



CIVIL CONTRACTORS FEDERATION
EARTH AWARDS
Excellence in Civil Construction

2026 CIVIL CONTRACTORS FEDERATION EARTH AWARDS SUBMISSION GUIDELINES



STATE/TERRITORY AWARDS EVENT COORDINATOR DETAILS	
Contact Name	
Contact Phone/s	
Contact Email	
Postal Address	

SUBMISSION CLOSING DATE

PAYMENT DETAILS

STATE/TERRITORY AWARDS EVENT DETAILS	
Event Name	
Event Date	
Event Location	

N.B. All winners from state/territory Earth Awards ceremonies automatically become eligible finalists in the National Earth Awards which will be held in Canberra on Friday 27 November 2026.



2026 SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

The maximum word count for the submission is 8000 words (1000 of which should be made up of the project overview), allowing entrants to address particular criteria as they see fit. However, it is important that you accurately describe how the project addresses each of the criteria. Entries which depart from the criteria or fail to answer the specific information requested may be marked down or disregarded. It is important to note that the Earth Awards is not about awarding prizes to projects. Rather, it is awarding excellence in project **delivery**.

Project Overview

This overview section should include a concise summary of up to 1000 words of the project that succinctly describes the project and its most noteworthy features. It should highlight all of the key aspects covered in the remainder of the submission. It might help if this section was the last to be completed.

Entry submissions must include:

- Project name – as it would appear on an awards certificate.
- Project value (Final Value including variations and GST).
- Role of company.
- Name of entrant – if this is an alliance, then list the names of the companies that make up the alliance. If there are joint entrants, then clearly identify the companies involved.
- Roles and names of consultants and the principal – where an entry is from more than one party, the entry should clearly state the names of all the partners involved.
- Project description including: type, size, total cost, impact on the community; and project specific actions relevant to the evaluation criteria.
- Concise and specific details of the project cost and timing schedule (including completion date).
- Client requirements, which should be limited to major considerations.
- Where relevant - a statement from the client on how well the project met its needs, time requirements and budget constraints.
- Description of features and solutions that indicate meritorious and/or
- innovative construction and/or environmental solutions, as distinguished from what would be regarded as standard construction practice and professional competence.
- Any images that are of relevance to the submission (i.e., before, during and after progress shots) that should be considered in the judging process must be included in the body of the submission (as well as being provided as separate files accompanying the submission).



Photographs/Video

- Wherever possible / practicable, entrants should support their entry with photos (before, during and after) which demonstrate the progress of the project.
- Your submission is to be provided electronically and contain a minimum of 25 high resolution digital photos (for finalist videos) and/or a video no longer than 30 seconds. Each state/territory will confirm how they wish to receive their submissions.
- By signing the privacy and confidentiality form and providing this to CCF the entrant gives permission to CCF to use images and content for marketing and the promotion of the Earth Awards. Entrants are requested to identify material where they wish to withhold permission (marked confidential – not for publication).

Awards Finalist Video Requirements

To assist with the coordination of the finalist videos to be played at each state/territory events, entrants are required to submit the following:

1. A selection of 25 photos (jpeg or png files only; no pdf accepted) to be used in each finalist video. Filename for each photo needs to be numbered between 1 to 25 to indicate the sequence which the photos are to be displayed in the video (1 is start and 25 finish). Please note that not all images may be used. We recommend landscape, not portrait. Any supplied with a date and/or name stamp or logo will not be used.
2. Entrants are required to supply a video narrative of 100 words to fit the 30 second video. This will be used as the voice-over for the video. The narrative is to be in **third person only** and is to be one consecutive paragraph as it would be read. Please do not provide any dot points.
3. Some key point to consider including in the narrative are provided below:
 - a. A brief outline of the project:
 - i. Who engaged you
 - ii. Overview of the scope of works you were engaged to deliver (not the whole project unless they are one and the same)
 - b. The challenges/problems encountered, and what you did to overcome them
 - c. Project outcomes in terms of budget (over/under/on – specifics not essential), schedule, quality, safety, and if relevant, environment.

Further Tips:

- Don't assume the narrator will know what the acronym means so do NOT use an acronym unless that's the way you want it said.



- Word limit is to be strictly adhered to – we cannot accept any more. This is in addition to the original submission word count.

