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Have You Encountered These…

• Performance Issues
  – Completed late
  – Cost increases
  – High volume of change orders
  – Projects don’t meet the expectations of the user
  – Lack of accountability (everyone blames a different party)
  – Skilled craftspeople decreasing

• Cost Issues
  – Costing more money to complete projects/services
Problems?
What People Have Tried
Again…And Again…And Again…

• Different delivery methods
• Better contracts / terms & conditions
• Strengthening partnerships
• Longer-term relationships
• Rely on technology & software
• Profit sharing
• Incentives / penalties
• Fast tracking
There Is A Fundamental Problem With Our Traditional Approach To Business
THERE WILL ALWAYS BE SOMEONE WHO SAYS THAT THEY CAN DO IT CHEAPER... BUT AT WHAT COST?
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Perception on Standards
Just because something is written in a contract does not make it so.
What Percent of Solicitations / RFP’s Are 100% Accurate?
Who Should Know More About Performing/Delivering the Services Required?
It Is More Important For The **Vendor** To Know What To Do Than It Is For Client To Know What The Vendor Should Do
Proven Solution To Increase Odds of Success On ANY Project:

Hire Experts

(High Performing Individuals & Teams That Actually Know How To Create Value & Mitigate Risk)
This Is **Not As Simple**

As It Sounds
1. Create an environment that **attracts expertise**
   – A structure that allows your vendors to use their expertise
   – A structure that allows them to maximize profit
   – A structure that gives experts the advantage in the procurement
   – A structure that encourages vendor’s to partner with the best subs
   – A structure where the vendor can pre-plan and identify their risk

2. People make the difference…Hire the **right people**
   – Does not mean getting a vendor with a big name
   – We want the best ‘people’ from the best vendor and sub-vendors
You Can’t Trick Vendors Into Believing That You Are A “Good” Client!
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?
“The Greatest Risk we always face is how to accomplish all the things that our sales team promised we could do.”
How do we attract, select, and leverage “Experts”? 
Expertise-Based Approach

1. SELECTION
2. PRE PLANNING
3. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Scope
Award Contract
**Filter 1**
Proposal Evaluations

**Filter 2**
Interview Key Personnel

**Filter 3**
Prioritization (Identify Best Value)
1 2
3 4

**Filter 4**
Cost Reasonablness Check
1 2 3 4

**Filter 5**
Pre-Award & Clarification

**Project Execution**
Risk Reporting & Close Out Rating

**Evaluation Criteria**
- Price / Cost / Fee
- Risk Assessment
- Value Added
- Past Performance Information (PPI)

**Short List prior to Interviews (if necessary)**

**Total Evaluation Scores are determined**

**Decision Matrix to confirm Selection of the potential Best Value Proponent**

**Pre Award Activities**
- Training
- Kickoff Meeting
- Plan & Clarify
- Summary Meeting

**Project Execution**
- Weekly Risk Report
- Director Report
- Performance Meas.
- Close Out Ratings
Filter 1

Risk Assessment

= risks you control and risks you don’t control

Value Added

= additional expertise beyond requirements
• **RISK:** Noise from our demolition may result in student/staff complaints (since we will be doing demo in an in-operational library during finals week).

• **VENDOR 1 Solution**
  Partnering is a key to success on any project. We will work with the user to develop the best strategies that can be implemented to minimize the impact of noise from demolition.

• **VENDOR 2 Solution**
  To minimize this risk, we have planned to demolition during off hours and weekends. We will also install rubber sheets on the floors and foam pads around the wall to diminish noise and vibrations.
RISK: A poor roofing system can result in roof leaks, which may inconvenience building occupants, and increase complaints, maintenance, damage, etc.

Vendor A Solution:
• Use our extensive roofing history to install the best system for your needs.

Vendor B Solution:
• To minimize this risk, our proposed roofing system has been installed on over 400 roofs and has had an average roof age of 18 years, in which 99% of the roofs don’t leak and 100% of the end clients are satisfied.

Vendor C Solution:
• To minimize this risk, we are proposing a thermally-welded roofing system that has a tensile strength of 2,130 PSI, elongation of 300%, tear strength of 312lbs, has been tested for 10,000, and has a cold brittleness of -30°C.
• **VENDOR 1**
  
  – **RISK:** The local water company must have the water turned on by June in order for us to water the newly installed recreational fields (or the grass will die).
  
  – **SOLUTION:** We will coordinate and plan our schedule with the water company as soon as the award is made to make sure that we get water to the site to irrigate the fields.

• **VENDOR 2**
  
  – **RISK:** The local water company must have the water turned on by June in order for us to water the newly installed fields (or the grass will die).
  
