

GC Procurement Maturity Self-Assessment

Scorecard Template | BuildVision Research | April 2026

This scorecard provides a structured framework for assessing your organization's procurement maturity across five dimensions. Each dimension is scored 1-5 based on observable capabilities. Your aggregate score maps to the five-stage maturity model from BuildVision's GC Procurement Maturity Landscape.

Score	1 (Ad hoc)	2 (Developing)	3 (Defined)	4 (Managed)	5 (Optimized)
-------	------------	----------------	-------------	-------------	---------------

Dimension 1: Specification Management

How does your organization handle equipment specifications from design documents?

Score	Description	Your score
1	PMs extract specs manually from drawings on a per-project basis. No standard process.	
2	Estimating team extracts specs during preconstruction. Some templates exist but are not enforced.	
3	Dedicated procurement or engineering staff extract specs using a standard checklist. Data is stored in a shared system.	
4	Automated or semi-automated extraction from drawings/specs. Structured data feeds a central equipment database.	
5	Full specification intelligence: automated extraction, historical matching, and substitution recommendations from portfolio data.	

Dimension 2: Vendor Sourcing & OEM Relationships

How does your organization identify and engage equipment vendors and OEMs?

Score	Description	Your score
1	PMs use their own vendor contacts. No corporate vendor list or preferred relationships.	
2	Informal preferred vendor list exists. Some corporate relationships, but not enforced at project level.	
3	Formal preferred vendor program with corporate OEM agreements. Vendors are shortlisted by category.	
4	National OEM accounts with preferred pricing. Vendor performance tracked and reviewed quarterly.	
5	Strategic OEM partnerships with volume commitments, priority allocation, and joint business planning.	

Dimension 3: Bid Management & Evaluation

How does your organization manage the RFQ-to-award process for equipment?

Score	Description	Your score
1	Subcontractors handle all bidding. GC has no visibility into equipment pricing until buyout.	
2	GC occasionally solicits direct quotes on select categories. Comparison is manual (spreadsheets, email).	

3	Standard RFQ process with bid leveling templates. Procurement team manages quotes on priority categories.	
4	Centralized bid management system. All priority categories routed through procurement. Automated leveling.	
5	Portfolio-wide bid intelligence. Historical pricing benchmarks inform negotiations. Real-time visibility into bid status.	

Dimension 4: Award Execution & Tracking

How does your organization execute and track equipment purchase orders?

Score	Description	Your score
1	POs are project-level. No central tracking of equipment orders, delivery, or spend.	
2	ERP captures POs but data is fragmented. No portfolio-level view of equipment spend or delivery status.	
3	Procurement team tracks POs in a shared system. Delivery milestones monitored for priority orders.	
4	Integrated PO management with ERP. Spend analytics by category, vendor, and project. Exception-based alerting.	
5	End-to-end procurement lifecycle management. PO-to-delivery-to-warranty tracking. Automated compliance checks.	

Dimension 5: Data & Decision Infrastructure

How does your organization capture and compound procurement data across projects?

Score	Description	Your score
1	No structured procurement data. Decisions live in email and individual knowledge.	
2	Some data captured in spreadsheets or ERP. Not connected across projects or used for decision-making.	
3	Central repository for procurement data. Historical data referenced for new projects, but not systematically.	
4	Structured equipment database with cross-project analytics. Data informs vendor selection and pricing strategy.	
5	Procurement intelligence platform. Equipment decisions are structured data. Portfolio-wide benchmarks, trends, and predictive analytics.	

Scoring & Interpretation

Aggregate score	Maturity stage	What it means	Priority action
5-8	Stage 1: Decentralized	No procurement function. Equipment decisions are fully project-level.	Hire a Director of Purchasing. Identify your highest-spend equipment category.
9-13	Stage 2: Emerging	Small team building the business case. Visibility without control.	Run 3-5 projects through a centralized process. Track cost variance vs. sub-procured.
14-18	Stage 3: Scaling	Dedicated team with active programs. Ready for OEM partnerships and technology.	Formalize preferred vendor agreements. Deploy procurement workflow infrastructure.
19-22	Stage 4: Federated	Large team with national accounts. Partial system integration.	Integrate procurement data with project systems. Build portfolio-wide analytics.
23-25	Stage 5: Enterprise	Fully centralized subsidiary. Operates independently.	Strategic OEM partnerships at executive level. Procurement as a revenue line.

Your aggregate score

___ / 25

Your maturity stage

Stage ___

Peer benchmark (median)

Stage 2.3

What is at stake

The difference between Stage 2 and Stage 3 is not incremental. It is the difference between a procurement team that adds headcount to cover more projects and one that scales with data. Across the 15 GCs in our research sample, we estimate \$7.3 billion in addressable procurement volume that currently flows through subcontractors instead of GC-controlled purchasing. At a 5% margin capture rate, that represents \$365 million in annual margin that GCs are leaving on the table.

Get a validated score.

This self-assessment provides directional guidance. BuildVision's Preliminary Procurement Diagnostic is a two-week engagement that produces a validated maturity score, equipment spend analysis across your active projects, and a peer benchmarking report against the GCs in our research index.

The diagnostic fee (\$35,000) is credited in full toward a Phase 1 engagement.

Contact Victor Muchiri | victor@buildvision.io | buildvision.io

This scorecard is based on the BuildVision GC Procurement Maturity Landscape (April 2026), a research index covering 15 enterprise GCs representing \$114B in combined annual construction volume.