

WWRGD General Contractor Risk Scoring Matrix

WWRGD

Worldwide Responsible General Development

GENERAL CONTRACTOR RISK SCORING MATRIX

Quantitative Risk Evaluation Framework for General Contractor Vendors

Document ID

Version

Effective Date

Classification

WWRGD-RSM-GC-001

v2.0

January 1, 2025

CONFIDENTIAL

SCOPE & PURPOSE

This matrix provides a standardized, quantitative framework for evaluating General Contractor (GC) vendor risk. It applies to all GC vendors bidding on or engaged in construction, renovation, infrastructure, or capital improvement projects for WWRGD. The 400-point scoring system, six weighted risk categories, and four-tier risk classification enable consistent, defensible, and comparable GC vendor assessments across the WWRGD project portfolio. This document is the companion scoring guide to the WWRGD Enhanced GC RFI (WWRGD_Enhanced_GC_RFI.xlsx).

APPLIES TO

All General Contractor vendors — construction, renovation, infrastructure, and capital improvement projects

COMPANION DOCUMENT

WWRGD Enhanced GC RFI | WWRGD_Enhanced_GC_RFI.xlsx

SECTION A Critical Risk Indicators (Automatic Disqualification)

The following indicators represent conditions that require immediate escalation and may result in automatic disqualification from General Contractor consideration, regardless of composite scoring. Any single failure should trigger review by the appropriate approval authority.

Critical Risk Indicator

Threshold / Disqualifying Condition

Status Check

Active Litigation

Pending or active litigation exceeding \$5,000,000

& Pass / & Fail

OSHA Violations

Willful or Repeat citations within the past 3 years

& Pass / & Fail

Financial Distress

Negative cash flow, covenant violations, bankruptcy filing, or formal insolvency

& Pass / & Fail

Debarment Status

Any active federal, state, or local debarment or exclusion from public contracts

& Pass / & Fail

Safety Metrics

EMR > 1.2 or TRIR > 3.0 (3-year rolling average)

& Pass / & Fail

Bond Capacity

Bonding capacity insufficient for project size or scope requirements

& Pass / & Fail

License Status

Expired, suspended, or revoked contractor licenses required for project work

& Pass / & Fail

NOTE: A "Fail" on any indicator above requires immediate escalation to VP/Executive level before proceeding with scoring. Critical Risk Indicators are evaluated independently of the composite scoring in Sections B–F.

SECTION B Weighted Risk Categories

Each of the six risk categories below is assigned a weight reflecting its relative importance to overall General Contractor risk. Scores are assigned on a 1–4 scale for each category (see Section C for detailed rubrics). The maximum composite score is 400 points.

Risk Category

Weight

Max Score

Rationale

Financial Stability

25%

100 pts

Highest impact on project completion ability and long-term contractor viability

Safety Performance

20%

80 pts

Critical to WWRGD liability exposure, workforce protection, and project site safety obligations

Quality / Performance History

20%

80 pts

Direct indicator of the contractor's ability to deliver to agreed specifications, timelines, and quality standards

Operational Capacity

15%

60 pts

Ensures the contractor has sufficient bandwidth, workforce, and equipment to execute the project alongside existing commitments

Compliance Record

10%

40 pts

Regulatory, legal, and contractual compliance risk mitigation across all applicable jurisdictions and industry standards

Technology Capabilities

10%

40 pts

Efficiency, modern project management platforms, BIM/VR capabilities, and cybersecurity posture

TOTAL

100%

400 pts

Maximum Composite Score

SECTION C Detailed Scoring Rubrics (1–4 Scale)

For each category, assign a score of 1 (Poor), 2 (Fair), 3 (Good), or 4 (Excellent) based on the criteria below. Use the highest fully-met score level; partial credit within a band is not applicable.

