech Events); joint name exists only as a 2026 co-branded <i>category</i> .
”	“AI Enterprise Business of the Year” category	Confirmed (partly)	“The Alconics AI Enterprise Business of the Year” + “AI Business of the Year” are real; “Best Enterprise AI Solution” wording not found.
”	rewards joint vendor + end-user entries	Confirmed	Rules explicitly allow joint vendor+client entries; 2026 winner was a joint NHS + university entry.
”	“premier enterprise standard for real-world AI deployment”	Refuted/unverifiable	Not the official framing; likely AI paraphrase.
ITU AI for Good	program “AI for Good Impact Awards” by ITU	Confirmed	Real; co-run with Tech To The Rescue.
”	“AI for Prosperity” category	Confirmed	One of three official categories.
”	jury “entirely academic specialists and independent scientists”	Refuted	Mixed panel (DeepMind industry, UNESCO official, academics).
”	criteria “ignore commercial marketing”, prioritize “Scalability, Sustainability, Ethical Guardrails”	Refuted	Real criteria: Innovation, Impact, Sustainability, Contribution, Ethical Considerations; no “scalability”, no

Program	Colleague claim	Verdict	Note
Australian AI Awards	Momentum Media, national, banking/defence/legal/aerospace	Confirmed	“ignore marketing” language. Real, current (2nd ed. 2025); sector list matches.
”	“Best Application of Responsible AI” + “Best Use of Agentic AI”	Confirmed	Both exact category names exist (plus an Agentic AI - Start Up sibling).
”	judged “entirely on long-term operational viability / PM friction points”	Refuted	Methodology criteria are generic business-excellence; no PM-friction/viability rubric.
BIG AI Excellence	(already in v1 §3.9)	n/a	Not re-added; v1 profile stands.

6.3 Wave 4: the “Change Blueprint” assessment and corrections to v1

The study’s headline recommendation is to **hybridize Alconics (operational-scale evidence) with ITU AI for Good (non-profit independent evaluation)** and to **score “The Change Blueprint”**: reward how the PM team cleaned master-data pipelines, automated repetitive workflow layouts, and “permanently beat the Back to Spreadsheets trap” rather than scoring what the AI can do.

Assessed against AIPM’s guardrails (original, non-commercial, practice-grounded, community-first, launch 2026): - **The scoring philosophy is the most valuable contribution, and it converges with v1.** “Score the change, not the model” is exactly AIPM’s *practice-grounded* mandate (recognize real AI application in projects, not ideas or tools) and matches v1’s draft criteria (Impact/Outcomes, Responsible-AI/Ethics, Innovation, PM Rigor, Community/Knowledge-sharing). It is worth adopting as an explicit *principle* in the Round 2 concept proposal. - **The hybrid is directionally right but needs two corrections.** (a) “Non-profit independent evaluation” is sound, but the ITU model is independent and *criteria-first*, not “all-academic”, so AIPM should promise an independent, published-criteria jury, not an academic-only one. (b) “Operational-scale evidence” from Alconics/National AI Awards skews enterprise/large-org; AIPM is *community-first*, so over-indexing on “large organizations with clear financial impact” would exclude the smaller practitioners who are the community. Keep the *evidence-of-real-deployment* bar, drop the *large-org* framing. - **Generalize the language.** “Cleaned master-data pipelines” and “automated repetitive workflow layouts” read as a BI/data-ops (spreadsheet-replacement) lens. AIPM projects are broader than data hygiene, so adopt the underlying idea (reward the operational embedding, adoption and change management that make an AI project

stick) but phrase it for any AI-in-project-delivery case, not only data pipelines. - **Net:** fold the “Change Blueprint” in as a **scoring-philosophy input to Round 2**, reframed as “reward durable change and real adoption over model novelty”, with the large-org and data-only framing removed. Do not adopt the named program pairing literally; v1’s single most transferable reference remains the **PMI PMO of the Year** mechanics.

