

# Vendor Evaluation Scorecard

A companion resource for The Enterprise Video Production Playbook by William Cook

**Purpose:** Compare production partners against the difficult parts of the actual job.

**Use when:** Selection criteria can be agreed before proposals are scored.

**Owner:** The buyer or sourcing lead, with input from the business, production and risk owners.

**Not for:** Converting unsupported claims into proof or allowing a weighted total to override a failed gate.

Set weights before proposals are scored. Make the total equal 100.

## Scoring scale

| Score | Meaning                                           |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------|
| 0     | Not addressed or contradicted by the response     |
| 1     | Material weakness or unsupported assertion        |
| 2     | Partial answer with important gaps                |
| 3     | Credible answer that meets the requirement        |
| 4     | Strong, specific answer with relevant proof       |
| 5     | Exceptional fit supported by clear proof and plan |

## Weighted criteria

| Criterion                                   | Weight | Vendor score 0-5 | Weighted result                           | Evidence / concern |
|---------------------------------------------|--------|------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Understanding of business job and audience  | [ ]    | [ ]              | $(\text{weight} \times \text{score}) / 5$ | [ ]                |
| Relevant finished work and case proof       | [ ]    | [ ]              | [ ]                                       | [ ]                |
| Creative approach                           | [ ]    | [ ]              | [ ]                                       | [ ]                |
| Production plan and schedule                | [ ]    | [ ]              | [ ]                                       | [ ]                |
| Proposed team and senior ownership          | [ ]    | [ ]              | [ ]                                       | [ ]                |
| Enterprise procurement and access readiness | [ ]    | [ ]              | [ ]                                       | [ ]                |
| Participant and interview approach          | [ ]    | [ ]              | [ ]                                       | [ ]                |

| Criterion                                   | Weight     | Vendor score 0-5 | Weighted result | Evidence / concern |
|---------------------------------------------|------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Post-production, versions and accessibility | [ ]        | [ ]              | [ ]             | [ ]                |
| Commercial clarity                          | [ ]        | [ ]              | [ ]             | [ ]                |
| Working fit and communication               | [ ]        | [ ]              | [ ]             | [ ]                |
| <b>Total</b>                                | <b>100</b> |                  | [ ] / 100       |                    |

## Evidence questions

### Understanding

- Does the response restate the job accurately?
- Does it distinguish the primary audience and channel?
- Which assumption would materially change the plan?

### Proof

- Is the proof relevant to the difficult part of this job?
- Can the vendor explain the constraint and its role?
- Is agency-mediated or partial-scope work labeled accurately?

### Team

- Who will actually run the project?
- Which roles are confirmed?
- What responsibility does each proposed role protect?
- Does senior ownership remain after award?

### Plan

- Are creative, pre-production, production, post and approval responsibilities clear?
- Does the schedule include client and procurement dependencies?
- Are contingencies tied to the important risk?

### Commercial clarity

- Can the price be traced to scope?
- Are optional items, exclusions and rights clear?
- How are revisions and new requests handled?

## Reference questions

1. Did the team surface risks early?
2. Did actual scope remain consistent with the proposal?
3. Who stayed involved after award?
4. How did the team respond when the plan changed?
5. Was the set organized and respectful?
6. How was feedback managed?
7. What would you clarify earlier next time?

## Non-scored gates

A high total does not override a failed requirement.

- ■ Approved supplier path is workable.
- ■ Required insurance is available.
- ■ Schedule can meet the immovable date.
- ■ Security and location requirements are accepted.
- ■ Conflicts of interest disclosed.
- ■ Rights and intended use can be supported.

## Decision record

Selected vendor: [   ]

Reason: [   ]

Material trade-off accepted: [   ]

Open condition before award: [   ]

Decision owner / date: [   ]

---

From *The Enterprise Video Production Playbook* by William Cook. Published by Luma Creative. Adapt this working document to your organization's requirements.

Use this worksheet with the book's chapter guidance and the requirements of your organization. It is not legal, tax, insurance or procurement advice.

© 2026 William Cook. Companion resource published by Luma Creative. [lumacreative.com/enterprise-video-production-playbook/](https://lumacreative.com/enterprise-video-production-playbook/)