  – **SOLUTION:** On past projects, the water company has failed to meet the schedule 90% of the time. To minimize this risk, we will coordinate our schedule with the water company as soon as we are awarded the project. If they fail to meet our schedule, we can connect temporary waterlines to the nearby fire hydrants, or we can also rent water trucks to irrigate the fields.
Option to Reduce Project Cost:

- Instead of purchasing “Named Licenses”, the Agency may want to consider purchasing “Concurrent Licenses”. In a “Named Licensing” model, the software designates a license per user and only that particular named user can use/access the license. If that named user is in meetings, on vacation, or not using the system, the license is not utilized.

- In a “Concurrent Licensing” model, the server keeps track of the total number of licenses and loans the licenses to users as they log in. If a user is inactive, the server releases the license and allocates the license to the next user. The advantage is that the Agency is not required to purchase licenses that are not being used, which can result in approximately 25% savings in cost.
• Reroofing this building will not stop all water leaks. The majority of the leaks are caused by cracks in the parapet walls, broken/missing glass, and poor caulking. We can repair/replace all of these issues to minimize all water leaks, for a minimal impact to time/funding.
Past Performance Information

- PPI will be collected on the critical Entities:
  - Firm/Key Firms
  - Project Manager (Individual)/Team Leader(s)
  - Key Subs or Suppliers and Other Key Individuals

**Step 1** Prepare Reference List
**Step 2** Prepare and Send Survey Questionnaires to Past Clients
**Step 3** Collect/Receive Completed Surveys
**Step 4** Enter data into Reference List
**Step 5** Package all material (Reference List and Surveys) and Submit
Financial Proposal/Bid Cost

- Dependent on project type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL PRICE SCHEDULE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSAL ITEM 1: ZONE A PRECINCT 2 – BLACK MOUNTAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Level 1 (less than 10,000 lbs., no special circumstances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Level 2 (less than 10,000 lbs., with special circumstances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Level 3 (10,000 to 15,000 lbs., no special circumstances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Level 4 (10,000 to 15,000 lbs., with special circumstances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Level 5 (15,000 to 35,000 lbs., no special circumstances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Level 6 (15,000 to 35,000 lbs., with special circumstances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Level 7 (35,000 lbs. or more, no special circumstances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Level 8 (35,000 lbs. or more, with special circumstances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Level 9 (mobile home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Level 10 (abandoned vehicles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Storage Rate (for non-30 day tows)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Storage Rate (30-day tows – A.R.S. § 29-3511 and P.C.C. § 23-55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. After Hours Gate Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Hourly Standby Rate Charge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blind Evaluation – Make it Fair

• The evaluated proposal documents **MUST NOT** contain any names that can be used to identify who the Proposer is.

• Including: company names, personnel names, project names, or product names.
Filter 1: Proposal Evaluations

Filter 2: Interview Key Personnel

Filter 3: Prioritization (Identify Best Value)

Filter 4: Cost Reasonableness Check

Filter 5: Pre-Award & Clarification

Project Execution: Risk Reporting & Close Out Rating

Evaluation Criteria:
- Price / Cost / Fee
- Project Capability
- Risk Assessment
- Value Added
- Past Performance Information (PPI)

Total Evaluation Scores are determined:
1
2
3
4

Decision Matrix to confirm Selection of the potential Best Value Proponent:
1
2
3
4

Pre Award Activities:
- Training
- Kickoff Meeting
- Plan & Clarify
- Summary Meeting

Project Execution:
- Weekly Risk Report
- Director Report
- Performance Meas.
- Close Out Ratings

Contract Award

Short List prior to Interviews (if necessary)
Filter 2: Interview (Different)

1. Get Team Members Up Front (ID in Proposal)

2. 15-25min Interview

3. Interview is One-on-One, No Notes

4. **Key Question:**

   *On the whiteboard: Quickly layout the project/service (from start to end) with the following:*

   – Identify the major activities with approximate durations
   – Identify the greatest risks and where they are on the timeline
   – Identify what you need from the client & when you need it
Comments

Goal Is To Minimize Risk

“I have no idea why I am here today”…“My boss called me last night and told me to show up for this interview”  - $10 Million Project

“I did not participate at all in preparing our proposal”  - $3 Million Project

“I am not currently employed by this company, but if we win this project, they will then hire me”  - $25 Million Service Project

“I have never managed a project of this size/scope”  - $30 Million Project

“There is no risk on this project”  - $5 Million IT Project

“The greatest risk that I always face, is how to accomplish all of the things that our sales team promised we could do”  – $5 Million Cleanroom Design
Case Study - Roofing

• Scope: Remove and replace various roofing systems on 3 different buildings

• Estimated Budget: $1 Million
Key Personnel

• All superintendents had significant experience (over 20 years in industry)

• Some individuals did not ‘look’ professional

• Some individuals did not ‘speak’ very professionally
Interview Statements

• **Superintendent 2**
  – “I got a call yesterday to be here today. I haven’t walked the roof yet.”
  – “I can determine the risks once we are awarded the project and after I walk the roof.”

