



Judges Guide 2010

Round One – Remote Judging
Round Two – Round table discussion

Contact: Aisling Conlon, aisling@iapi.com, or 01 676 5991

Each judge will be given a score sheet with a number of columns on it, representing the key judgment criteria found below. The judges are asked to score each entry based on the criteria below. All of them are important but as this is an effectiveness award, particular weight is put on scale of effect and strength of proof.

“Bonus points” should be added for papers which add something new to our knowledge, or make an original point.

ADFX is based on 80% effectiveness according to the entry, evidence of results which shows beyond reasonable doubt the effectiveness of the choice/s made and use of commercial communications, and 20% on creative work.

At **first round** judges evaluate all elements of an entry, written case and creative executions, on a stand alone basis without comparisons to others in the category.

Round two is carried out by a round table discussion with all judges present. Short-listed entries are judged against other finalists within their category.

Awarding the Grand Prix; all gold winners are then reviewed by the judges and winner will be selected via discussion and consensus.

It is important to note that a judge is not allowed to review and provide a score for any entries that they may have been involved in, and any canvassing of judges will result in disqualification.

Finally, the winners list will be revealed on the 14th of October 2010 in the Shelbourne Hotel.

Judges Criteria 2010

1. Clarity of the case

- Does the paper have a strong and compelling argument that draws you in?
- Is the paper well written, seamless and not require you to flick back and fourth to certain sections?
- Is there a strong use of evidence/data?
- Are strategic and creative solutions clear and concise, the entrant has not assumed that that the reader has prior knowledge of the market or the brand, but they do assume the reader has expert business understanding and financial literacy?
- Has the entrant summarised and presented a clear and concise case, with limited use of Industry jargon?

- The ability to summarise and present a concise case, that yet covers all the bases is a skill in itself and should be rewarded. The submission should be seen as more than just an essay.

2. Scale of task

- What were the challenges faced with the objectives and how did they make their campaign successful?
- Are the sources of any problems noted, e.g. the market, brand, target market, behaviour patterns, budget restrictions, competitors activity, trade issues, lack of experience.
- Were there any insights that stand out as new learning's?
- What were the business and behavioral objectives; these should be clear and logically flow on from one another.
- The strategic response to the objectives should be detailed and comprehensive from creative and media perspectives.
- Who are the targeted audience, was there any insights provided?
- Objectives should be specific, measureable, ambitious, realistic, and clear!

3. Strength of Solution

- Are the strategic, media and/or creative solution imaginative, innovative and impressive?
- Has the entry made reference to their competitors?
- What was the big creative idea?
- What was the media strategy? Have they explained the why and how rather than just the where and when?
- What is the balance between media and creative strategy?
- How does the creative interpretation correspond to the strategic goals?

4. Scale of Effect

- The entry should clearly show as much as possible the effect of the advertising in isolation from other market factors. These market factors should be acknowledged and accounted for.
- An entry that omits competitor activity or market conditions that impact on sales should not be highly rewarded.
- An honest claim stands more of a chance of winning than an impressive entry that ignores the demise of a competitor for example.
- Has ROI been calculated in accordance with the IAPI ADFX definition and math?
- Has PR been given as a scale of effectiveness? This is not a measurable tool in this instance and should not be rewarded as such.

- Entrants into the public service category should also have made reference to measurements of some form to be rewarded. A good example of this is the IPA winning paper BHF Yoobot available on WARC.

5. Strength of Proof

- Has the paper clearly demonstrated that it reached or exceeded the objectives?
- Have they related each objective to each result e.g. for SOV is the first objective then it should be the first result.
- Graphs etc should be included and should be readable and easy to follow.
- All quotes etc... must be referenced otherwise they will be disqualified.
- Have any other factors that contributed to the success of the campaign been accounted for?
- Have they used any econometric modeling to demonstrate the marketing payback?
- If digital has been referred to, has data been provided to support this such as Google trending data?
- What interesting insights and new learning's have been presented in the paper? E.g. The Grand Prix IPA winner, Morrison's noted that their vouchers were exchanging hands on EBay – an insight that fully supports the strategy.
- Quotes from the sales manager are not results and therefore should not be awarded as such.
- If the advertising wasn't successful as objectives stated, has the paper argued what would have happened had the advertising not taken place?
- Has the entry dug deep enough and provided enough data to support all claims?

*The Jury reserves the right to verify all information.

6. Use of channels

- Has the paper clearly demonstrated the why and how of the media strategy rather than just what and where?

Some final questions to keep in mind before you upload your entry;

1. Is the case study clearly developed and does it make sense?
2. Are all the stated objectives covered in the strategy?
3. How good and comprehensive is the evidence supporting the claims made in the entry?
4. How well argued is the Advertising effect?

5. Are other Market factors that you are aware of isolated and accounted for?
6. Does the case study seem realistic?
7. How well does the case study read?
8. Is it concise and to the point?
9. Is there a link between the creative and strategy?
10. Is this great creative?

Good Luck!