Corrections to the v1 synthesis from Wave 4

- **v1 said the AI-industry awards are all pay-to-enter (USD 295 to 949).** Wave 4 verified **three free AI-domain awards** (National AI Awards with an explicit no-pay-to-play policy, ITU AI for Good, Australian AI Awards). So “free” is not only a PM-chapter trait, it is achievable and already practiced in the AI-awards space. This *strengthens* the case that a free AIPM award is credible, but it *weakens* “free is a differentiator versus all AI awards” (the paid set is Stevie, BIG, AI Breakthrough, Webby; the free set now includes these three).
- **Infrastructure signal reinforced.** Award Force (*.awardsplatform.com) now has a third data point (Australian AI Awards), alongside PMI and APM. It remains a scale decision, not a launch requirement.
- **New mechanic to consider.** Joint vendor + end-user entries (National AI Awards) are a clean way to capture real delivery-team case studies; AIPM can allow them while keeping the spotlight on the practitioner/team, not the vendor.

6.4 Wave 6: PMI Project of the Year category-count reconciliation

Farhad’s report listed **four** project categories for PMI Project of the Year, adding “Sustainability” to Engineering/Technology, Construction/Infrastructure and Social. Re-grounded against the **live 2026 PMI Professional Awards entry form**, there are **three** submission categories (the form states candidates “must submit their project under one of the three categories”: Engineering/Technology, Social, Construction/Infrastructure), with one overall Project of the Year. A **Sustainability Award** does exist, but as an **Honorable Mention run in conjunction with Green Project Management (GPM)**, listed separately from the three category winners in the 2025 winners release; Farhad appears to have elevated that honorable mention to a fourth submission category. §3.5 was corrected to name the categories exactly (PMI’s social category is the “**Social Project Award**”, not “Social Impact”) and to record the Sustainability honorable mention.

Two caveats are kept honest: (a) one adversarial check argued Sustainability should count as a fourth category via the PMI-GPM Joint Venture; the primary source (the entry form, which says “three” four times) governs, so the benchmark keeps **three** and flags the minority reading; and (b) the pmi.org HTML pages (the award page, the awards index, the 2025 release) returned **HTTP 403** to automated fetch, so the finding rests on the official entry-form PDF (pmiprofessional.awardsplatform.com) and the winners release, with a live-HTML re-read the one item left to confirm. Separately, the verification noted PMI updated the Project of the Year evaluation process **for 2025** to a single ~2,000-word “Story of Success” essay; the ten-criteria / 20-page template described in §3.5 dim 6 is the **legacy (2017)** format.

6.5 Wave 6: PMOGA six-criteria corroboration (no drift)

Farhad's report lists the same six PMO of the Year / PMOGA criteria as §3.4. Re-verified against the official **2026 PMO of the Year Award Nomination Handbook** (pmi.org PDF, "Award Scoring Rubric" section): Value Creation and Impact 25%, PMO's Evolution 20%, Client Service Excellence 15%, Adherence to Best Practices 15%, Innovation and Adaptability 15%, Community Engagement 10% (summing to 100%), a 1:1 match with §3.4. No drift, no edit needed; the independent corroboration strengthens §3.4 as a rubric exemplar.

6.6 Wave 2: PMI chapters with no chapter-run juried award (clean negatives)

These large US and European chapters were checked on their official sites and adversarially re-verified; each runs only internal volunteer recognition, not a juried project/AI award. The negative is itself useful: it shows AIPM should not look to most US chapters for award-design precedent.