• **Superintendent 3**
  – “I just found out 2 days ago that I was assigned to this project.”
  – “I haven’t had time to investigate the roof since I just flew into State.”
  – “I haven’t walked the roof. I tried to take a look at it this morning.”

• **Superintendent 4**
  – “I haven’t walked the roof, but I’ve seen pictures. I don’t think there should be any ponding issues.
  – “I was not involved with preparing the proposal at all.”
Blind Evaluations: standard templates, no modifications, and no names.

1-2 pages each, 2-6 pages in total + 20min Interview
Filter 3: Prioritize

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weights</th>
<th>RAW DATA</th>
<th>PRIORITIZED DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Firm A</td>
<td>Firm B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>$ 1,025,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Risk Assessment Plan</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Value Assessment Plan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PPI – Firm (1-10 Scores)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PPI – Firm (# of Surveys)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PPI – Project Manager (1-10 Scores)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PPI – Project Manager (# of Surveys)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 1000

PRIORITIZED DATA: 742, 982, 667
**Filter 1**
Proposal Evaluations

**Filter 2**
Interview Key Personnel

**Filter 3**
Prioritization (Identify Best Value)

**Filter 4**
Cost Reasonableness Check

**Filter 5**
Pre-Award & Clarification

**Project Execution**
Risk Reporting & Close Out Rating

**Evaluation Criteria**
- Price / Cost / Fee
- Project Capability
- Risk Assessment
- Value Added
- Past Performance Information (PPI)

Short List prior to Interviews (if necessary)

Total Evaluation Scores are determined

Decision Matrix to confirm Selection of the potential Best Value Proponent

**Pre Award Activities**
- Training
- Kickoff Meeting
- Plan & Clarify
- Summary Meeting

**Project Execution**
- Weekly Risk Report
- Director Report
- Performance Meas.
- Close Out Ratings
Filter 4: Cost Reasonableness Check

Highest Ranked is also the lowest price
- Yes
- No

Highest Ranked is within [X%] of next highest ranked
- Yes
- No

Selecting HR can be justified based on other factors
- Yes
- No

Proceed to Pre-Award
- Yes
- No

Go with Alternate Proposal or Cancel
The Process

1. SELECTION
2. PRE PLANNING
3. PROJECT MANAGEMENT
### Filter 1
Proposal Evaluations

- Evaluation Criteria
  - Price / Cost / Fee
  - Project Capability
  - Risk Assessment
  - Value Added
  - Past Performance Information (PPI)

- Short List prior to Interviews (if necessary)

### Filter 2
Interview Key Personnel

- Total Evaluation Scores are determined

### Filter 3
Prioritization (Identify Best Value)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

### Filter 4
Cost Reasonableness Check

- Decision Matrix to confirm Selection of the potential Best Value Proponent

### Filter 5
Pre-Award & Clarification

- Pre Award Activities
  - Training
  - Kickoff Meeting
  - Plan & Clarify
  - Summary Meeting

- Project Execution
  - Weekly Risk Report
  - Director Report
  - Performance Meas.
  - Close Out Ratings

### Project Execution
Risk Reporting & Close Out Rating
Filter 5: Pre-Award / Clarification? (Proactive vs Reactive)

Minimize All Surprises!!!
How Can We Minimize Surprises

1. **Cost Verification**
   - Provide a detailed cost breakdown
   - Identify why the cost proposal may be significantly different from competitors
   - Review big-ticket items
   - Review value added options
   - Identify how payments will be made and all expectations regarding finances

2. **Preplan in Detail**
   - Coordinate the project/service with all critical parties
   - Revisit the sites to do any additional investigating
   - Prepare a high level project schedule
   - Prepare a schedule of client activities
   - Prepare a detailed project work plan (transitioning, training, safety, security, staffing, etc)
How Can We Minimize Surprises

3. **Align expectations**
   - Review and address all assumptions
   - Clearly identify the client’s roles and responsibilities
   - Technical review of product/system & demonstrations if necessary
   - Potential deal breakers
   - What is included and excluded in the proposal
   - Review any unique requirements with the client
   - Review and approve all contract terms and conditions

