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Effective project delivery meets or exceeds owner’s expectations for schedule, cost and quality. There is an emerging body of research that shows more collaborative/integrated delivery is more likely to lead to successful outcomes and high-level team performance. Within that context, this survey takes a snapshot of current perceptions of effectiveness on projects using multiparty agreements, the most formal and contractually binding of the integrated delivery methods.

Conducted by the University of Minnesota and sponsored by Canada’s Integrated Project Delivery Alliance, the goal of this survey was to understand the current state of Integrated Project Delivery (IPD).

This goal was pursued through use of a broad-based comparative survey. Each survey response collected data for one IPD project from one respondent’s experience. If the respondent had multiple IPD project experience, they could take the survey multiple times, entering data for one project each time. Individual stakeholders on the same project could be matched by project name during the data analysis. For the purpose of this survey, IPD was defined as a multi-party agreement.

The survey was short and required no preparation. With one specific IPD project in mind, respondents began the survey by verifying the use of a multiparty agreement (those with other types of agreement were thanked and survey ended). For those who confirmed multiparty, survey gathered basic demographic data about the respondent and their project, followed by three questions:

- Comparison of this IPD experience with non-IPD project experience
- The meeting of expectations on this project
- Likelihood of future use of IPD
Key Findings

Significantly Positive
• Responses are significantly positive, strongly supportive of IPD as a superior delivery method.
• Distribution of responses is weighted heavily toward the most positive possible answers, not clustered around the neutral point.
• The overwhelmingly positive response is consistent across all demographics: stakeholder type, project type, project progress, project averages, and past respondent experience.

Owner Expectations
• Owners’ expectations were met or exceeded more than architects, contractors, or others. When owners compare their expectations of IPD at the start of the project to the project outcomes, they overwhelmingly say their expectations were met, exceeded, or significantly exceeded.

Choosing IPD
• Reasons for choosing IPD are varied but seem to be most important where there is a desire for more team integration, a challenging budget, and/or where the owner requires the use of IPD.

Diverse Data Set
• The 108 response / 59 project data set represents a broad cross-section of building type, project location, project scope, project progress, and stakeholder background. BIM and Lean tools were used to varying degrees on almost all projects.

For Consideration
• Positive survey outcomes may reflect interest, engagement, and approval of early adopter owners and AEC professionals, and may additionally be influenced by project teams constructed of skilled and motivated practitioners.
Respondents had an opportunity to comment on their experience. Some comments reflect challenges and needs:

Challenges IPD teams face
- Unwillingness to fully embrace IPD, its hard to let go of traditional roles
- Understanding of what is IPD (and what it takes to succeed) is uneven in the industry
- Negative performance by any single stakeholder can disrupt the whole team
- Changes in personnel can have a large negative impact

IPD Teams have particular need for:
- Alignment and commitment across the team
- Strong owner involvement
- Strong leadership
- Having the right people involved at the right time
- Increased and earlier planning
- Careful attention to fees/time
- Maintaining focus on key project goals
- Accountability among team members.
Projects | Distribution

59 unique projects

2 outside North America
Projects | Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>$10-$25M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>over $50M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government/Civic</td>
<td>under $10M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>under $10M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>under $10M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>under $10M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>under $10M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10-$25M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>over $50M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>over $50M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>over $50M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>over $50M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>under $10M</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>$10-$25M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Education (college/university)</td>
<td>over $50M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>over $50M</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>over $50M</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Education (college/university)</td>
<td>$25-$50M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>$25-$50M</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>$10-$25M</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$10-$25M</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25-$50M</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Education (college/university)</td>
<td>$10-$25M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>$10-$25M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>$25-$50M</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>over $50M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>over $50M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>over $50M</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Utilizes: Power/Water/Sewer</td>
<td>$10-$25M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Education (college/university)</td>
<td>$10-$25M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>under $10M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$25-$50M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>$10-$25M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Utilizes: Power/Water/Sewer</td>
<td>$10-$25M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Education (college/university)</td>
<td>over $50M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberts</td>
<td>Education (K-12)</td>
<td>over $50M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Government/Civic</td>
<td>under $10M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>$25-$50M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>under $10M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>over $50M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Single-family Residential</td>
<td>under $10M</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **59 unique projects**
  - 48 in U.S.
  - 9 in Canada
  - 2 outside of North America

**Project Types**
- Education (K-12) 1
- Education (college/university) 5
- Health Care 28
- Cultural 1
- Recreational 1
- Office 5
- Industrial 3
- Mixed Use 3
- Government/Civic 3
- Single Family Residential 1
- Multi-Family Residential 1
- Utilities Power/Water/Sewer 2
- Other 5