- **PMI San Francisco Bay Area (PMI SFBAC, ~3,000 members):** no chapter-run juried award. Internal volunteer recognition only, the President's ACE Award (an annual Board-decided team award) and the monthly STAR Award (a small USD 25 Amazon gift card), plus an annual Volunteer Appreciation event with honorary named categories (Visionary, Above and Beyond, Dedicated Service, Making the Difference, Rising Star). The chapter's public "Awards" page just lists PMI-global Project of the Year winners that originated in the Bay Area (Chevron 2015; National Ignition Facility / Lawrence Livermore 2010), which the global lane already covers, so it must not be double-counted. (That page returned 404 to fetch; its content is confirmed via search snippets.) Sources: pmissfbac.org (home, volunteer-opportunities, blog/march-2020, the 2023 Volunteer Appreciation post).
- **PMI Silicon Valley (~2,300 members):** no chapter-run juried award. Internal recognition only, a "President's Award: Volunteer of the Year" and an annual free Volunteer Recognition Dinner (recognition, networking, swag, a raffle). Note for the source list: the hint domain pmi-svc.org is actually PMI Sacramento Valley; the Silicon Valley chapter is pmissv.org / java.pmissv.org. The only "Project of the Year" hits resolve to the PMI-global award. Sources: pmissv.org (home, about-us, get-involved/about-volunteering, the Volunteer Appreciation Dinner event listing); java.pmissv.org.
- **PMI New York City (PMINYC, 3,000+ members):** no chapter-run juried award; programs are educational and networking. The only money-award it is associated with is a PMIEF-channel academic scholarship (reported up to USD 2,500, deadline May 1, both unconfirmed, aggregator-sourced because the PMIEF directory page redirected to a generic landing page). Its Volunteer Appreciation events are social (networking, games, raffles), not a juried award. Sources: pminyc.org (home, about, programs-overview, volunteer, policies); pmief.org scholarship directory.
- **PMI Switzerland:** no chapter-run juried project award. Recognition is volunteer-centric, a voted Volunteer of the Year (e.g., Pia Henzelmann 2025; non-cash gifts, with runners-up) and a president-granted President's Award, both announced at the Annual Members Meeting (AMM, Feb/March, rotating venues). The chapter's

marquee event is the annual PM Conference (the 13th was 23 Sep 2024 in Lausanne, theme “AI Unveiled: Transforming Projects and Organizations with Smart Innovation”; the 14th is scheduled for 29 Oct 2026, Zurich), which is an event with no project-competition or prize track. Sources: pmi-switzerland.ch (home, become-a-volunteer, the 2022 Volunteer of the Year post, the AMM 2024 and AMM25 recaps).

6.7 Dimension 13 (Prize & sponsorship) backfill for the v1 programs

Source-verified prize/sponsor detail for the v1 programs, to complete the 13th dimension. The headline pattern: **no benchmarked program awards a cash purse**; the deliverable is a physical object (trophy/medal/statuette) plus publicity/credentialing.

- **§3.3 PMI-DF Prêmio Candango:** recognition only (winning projects presented in person at the annual EGP conference in Brasília); free registration, judged by a PMI-DF committee. The official 2024 page lists tiered EVENT sponsors (Diamante Plus PX2B, Diamante Sluper, plus Bronze-level IPETEC, Orfeu, Plano Consulting and supporting orgs) rather than a single award sponsor; whether a physical trophy/certificate or any cash is given is not stated.
- **§3.4 PMOGA (PMI PMO of the Year):** no cash; the prize is global recognition and publicity through PMI channels and external media, with the winner announced at the PMI Global Summit. Regional winners must attend the Summit and deliver a session, and the rules state PMI will not cover the costs of producing materials, attending the Summit, or shipping trophies. No external sponsor (PMI/PMOGA-funded).
- **§3.5 PMI Project of the Year:** an official PMI trophy and certificate plus peer recognition (no cash); finalists give a virtual presentation and Q&A. PMI-owned and funded, no external sponsor named.
- **§3.6 APM Project Management Awards:** an APM trophy per category plus profile/publicity (no cash), presented at the November black-tie ceremony (2025: 17 Nov, Park Plaza Westminster Bridge, London). Named sponsors exist at headline and category level: RPC UK Ltd (headline, 2023); CITI (Social Project of the Year and Sustainability Award); KBR (Innovation in Project Management Award, per APM’s sponsors/kbr page).
- **§3.7 House of PMO:** no competitive prize or sponsor; recognition is a peer-passed “Professional of the Month” trophy and a PMO Day celebration (not a juried award).
- **§3.8 Stevie Awards:** no entry fee, but a per-winning-nomination Winners’ Fee (amount varies by region/deadline; e.g., MENA USD 545/585). Gold winners receive a Gold Stevie trophy, Silver/Bronze winners a medal (trophy purchasable); no cash; handed over at the optional gala or shipped for a fee. Commercially self-funded, no third-party prize sponsor.
- **§3.9 BIG AI Excellence Awards:** USD 949 nomination fee; winners receive a personalized trophy (a multi-color glass obelisk) and/or a digital certificate plus a content/visibility package (royalty-free logo, social image/video, an issued press release, judge feedback); no cash; run and funded by Business Intelligence Group, no external sponsor. (The package contents are listed officially, but no dollar value is