To give you a better idea, we have included below an example of well-structured awards video narrative below:

“XXX Council engaged [company name] to design and construct a pathway to complete a missing pedestrian link on the river foreshore. The pathway consisted of a 500 metre long, lightweight and precast boardwalk and two new sets of stairs. The scope of works included a difficult excavation, disposal of highly contaminated soil, ground stabilisation, piers and ground anchors, precast and in-situ concrete construction, installation of prefabricated steelwork, and landscaping. River transport logistics and coordination was challenging, with strict environment considerations. Other challenges included tight tolerances in boardwalk design, working in water and the tight timeframe for the project”.

Submission Criteria

Submissions will be assessed against the following criteria:	
1. Project and Construction Management (30%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project planning and management • Construction excellence and industry best practice • Technical complexities • Project timing/milestones and budgets 	5. Safety Management (10%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning management and outcomes
2. Innovation (20%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovation concept and implementation 	6. Environment Management (10%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning management and outcomes
3. People Development and Training (10%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiatives/programmes/recognition 	7. Stakeholders Management (10%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning management and outcomes.
4. Quality Management (10%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning management and outcomes 	



Earth Awards Judging

Each state/territory office is responsible for the selection of their Earth Award judging panel. All submissions are judged according to the same criteria. Following the completion of each state/territory Earth Awards judging, successful finalist will be notified. To be a finalist your award submission/s must reach a minimum score of 50% and a minimum of 20% for each section of the judging criteria.

Only one winner will be selected for each category value for each state/territory Earth Awards. Judging sheets will not be provided at any time. Feedback can be requested, however will only be provided if agreed to by the state/territory Chief Judge. Requests for feedback should be made directly to the relevant state/territory office.

At no point in time during the Earth Awards nomination and/or judging process or following the award announcements should a nominee contact an appointed state/territory or national judge to discuss their Earth Awards nomination/s. Failure to comply with this will result in the nominee's submission/s being excluded from judging. All judges are required to complete a conflict-of-interest form.

Judging Protocol

The Earth Awards Judging Protocol below explains the process of how each state/territory CCF office manages the judging of Earth Awards to maintain consistency:

- Judging is a process governed by the rules, proforma and criteria set in the first instance by CCF National.
- Each state/territory CCF office approved their award judges with the National Earth Awards judging panel have representation from selected state/territories.
- Judging process is an independent process to each state/territory CCF office. State/territory and National CCF staff are not involved in the judging process in anyway.
- Local CCF staff are available to assist when clarification is required only during the judging process.
- Judging is initially carried out at a state/territory level and comprises a review of the entry submission and potentially engagement directly by the state/territory judging panel. Site visits will not be expected to be conducted as part of the judging process.
- All judges are required to complete a Conflict-of-Interest Form as part of their involvement in the awards.



Judging Scale Descriptors

To ensure consistency with judging in each state/territory, CCF has established a group of descriptors to define the ratings given. These descriptors are provided below.

For Score(s) < 5

1. Fails to fulfill submission criteria (too many words; inappropriate format; project dates outside of timeline nominated, etc). Generally, such submissions are eliminated from further judging as a non-conforming submission.
2. Fails to address nominated information requests (Doesn't answer questions).
3. Demonstrates a fundamental lack of understanding of skills being sought (Project Management, Safety, Quality, etc).
4. Would benefit from specific feedback before any future submission(s).

For Score of 5

1. Only just answers nominated questions e.g. no real specifics, extremely high-level descriptions, uses some 'buzz phrases' only but doesn't demonstrate an appropriate understanding of their significance.
2. No metrics or graphics provided to validate points being made.
3. Minimal supporting material provided within submission.
4. Apparent that little overall effort made for content of submission.

For Score of 6

1. Answers questions but with very 'motherhood' descriptions, e.g. extremely qualitative, high-level, with a fair bit of unimportant 'waffle'.
2. Occasional metrics but poorly presented and no clear significance to supporting text.
3. Unclear definition of specific roles and responsibilities of parties involved in project.
4. Submission not well structured and confusing to read.
5. Doesn't demonstrate a sound understanding of 'professional' approach to issue.



6. Provides photos but unlabelled and no apparent relevance to text surrounding them.
7. Fails to clearly demonstrate effective delivery performance.

For Score of 7

1. Does address questions but presents 'innovations' and 'challenges' that should have been expected for a contractor with this type of project.
2. Presents 'Business As Usual' responses for this type of project.
3. Doesn't demonstrate clearly that this contractor has delivered a 'special' outcome e.g. a road project submission that focuses almost entirely on its traffic staging planning.
4. Occasional metrics and graphics are provided to demonstrate performance measurements.
5. Provides appropriately labelled photos relevant to text surrounding them.
6. A well-delivered project but no real 'stand-out' project features detailed in the submission.

