



Reviewer code and conflicts policy

Version 1.0 | 13 October 2026

Assessment depends on relevant expertise and freedom from interests that could affect a particular decision. The programme's reviewer requirements, conflict checks and separation from purchasing apply to every entry.

Expertise matched to the product

Reviewer appointments consider professional experience, knowledge of the product field and the ability to evaluate relevant evidence. For each entry, the two initial reviewers must together cover the technical subject, methods and use context. Reviewers are selected for experience relevant to the product and its supporting evidence.

The review chair checks the application of the criteria and the reasons for the outcome. Specialist advice or a third assessment is obtained when the rules require it.

Interests that must be disclosed

Reviewers disclose current employment, ownership interests and relevant employment, consulting or collaboration in the preceding three years. They also disclose close personal relationships, significant competitive interests, disputes and other circumstances that could reasonably affect impartiality.

An authorised person without the relevant conflict decides whether a reviewer can take the assignment, needs a restriction or must be replaced. Reviewers do not grant themselves an exemption. A new interest discovered during review must be reported promptly.

Independent initial assessments

Reviewers submit their own scores and reasons before seeing the other assessment. The chair records how differences are resolved. Neither the applicant's size nor its association membership provides points or an exemption from an evidence requirement.

Separation from purchases and funding

Reviewers are not shown orders for trophies, printed certificates or labels. Purchasing staff cannot change scores, decisions or register placement. No sponsor may nominate a guaranteed winner, buy a judging outcome or receive confidential applicant material through its support of the programme.

Entry, assessment and standard award materials are free. Optional physical-item purchases are handled separately and give no assessment advantage.

Confidentiality and contact

Reviewers may use the entry materials only for their assigned programme work. They must not disclose it to unauthorised people, use it for their own business or upload confidential material to unauthorised external services.

Questions to applicants go through the awards team. Contact the awards team about a current entry; private approaches to assigned reviewers are not permitted.



Reviewer information and accountability

Reviewer appointments and conflict declarations are held by IAHPM. Applicants can report a concern about the independence of an assessment through the awards team. If you believe a relevant interest has affected a case, provide the entry reference or Award ID and the facts you want considered.

[Read the award rules](#) · [Raise a concern](#)

Accepting an assignment

Confirm that you have the relevant competence, time and access needed. Declare interests before opening the entry. If your knowledge covers only part of the assignment, identify the gap rather than assuming another reviewer will resolve it. Do not delegate a review without programme authorisation.

Use the current rubric and the assigned entry snapshot. Record which reports support each material finding. Separate evidence-based conclusions from assumptions and identify uncertainty. Do not seek to achieve a target award rate.

Handling questions and disagreements

Send factual questions through the case manager. Do not promise an applicant an outcome, recommend a paid service as a condition of passing, or accept a gift related to the entry. Record any attempted private influence.

Submit the initial assessment before seeing other scores. During moderation, explain disagreements in terms of evidence and criteria. A chair may ask for correction of an error; any changed rating and reason must remain traceable to the original assessment.

Protecting information

Use the authorised review workspace. Download material only where needed and allowed. Do not forward access links, store copies in personal shared folders or use applicant material in teaching, publications or commercial work without separate permission. Remove local working copies when the assignment ends under programme instructions.

Report suspected unauthorised access or misdirected material promptly through the programme's incident route. Do not contact the affected applicant independently unless authorised to do so.

Conflict decisions

A declaration records the relationship, dates, involved organisations, nature of the interest and any proposed restriction. The authorised conflict manager records the decision and reason. Current employment by the applicant, a direct financial interest in its success, or a close relationship affecting the case normally requires recusal.

Expertise may involve past industry contact; disclosure allows the relevance to be assessed. A superficial relationship is not automatically equivalent to a disqualifying conflict, but undisclosed material interests undermine the assessment and may require a fresh review.

Completion and accountability

Sign the assessment with your programme identity and date. Keep evidence references and reasoning sufficient for moderation and a possible appeal. The programme may investigate departures from this code, remove an assignment, require reassessment or end an appointment, with the relevant facts recorded.

An appeal must not be decided solely by the person whose work is challenged. Reviewer cooperation with a case does not confer authority to decide it.