published; an earlier “valued at over USD 6,000” figure was not found on the official page and is not asserted.)

- **§3.10 AI Breakthrough Awards:** prize/trophy and any sponsor are not published; recognition is a private notification then a public announcement.
- **§3.11 GitHub Stars:** no fee and no cash; recipients receive exclusive GitHub swag, a personalized physical “Star”, Hall of Fame placement, early feature access and speaking opportunities; GitHub-funded; shipping/handoff mechanics not specified.
- **§3.12 Webby Awards:** pay-to-enter; winners receive a hand-cast Webby Statuette plus a website badge (duplicate statuettes purchasable), no cash; honored at a live event in May. Named sponsors include Adobe, WP Engine, Meltwater, Patreon, ElevenLabs, Framer, NAACP, KPMG and Meta Lab (non-exhaustive).

6.8 Wave 3: PMI awards platform + nomination guide (process note, not a new program)

This closes the last item in the Wave 3 backlog. The PMI awards entry platform (pmiprofessional.awardsplatform.com) and the PMI “Nomination Guide” are **NOT a separate award**; they are the shared entry and judging infrastructure behind the PMI Professional Awards this benchmark already profiles (PMO of the Year, §3.4; Project of the Year, §3.5). They are recorded here as a process note, not a new matrix row, to avoid double-counting.

- **Platform and process.** PMI runs the portfolio on **Award Force**, a cloud awards-management SaaS white-labeled at pmiprofessional.awardsplatform.com (the same SaaS family this benchmark already flags for APM, the PMI Global Chapter Awards, and the Australian AI Awards). The reusable UX pattern: an entrant creates an online account, a single named “**Lead Nominator**” is the point of contact, and the entry is built online with a **save-as-draft** stage during the open call and a **save-as-final** to submit. (A separate legacy PMI portal, professionalawards.pmi.org, also appears; which awards route through which portal in 2026 is unconfirmed.)
- **Nomination rules worth copying.** Eligibility and self-nomination are per-award (self-nomination is allowed for the Rising Leader and Eric Jenett awards, not for the Fellow Award; Project of the Year nomination is open and the Lead Nominator need not be PMI-affiliated). A shared, **automatic conflict-of-interest rule** is the standout: any nomination submitted by an active or recent evaluator is automatically declined. Submissions that are incomplete, mis-formatted, late, or not in English are not considered.
- **Judging body.** The **PMI Professional Awards Insight Team (PAIT)**, PMI-volunteer practitioners, administers the program and evaluates nominations, leading subject-matter-expert teams; Project of the Year runs two stages ending in a roughly one-hour virtual finalist session. The exact panel size per entry is not published.
- **Criteria and transparency.** PMI publishes named criteria but **affirmatively declares the scoring weights and methodology proprietary and non-disclosed** (stronger than merely “not published”); the contrast is that the sibling PMO of the Year handbook does publish six weighted criteria summing to 100%. The current published Project of the Year evaluation rubric names criteria such as Context and Challenge Identification; Outcomes, Value, and Category Alignment; Alignment with

Organizational Goals; Demonstration of Project Management Excellence; Demonstration of PMI Culture Values; and Overall Project Success (five or six named criteria, weights withheld); this is distinct from the older 2017 application template's ten sections.