For Score of 8

1. Clearly demonstrates a sound understanding of professional project management e.g. Project Structure Org Charts, Risk-based delivery planning, appropriate project scheduling details provided.
2. All requested information is succinctly provided in an easy-to-read presentation format.
3. Frequent metrics and graphics are provided to demonstrate actual performance as evidence-based e.g. training hours, Quality/Safety/Environmental lots, audits, and Non-compliance reports.
4. Stakeholder management matrix provided, along with effective communications.
5. Provides labelled photos relevant to text surrounding them that highlight delivery aspects.
6. Some local community engagement and stakeholder management.



For Score of 9

1. All above characteristics plus demonstrated ability to overcome unforeseeable project challenges that arose during delivery with minimal impacts on Schedule and budget outcomes for project.
2. High level of project complexity addressed through risk-based planning and execution.
3. Metrics and graphics provided for each of nominated criteria, succinctly provided and demonstrating exceptional delivery performance.
4. Genuine innovation identified and delivered for benefit of company and industry.
5. Clear demonstration of company improvement through project delivery capability, staff training, reputation etc.
6. Good use of supporting information e.g. graphics and labelled photos relevant to text.
7. Genuine contribution to local community outcomes during delivery.
8. Specific case studies included to highlight delivery excellence, with client/community testimonials.
9. Submission contains some 'wow factor' to differentiate project delivery from typical.

For Score of 10

1. All above characteristics +.
2. This submission must demonstrate rare excellence to achieve this score.
3. Information sought must be succinctly provided, clearly presented, well supported and could be a 'stand-alone' demonstration submission to others.
4. Innovation must have some clearly apparent 'wow factor' with learning for industry achieved.

Criteria Checklist

In line with the criteria list above, CCF has provided a checklist for entrants to use when developing their submission. The questions provided below are a sample only of what could be included in your submission.



Project and Construction Management

- How did you approach the project's delivery planning?
- How did you identify and address the project's anticipated complexities?
- What were your major scheduling milestones e.g., tender, award, critical deliverable dates, any separable portion dates, practical completion date, any approved time extensions, etc?
- What were the project's major financial indicators (incl GST) e.g., at award, approved variations, completed price?
- What challenges arose during project delivery that required you to adjust your delivery planning?
- What aspects of this project stretched your company's previous performances and how did you manage those aspects?
- How did you measure the successful delivery of this project and what are you most proud of about this project?
- What legacies did your delivery of this project leave for your company, your people, our industry, and the local community?

Innovation

- What did you identify about this project that would require you to move beyond your 'Business as Usual' approach?
- How did you identify project delivery issues that would require special attention and how did you address those issues?
- Did your project delivery involve any aspects of design, materials, technologies, construction procedures, or outcomes that were the first time for either your company, local industry, local community, or our country?
- How did you establish and measure the level of influence of the innovations you adopted on the overall project's delivery?
- What legacies do you believe the innovations you adopted for this project has delivered for your company and/or our industry?

People Development and Training

- How did you identify the specific training requirements for you to deliver this project?
- How did you measure the implementation of the required training regime?
- How did you measure the effectiveness of the implemented training regime?
- What, if any, additional training did you implement during the delivery of the project?
- What legacies have resulted for your company, your people, and the community because of your project's training regime?



Quality Management

- What Quality Management System (QMS) did you adopt for the delivery of this project?
- How did you establish the effectiveness of your adopted QMS?
- What adjustments, if any, did you need to make to your QMS during the delivery of the project and why?
- How did your QMS contribute to the success of this project?
- What relationship, if any, existed between your QMS, and those adopted for your Safety and Environmental Management?

Safety Management

- What Safety Management System (SMS) did you adopt for the delivery of this project?
- How did you identify and manage any project-specific safety risks for this project?
- How did you measure the effectiveness of the Safety Management System you implemented for this project?
- How did your SMS contribute to the success of this project?
- Are there any SMS case studies from this project you would like to highlight?

Environmental Management

- What Environmental Management System (EMS) did you adopt for the delivery of this project?
- How did you identify and manage any project-specific environmental risks for this project?
- How did you measure the effectiveness of the EMS you implemented for this project?
- Are there any EMS case studies from this project you would like to highlight?
- What legacies did this project leave for its local community because of your EMS?

Stakeholder Management

- How did you identify the relevant stakeholders associated with this project?
- How did you establish the requirements of those project stakeholders?
- How did you manage the stakeholders for this project during its delivery?
- How did you measure the effectiveness of your stakeholder management processes?
- Were you able to obtain any testimonials from key stakeholders for this project?