C1. Financial Stability 25% weight

Score

Level

Criteria

4

Excellent

D/E ratio < 0.5; EMR < 0.85; bond capacity >150% of project value; audited financials with clean opinion for 3+ consecutive years

3

Good

D/E ratio 0.5–1.0; EMR 0.85–1.0; adequate bonding with modest margin; audited or reviewed financials with minor audit findings

2

Fair

D/E ratio 1.0–2.0; EMR 1.0–1.2; limited bonding capacity relative to project value; some financial concerns or qualified audit opinions

1

Poor

D/E ratio > 2.0; EMR > 1.2; bonding issues or inability to bond; significant financial stress, negative equity, or adverse audit findings

C2. Safety Performance 20% weight

Score

Level

Criteria

4

Excellent

TRIR < 1.0; zero serious OSHA violations in the past 3 years; comprehensive written safety program with proactive safety culture and dedicated safety officer

3

Good

TRIR 1.0–2.0; minor violations only (no willful/repeat); documented safety program with regular employee training and incident review processes

2

Fair

TRIR 2.0–3.0; some serious violations with documented remediation; basic safety compliance meeting minimum OSHA requirements

1

Poor

TRIR > 3.0; willful or repeat OSHA violations; inadequate or non-existent safety program; pattern of workplace incidents

C3. Quality / Performance History 20% weight

Score

Level

Criteria

4

Excellent

Cost Performance Index (CPI) > 0.95; Schedule Performance Index (SPI) > 0.95; defect rate < 5%; 90%+ client retention rate on completed projects

3

Good

CPI 0.90–0.95; SPI 0.90–0.95; defect rate 5–10%; client retention rate 75–90%; minor punch-list items resolved promptly

2

Fair

CPI 0.85–0.90; SPI 0.85–0.90; defect rate 10–15%; client retention rate 60–75%; recurring quality issues with documented remediation

1

Poor

CPI < 0.85; SPI < 0.85; defect rate > 15%; client retention < 60%; history of project failures, claims, or terminated contracts

C4. Operational Capacity 15% weight

Score

Level

Criteria

4

Excellent

Current capacity utilization < 70%; deep bench strength in key trades and project management; proven scalability with documented ability to staff up rapidly

3

Good

Capacity utilization 70–85%; adequate staffing for project requirements; some scalability with subcontractor relationships or temp workforce options

2

Fair

Capacity utilization 85–95%; limited bench strength; capacity concerns may affect project start dates or milestone delivery

1

Poor

Capacity utilization > 95%; no meaningful bench strength; contractor is overextended across multiple projects; high risk of workforce or equipment shortfalls

C5. Compliance Record 10% weight

Score

Level

Criteria

4

Excellent

Zero regulatory violations in the past 5 years; proactive compliance management program; third-party compliance audits completed; no open enforcement actions

3

Good

Minor violations only (fully remediated); documented compliance program; active license and insurance maintenance; no pattern of non-compliance

2

Fair

Some violations with documented remediation plans; basic compliance meeting minimum regulatory requirements; some lapses in insurance or licensing maintenance

1

Poor

Significant violations or pattern of non-compliance; inadequate compliance program; open enforcement actions; lapses in required licenses or insurance

C6. Technology Capabilities 10% weight

Score

Level

Criteria

4

Excellent

BIM/VR capabilities; Procore proficiency (or equivalent tier-1 PM platform); SOC 2 certified or equivalent cybersecurity posture; advanced real-time reporting and dashboard capabilities

3

Good

Standard project management software in use; basic cybersecurity controls; adequate reporting and document management; capable of integrating with WWRGD systems

2

Fair

Limited technology adoption; basic or fragmented PM tools; minimal security measures; reporting requires significant manual effort

1

Poor

Primarily paper-based processes; no meaningful cybersecurity program; unable to provide electronic reporting, RFI tracking, or document control

SECTION D Risk Level Definitions

The composite score maps to one of four risk tiers. These thresholds drive approval authority, required actions, and contract enhancements (see Section F). Risk levels are consistent across the WWRGD vendor evaluation framework to enable cross-portfolio comparability.

Composite Score Range

Risk Level

Color Code

Decision Framework

320–400 pts (80–100%)

LOW RISK

+\$ GREEN

APPROVE — Category Manager authorization; standard MSA terms; routine monitoring

240–319 pts (60–79%)

MEDIUM RISK

+\$ YELLOW

CONDITIONAL APPROVAL — Director level authorization; enhanced monitoring required; quarterly reviews

160–239 pts (40–59%)

HIGH RISK

+\$ ORANGE

EXECUTIVE REVIEW REQUIRED — VP/Executive authorization; weekly reporting; dedicated oversight assigned

< 160 pts (< 40%)

CRITICAL RISK

+\$ RED

NOT RECOMMENDED — Disqualify; formal rejection letter issued; 12-month waiting period for re-application

SECTION E Calculation Methodology

Follow this five-step process to calculate a composite risk score for each General Contractor vendor under evaluation:

Step

Description

Step 1: Screen for Critical Risk Indicators

Review all seven indicators in Section A. Any single "Fail" result triggers automatic escalation to VP/Executive level. Do not proceed with composite scoring until Section A review is complete and documented.