- **Free, with one sponsored exception.** Entry is confirmed free twice over (“there is no application fee... no fee to submit a nomination”), and the core juried categories (Project of the Year, PMO of the Year, the individual recognition awards) carry **no cash prize**, only reputational recognition announced at the annual PMI Global Summit (2026: **21 to 24 October, Detroit**; the awards-platform copy’s “18 to 21 October” is stale). The one correction to the “PM-body awards have no commercial sponsor” pattern: the **PMIEF Kerzner Award** is sponsored by a commercial firm, **International Institute for Learning (IIL)**, and carries a quantified prize (IIL training valued at **US \$5,000** plus an expense-paid trip, **total value up to US \$9,000**). So the “no cash, no commercial sponsor” reading holds for the core categories but not for the IIL-sponsored Kerzner line.

Why this matters for AIPM: treat this as the **infrastructure reference** for the PMI rows AIPM already studies. The reusable, guardrail-aligned signals: **free entry at scale** (PMI runs a dozen-plus awards with no application fee, proof that “free” is viable for a large body); a clean **draft-then-final online flow** with a single named Lead Nominator (copyable with a plain form and a shared sheet, no paid SaaS needed for year one); an explicit **automatic conflict-of-interest decline rule** (a cheap, credibility-building governance move worth adopting in spirit); and a **two-stage funnel ending in a short live finalist session**, exactly the “about five finalists to one winner plus online ceremony” shape the founders sketched. The cautions: borrow mechanics, not branding (Award Force, “PAIT”, PMI naming and identity stay PMI’s, per the “do not look like a copy of PMI” guardrail); PMI does not publish its criterion weights, so AIPM can do better by publishing a transparent weighted rubric; Award Force is a scale decision, not a launch requirement; and the rubric is generic PM-excellence language, leaving AIPM the space to own a genuinely AI-practice-grounded rubric.

7. Consolidated sources

Brazilian PM chapters - PMI-SP: <https://pmisp.org.br/melhores-do-ano-2025/> · <https://sigp.org.br/pmi-summit-melhores-do-ano/> · <https://pmispsummit.com/> - PMI-RIO: <https://www.pmirio.org.br/pagina/70/> · <https://pmirio.org.br/pagina/72/> · https://www.pmirio.org.br/uploads/tinymce/files/Regulamento%20PMO%202025_PMIRIO.pdf · <https://www.sympla.com.br/evento/evento-de-premiacao-do-pmi-rio-2024/2741879> - PMI-DF Candango: <https://summit.pmidf.org/wp-content/uploads/Edital-Premio-Candango.pdf> · <https://pmidf.org/premio-candango/> · <https://pmidf.org/envolva-se/voluntariado-do-ano/>

International PM bodies - PMI PMO of the Year: <https://www.pmi.org/-/media/pmi/documents/public/pdf/about/awards/>

pmo_of_the_year_handbook.pdf · <https://pmoga.pmi.org/pmi-pmo-awards/rules-and-procedures> · <https://pmoga.pmi.org/pmi-pmo-awards/judge-committee> - PMI Project of the Year: <https://www.pmi.org/about/awards/project-of-the-year> · <https://www.pmi.org/about/awards/professional> · <https://www.pmi.org/-/media/pmi/documents/public/pdf/awards/project-year-application.pdf> · <https://pmiprofessional.awardsplatform.com/> - APM Awards: <https://www.apm.org.uk/apm-awards/> · <https://apm.awardsplatform.com/entry/entrant/MwLyoKvN/blank-pdf> · <https://www.apm.org.uk/apm-awards/pmo-of-the-year-award/> - House of PMO: <https://houseofpmo.com/> · <https://houseofpmo.com/blog/2022/12/11/pmo-awards/> · <https://houseofpmo.com/event/international-pmo-day-celebrating-pmo-success/>