**Project Scopes**
- Under $10M 15
- $10M to $25M 16
- $25M to $50M 7
- Over $50M 21

**Project Status**
- Design 12
- Construction 9
- Complete 38
Respondents | Past Experience

108 Responses

- Owner (n=23)
- Architect (n=17)
- Contractor (n=58)
- Other (n=10)

Stakeholder experience in IPD for this project:

- New to IPD
- 1 or 2 IPD projects
- 3 or more IPD projects

Outside of this project, the majority of my project delivery experience is in:

- Design-Bid-Build
- Design Build
- CM at Risk
- Integrated Project Delivery
- Other
The reason(s) we chose IPD were:

- Challenging program: Owner (n=23) - Architect (n=17) - Contractor (n=58) - Other (n=10)
- Challenging building technology: Owner (n=23) - Architect (n=17) - Contractor (n=58) - Other (n=10)
- Challenging schedule or budget: Owner (n=23) - Architect (n=17) - Contractor (n=58) - Other (n=10)
- Desire more integration: Owner (n=23) - Architect (n=17) - Contractor (n=58) - Other (n=10)
- Owner required: Owner (n=23) - Architect (n=17) - Contractor (n=58) - Other (n=10)
- Desire to repeat IPD: Owner (n=23) - Architect (n=17) - Contractor (n=58) - Other (n=10)
- Desire IPD experience: Owner (n=23) - Architect (n=17) - Contractor (n=58) - Other (n=10)
- Market forces: Owner (n=23) - Architect (n=17) - Contractor (n=58) - Other (n=10)
- Marketing/positioning: Owner (n=23) - Architect (n=17) - Contractor (n=58) - Other (n=10)
- Other: Owner (n=23) - Architect (n=17) - Contractor (n=58) - Other (n=10)
Compared to your experience on non-IPD projects, rate your impression of the performance of this project in each of the categories below.

- **Schedule predictability**
- **Cost and budget control**
- **Quality of building outcome (design goals)**
- **Quality of building outcome (technical performance goals)**
- **Changes (quantity)**
- **Changes (handling)**
- **Morale of stakeholders**
- **Overall value delivered**

The results are as follows:

- **Schedule predictability**
  - Same: 10%
  - Better: 40%
  - Significantly better: 50%

- **Cost and budget control**
  - Same: 10%
  - Better: 40%
  - Significantly better: 50%

- **Quality of building outcome (design goals)**
  - Same: 10%
  - Better: 40%
  - Significantly better: 50%

- **Quality of building outcome (technical performance goals)**
  - Same: 10%
  - Better: 40%
  - Significantly better: 50%

- **Changes (quantity)**
  - Same: 10%
  - Better: 40%
  - Significantly better: 50%

- **Changes (handling)**
  - Same: 10%
  - Better: 40%
  - Significantly better: 50%

- **Morale of stakeholders**
  - Same: 10%
  - Better: 40%
  - Significantly better: 50%

- **Overall value delivered**
  - Same: 10%
  - Better: 40%
  - Significantly better: 50%
Expectations | All Responses

Considering your expectations at the start of this project, rate the outcomes of this project in each of the categories below.
Identify the likelihood for each of the following statements:

- On a project of similar type and scope, the likelihood I would want to use IPD again
- The likelihood of me wanting to use IPD in general on other projects
- The likelihood of me recommending IPD as a delivery methodology to others
Compared to your experience on non-IPD projects, rate your impression of the performance of this project in each of the categories below.
Considering your expectations at the start of this project, rate the outcomes of this project in each of the categories below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule predictability</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost and budget control</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of building outcome – design goals</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of building outcome – technical performance goals</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes (quantity)</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes (handling)</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale of stakeholders</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall value delivered</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
<td>![Chart]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The charts indicate the percentage of respondents who rated the outcomes as 'met', 'exceeded', or 'significantly exceeded' for each category.*
Identify the likelihood for each of the following statements:

- On a project of similar type and scope, the likelihood I would want to use IPD again
- The likelihood of me wanting to use IPD in general on other projects
- The likelihood of me recommending IPD as a delivery methodology to others

For Owner:
- Likely: 23
- Significantly likely: 23

For Architect:
- Likely: 17
- Significantly likely: 17

For Contractor:
- Likely: 58
- Significantly likely: 58

For Other:
- Likely: 10
- Significantly likely: 10

Likelihood | Stakeholder

- Unlikely
- Significantly unlikely
- Neutral
- Likely
- Significantly likely
Survey Open Through September 2016!

The data in this report was collected between July 9th and September 15th 2015. We recognize that many stakeholders on past or current projects did not have the chance to participate and as such their experiences are not represented in this data set.

To increase the robustness of the report, the survey will remain open until September 15th 2016, followed by a revised report.

If you are have worked on or are currently working on an IPD project, please take the survey here:

http://survey.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_5uPcumvO8xJu9CZ
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