Step 2: Score Each Category (1–4 Scale)

Using the rubrics in Section C, assign a score of 1 (Poor), 2 (Fair), 3 (Good), or 4 (Excellent) for each of the six risk categories. Document your evidence basis for each score in the vendor file.

Step 3: Apply Category Weights

Multiply each category score by its assigned weight percentage to calculate the weighted score for that category. Weights are defined in Section B.

Step 4: Calculate the Composite Score (Max 400)

Sum all six weighted scores to arrive at the composite score. The maximum achievable score is 400 points (all categories rated Excellent × 100%).

Step 5: Map to Risk Level

Using the threshold table in Section D, identify which risk tier the composite score falls into. Apply the corresponding decision framework from Section F.

WORKED EXAMPLE — General Contractor Evaluation

Scenario: WWRGD is evaluating a mid-market General Contractor for a \$12M commercial renovation project. Following full RFI review, site visit, and reference checks, the following scores were assigned:

Section A Result: All 7 Critical Risk Indicators passed — scoring proceeds.

Risk Category

Score (1–4)

Weight

Weighted Score

Score Basis

Financial Stability

3

25%

75 pts

D/E ratio 0.8; EMR 0.92; adequate bonding; reviewed financials

Safety Performance

4

20%

80 pts

TRIR 0.7; zero serious violations 3 yrs; dedicated safety officer

Quality / Performance History

3

20%

60 pts

CPI 0.93; SPI 0.91; 7% defect rate; 82% client retention

Operational Capacity

3

15%

45 pts

78% utilization; adequate crew; some scalability demonstrated

Compliance Record

4

10%

40 pts

Zero violations 5 yrs; proactive compliance program; annual audits

Technology Capabilities

2

10%

20 pts

Basic PM software; limited BIM; minimal cybersecurity controls

COMPOSITE TOTAL

100%

320 pts

LOW RISK — Green Tier

' RESULT: The contractor scores 320 out of 400 points (80%), placing it in the LOW RISK (Green) tier. Category Manager may approve under standard MSA terms. Recommended monitoring: quarterly progress reviews, SLA compliance tracking, and annual re-scoring at contract renewal.

SECTION F Decision-Making Framework

The following framework maps composite scores to approval authorities, required actions, and contract enhancements. All decisions must be documented in the vendor file and linked to this scoring matrix.

Risk Level

Approval Authority

Required Actions

Contract Enhancements

Re-Application

LOW RISK

320–400 pts

Category Manager

- Standard due diligence review
- Annual re-scoring at renewal
- Quarterly business reviews

- Standard MSA terms
- Standard retainage rates

N/A — Not Required

MEDIUM RISK

240–319 pts

Director Level

- Enhanced monitoring program
- Quarterly reviews required
- Semi-annual re-scoring
- Performance bonds required
- Parent guarantees where applicable
- Enhanced insurance requirements

Eligible after 6 months with documented improvements

HIGH RISK

160–239 pts

VP / Executive

- Weekly progress reporting
- Dedicated WWRGD oversight officer
- Monthly executive review
- Quarterly re-scoring mandatory
- Increased retainage (10%+)
- Milestone-based payment schedule
- Reduced scope; limit new awards
- Performance and payment bonds mandatory

Eligible after 12 months with significant documented improvements

CRITICAL RISK

< 160 pts

DISQUALIFY

- Issue formal rejection letter
- Document disqualification basis
- Notify VP/Executive and Legal

N/A — Not Applicable

12-month mandatory waiting period; full re-qualification required

NOTE: Critical Risk vendors must observe a mandatory 12-month waiting period before re-applying. Re-application requires full re-qualification under the current version of this matrix, submission of documented corrective actions, and VP/Executive approval to enter the evaluation queue.

WWRGD General Contractor Risk Scoring Matrix | Document ID: WWRGD-RSM-GC-001 | Version 2.0

Companion to: WWRGD Enhanced GC RFI (WWRGD_Enhanced_GC_RFI.xlsx) | Effective Date: January 1, 2025