AI / innovation / community awards - Stevie: <https://stevies-tech.secure-platform.com/> · <https://tech.stevieawards.com/> - BIG AI Excellence: <https://www.bintelligence.com/awards/artificial-intelligence-excellence-awards> · <https://www.bintelligence.com/judging-panels/2025-ai-excellence-awards> · <https://www.bintelligence.com/become-a-judge> - AI Breakthrough: <https://aibreakthroughawards.com/judging-process> · <https://aibreakthroughawards.com/award-categories> · <https://aibreakthroughawards.com/faqs> - GitHub Stars: <https://stars.github.com/program> · <https://stars.github.com/nominate> · <https://stars.github.com/terms/> - Webby Awards: <https://www.webbyawards.com/awarding/> · <https://www.webbyawards.com/eligibility-and-guidelines/> · <https://www.webbyawards.com/about/categories/>

Wave 4 additions (AI-domain awards, source-verified 2026-06-24) - The National AI Awards: <https://thenationalaiawards.com/> · <https://thenationalaiawards.com/about/> · <https://thenationalaiawards.com/awards/> · <https://thenationalaiawards.com/faqs/> · <https://thenationalaiawards.com/winners-2025/> · <https://london.theaisummit.com/latest-news/a-new-awards-partnership-for-2026/> · <https://research.reading.ac.uk/economics/winner-of-the-national-ai-awards-2026/> - Alconics (Informa): <https://newyork.theaisummit.com/aiconics> · <https://newyork.theaisummit.com/latest-news/the-2025-aiconics-awards-north-america-shortlists/> · <https://aibusiness.com/events/the-ai-summit-london> - ITU AI for Good Impact Awards: <https://aiforgood.itu.int/ai-for-good-impact-awards/> · <https://aiforgood.itu.int/application-form/> · <https://aiforgood.itu.int/meet-the-winners-for-the-2025-ai-for-good-impact-awards/> · <https://aiforgood.itu.int/real-world-ai-real-world-impact-meet-the-ai-for-good-impact-awards-2026-finalists/> · Terms and Conditions 2026 PDF (s41721.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Terms-and-Conditions-AI-for-Good-Impact-Awards-2026.pdf) · Innovation Factory (separate USD 20k track): <https://aiforgood.itu.int/about-us/innovation-factory/> - Australian AI Awards: <https://www.australianaiawards.com.au/> · <https://www.australianaiawards.com.au/categories/> · <https://www.australianaiawards.com.au/awards/about> · <https://www.australianaiawards.com.au/awards/methodology> · <https://www.australianaiawards.com.au/awards/judges> · <https://www.australianaiawards.com.au/awards/faqs> · <https://www.australianaiawards.com.au/winners> · <https://australianai.awardsplatform.com/> · <https://www.momentummedia.com.au/insights/australia-s-top-ai-talents-set-to-shine-australian-ai-awards-returns-for-2025>

Wave 2 additions (PMI chapters US + Europe, source-verified 2026-06-24) - PMI UK Chapter: <https://www.pmi.org.uk/awards2022-awards-categories> · <https://www.pmi.org/events/pmi-uk-chapter-national-project-awards> ·

<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/pmi-uk-national-project-awards-pmiuk> ·
<https://projectmanagernews.com/news/pmi-uk-awards/> ·
<https://www.stoneseed.co.uk/stoneseed-and-the-national-project-awards/> - PMI Netherlands Chapter: <https://pmi-nl.nl/judging-process> · <https://pmi-nl.nl/research-awards> · <https://pmi-nl.nl/students> · <https://pmi-nl.nl/blog/ipma-nl-pmi-nl-master-awards> · <https://pmi-nl.nl/blog/pmi-netherlands-celebrates-2023-achievements-at-the-pier-scheveningen-22065> · <https://pmi-nl.nl/blog/dive-into-the-pmi-netherlands-end-of-year-gala-2025-23194> - PMI Sweden Chapter: <https://www.pmi-se.org/Natverk/Young-Professionals/Under-35-Changemaker-Awards-2025> · [/Jury-2025](https://www.pmi-se.org/Volontar/Arets-Volontar) · <https://www.pmi-se.org/Volontar/Arets-Volontar> · <https://williammeller.com/under-35-changemaker-award-2025-on-leadership/> · <https://www.pmi.org/events/pmi-sweden-chapter-passion-for-projects-congress> - PMI Madrid Spain Chapter: <https://pmi-mad.org/eventos/registro-de-eventos/reuniones/premios> · <https://pmi-mad.org/socios/voluntariado/historicoganadores-premio-voluntario-del-ano> · https://pmi-mad.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=171:pmi-msc-premio-proyecto-del-ano-2012&catid=99:socios&Itemid=138 ·
<https://pmi-mad.org/quienes-somos/branches/branch-extremadura/1er-concurso-de-ftm-en-master-de-direccion-y-gestion-de-proyectos-uex> - PMI-SP closure: <https://pmisp.org.br/melhores-do-ano-2025/> ·
Regulamento_Premio_PMI_SP_Projeto_do_Ano_2025_v4.pdf and
Regulamento_Premio_PMI_SP_PMO_do_Ano_2025-v3.pdf (chapter Google Drive: drive.google.com/file/d/1fyn0w9f0zmTa_fV7Unhg_vinzMDwOVli/1aE5loE5NkSrBZpT4Cy0Ss0mEU5mS4MHY) · <https://pmispsummit.com/> - PMI-RIO closure: <https://www.pmirio.org.br/pagina/120/> ·
https://www.pmirio.org.br/uploads/tinymce/files/Regulamento%20PMO%202025_PMI RIO.pdf (Cloudflare-challenged on direct fetch; recovered via the web-search index) · <https://www.sympla.com.br/evento/20-pmi-rio-summit-inteligencia-artificial-a-reinvencao-dos-projetos/2884845> - Chapters with no chapter-run award (negatives): <https://pmisfbac.org/> (San Francisco Bay Area) · <https://pmisv.org/> and <https://java.pmisv.org/> (Silicon Valley; note pmi-svc.org is Sacramento Valley) · <https://pminyc.org/> and the PMIEF scholarship directory (New York City) · <https://pmi-switzerland.ch/> (Switzerland)

Wave 6 additions (IPMA + PMI/PMOGA re-verification, source-verified 2026-06-24) -

IPMA Global Project Excellence Award: <https://awards.ipma.world/> ·
<https://awards.ipma.world/ipma-global-project-excellence-award-largemega-sized-projects/> · <https://awards.ipma.world/ipma-global-project-excellence-award-small-medium-sized-projects/> · <https://awards.ipma.world/faq/> · <https://ipma.world/ipma-standards-development-programme/peb/> (IPMA Project Excellence Baseline) ·
<https://ipma.awardsplatform.com/> (Award Force portal) - PMI Project of the Year category reconciliation (three categories; Sustainability = GPM honorable mention): <https://pmiprofessional.awardsplatform.com/> (entry form, primary; [pmi.org](https://www.pmi.org) HTML returned HTTP 403) · <https://www.pmi.org/about/awards/project-of-the-year> · the 2025 PMI Awards winners release (mirrored via pmworldlibrary.net) - PMOGA six-criteria corroboration: the 2026 PMO of the Year Award Nomination Handbook PDF on [pmi.org](https://www.pmi.org) ("Award Scoring Rubric"); <https://pmoga.pmi.org/pmi-pmo-awards> (HTML 403/404 on

fetch, handbook PDF authoritative) - Source of record for Farhad's report:
docs/awards/incoming/farhad-benchmark.md (transcription) and
~/Downloads/AIPM_AI_Project_of_the_Year_Award_Benchmarking_Report.pdf
(original)

Wave 3 additions (hackathons + commercial/traditional, source-verified 2026-06-24) - CloudFest Hackathon Awards: <https://hackathon.cloudfest.com/hackathon-awards-2026/> · <https://hackathon.cloudfest.com/> · <https://hackathon.cloudfest.com/hackathon-awards/> · <https://hackathon.cloudfest.com/attendee-guide/> · <https://www.cloudfest.com/blog/cloudfest-hackathon-2026-recap> · <https://www.cloudfest.com/charity> (Groundbreaker Talents; charity page says "Sub-Saharan Africa") · <https://openchannels.fm/whats-new-at-cloudfest-hackathon-2026-trends-changes-and-creative-energy/> (the verbatim "100% to Groundbreaker" quote + the EUR 6,000 recap figure) - Hack-Nation (Global AI Hackathon): <https://hack-nation.ai/> (JS-rendered, title only on fetch) · <https://hack-nation.ai/hackathon> · <https://hack-nation.ai/partnership> · <https://hack-nation.devpost.com/> · <https://projects.hack-nation.ai/> · <https://alumcommunity.mit.edu/events/148406> (MIT "Alumni Jury for Global AI Hackathon") · secondary aggregators: opportunitiesforyouth.org, techpression.com, internshala.com, startupresearcher.com · NOT the MIT RAISE / App Inventor "Global AI Hackathon" (raise.mit.edu, a distinct program) - Google Cloud ADK / Multi-Agents Hackathon (Devpost): <https://googlecloudmultiagents.devpost.com/rules> (Official Rules; 50/30/20 weighted rubric; \$50,000 cash pool) · <https://googlecloudmultiagents.devpost.com/> (listing; 33 named judges) · <https://googlecloudmultiagents.devpost.com/updates> ("over 25 judges"; "And the winners are", 14 Jul 2025). The two cloud.google.com ADK blog posts describe a different/earlier broader ADK event and are NOT relied on here. - Global Recognition Awards: <https://globalrecognitionawards.org/> · [/gra-methodology/](https://globalrecognitionawards.org/gra-methodology/) · [/apply-to-be-a-judge/](https://globalrecognitionawards.org/apply-to-be-a-judge/) · [/logo/](https://globalrecognitionawards.org/logo/) · [/about-us/](https://globalrecognitionawards.org/about-us/) · [/pricing-may-2025/](https://globalrecognitionawards.org/pricing-may-2025/) · [/professional-pack/](https://globalrecognitionawards.org/professional-pack/) (\$499 USD) · [/winners-emblem-pack/](https://globalrecognitionawards.org/winners-emblem-pack/) (\$99 USD Digital Certificate) · [/awards-categories/](https://globalrecognitionawards.org/awards-categories/) · [/faq/](https://globalrecognitionawards.org/faq/) · [per-category](https://globalrecognitionawards.org/per-category/) /...-judging-panel-2025/ pages (named judges) · secondary press (unfinishedman.com, techcabal.com) for the PR-only "blockchain"/"69% rejection" claims · trustpilot.com/review/globalrecognitionawards.org (HTTP 403; alleged \$800 judge fee unverified) - PMI awards platform + nomination guide (PROCESS NOTE, §6.8, enriches §3.4/§3.5): <https://www.pmi.org/about/awards/nomination-guide> (Cloudflare 403 to direct fetch; facts via WebSearch extracts) · <https://pmiprofessional.awardsplatform.com/> (Award Force; DataDome captcha) · <https://www.pmi.org/about/awards/professional/nomination-guidelines> · <https://www.pmi.org/about/awards/pmief> (PMIEF Kerzner Award, IIL-sponsored) · <https://www.iil.com/scholarships-and-awards/> (Kerzner prize value up to US \$9,000) · PMI Global Summit 2026 = 21-24 Oct, Detroit (events.pmi.org / venue listings)

Items noted as not publicly disclosed are where the official source was unreachable (404/403/JS-rendered) or silent during research; they are documented, not assumed. The two highest-value v1 gaps (PMI-SP's full regulamento + rubric and PMI-RIO's PMO regulamento PDF) were closed in Wave 2 (see §3.1, §3.2 and §6.6); PMI-RIO's PDF sits behind a Cloudflare

challenge and was recovered via the web-search index, so its per-criterion weights and fee remain open. The remaining items are mostly jury names/sizes (often confidential by design), unpublished numeric weights, the Clube da Programação prize sponsor and payout, hackathon cash-vs-credits and per-edition figures, and details on programs whose official pages 403/404/JS-block automated fetch. Wave 5 (v2 consolidation) merged the per-wave additions into the four-lens structure and re-did the synthesis (§4) and picks (§5); the workstream now moves to Round 2 (concept proposal) and Round 3 (business case). The wave plan is in HANDOFF.md.