4. **Identify and mitigate all uncontrollable risks**
   - Identify all risks or activities not controlled by the Offeror
   - Identify the impact of the risks
   - Identify what the client can do to mitigate the risks
   - Address how unforeseen risks will be managed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Traditional RFP</th>
<th>XPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of projects analyzed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total awarded cost</td>
<td>$14,244,385</td>
<td>$9,994,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Total awarded schedule</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>1,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Percent awarded cost below budget</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Average time RFP Release to Contract</td>
<td>68 days</td>
<td>78 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Average BV-PA duration (days)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Average Overall Change Order Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>50% Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Average Overall Project Delay Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>38% Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>GSA Satisfaction Rating of Contractor/Job</td>
<td></td>
<td>34% Increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For within BV projects, also tested “<1 week” PA vs “>1 week” PA
- Longer PA had **33%** lower change order rate (**73% reduced overall**)
- Longer PA had **69%** lower delay rate (**73% reduced overall**
Particle Accelerator / Cyclotron Facility

- **SCOPE:** Renovate an existing curling-rink facility into a specialized radiopharmaceuticals research facility that houses a 24MeV cyclotron. The cyclotron will be housed in a specialized vault that will house the particle accelerator. The facility will produce and provide a steady supply of isotopes (including clinical-quality technetium-99m - isotope used for 80% of nuclear medicine diagnostic procedures) used to help patients with cancer, cardiac, neurological and other diseases.

- **BUDGET:** $30 Million
Proposals

• 4 contractors proposed

• Best-valued contractor was not the lowest or highest bid, but was 5.3% below average cost

• Best-valued contractor had a risk / value proposal that was rated 81% higher than the competitors
Impact of Clarification / Pre-Award

• The contractor caught and identified the issue prior to award

• This allowed the owner to address and resolve the issues prior to awarding the contract

• In the traditional procurement approach, auditors determined that these issues would not have been caught until 5 months into the project (and would have resulted in significant delays and cost increases)
Project Results

• Performance:
  – 0% project delays
  – 0% cost increases
  – 10 out of 10 customer satisfaction rating

“Through this approach, the contractor was able to save 14-18 months in schedule and $8-12 Million in cost (when compared with the traditional approach)”

- Hugh Warren | Executive Director Operations & Maintenance at University of Alberta – as measured by the governmental Auditors Office.
**Filter 1**
Proposal Evaluations

**Filter 2**
Interview Key Personnel

**Filter 3**
Prioritization (Identify Best Value)

**Filter 4**
Cost Reasonableness Check

**Filter 5**
Pre-Award & Clarification

---

**Project Execution**
Risk Reporting & Close Out Rating

**Evaluation Criteria**
- Price / Cost / Fee
- Project Capability
- Risk Assessment
- Value Added
- Past Performance Information (PPI)

**Pre Award Activities**
- Training
- Kickoff Meeting
- Plan & Clarify
- Summary Meeting

**Project Execution**
- Weekly Risk Report
- Director Report
- Performance Meas.
- Close Out Ratings

---

1 2 3 4
1 2 3 4

---

Short List prior to Interviews (if necessary)
Total Evaluation Scores are determined
Decision Matrix to confirm Selection of the potential Best Value Proponent
Measured Environment

• Must be simple and dominant

• Must be for the purposes of positive accountability

• Transparency and openness

• Measuring against a plan (or expectation created by the individual/team doing the work)
### Weekly Risk Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RISK CATEGORY</th>
<th>RISK DETAILS</th>
<th>IMPACT TO PROJECT DURATION</th>
<th>IMPACT TO PROJECT COST</th>
<th>PLANNED RESOLUTION DATE</th>
<th>ACTUAL DATE RESOLVED</th>
<th>CLIENT PM SATISFACTION RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/15/11</td>
<td>Party Responsible for the Risk: Vendor, Owner, Unforeseen</td>
<td>Describe: 1. What is the risk [high level]? 2. What is the plan to mitigate this risk [high level]? 3. Name(s) of individuals responsible for resolving the issue? 4. Potential impacts?</td>
<td>15 Days</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>2/15/11</td>
<td>2/1/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Report – Analysis of Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>Number of Risks</th>
<th>Impact to Cost</th>
<th>Impact to Schedule</th>
<th>Percent Impact to Cost</th>
<th>Percent Impact to Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) Client Impacts</strong></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>$660,369</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Scope Change / Decision</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>$660,369</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Requested Delay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) CPPM Impacts</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>$329,425</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Issue</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$189,876</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPM Issue (Codes / Permits)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$46,140</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPM Issue (Energy Mgmt)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$47,533</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPM Issue (Hazardous / Health &amp; Safety)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$35,407</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPM Issue (NTS)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$10,018</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPM Issue (Contract / Payment)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPM Issue (Other)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$451</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) Contractor Impacts</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$21,005</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Issue</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Oversight of Design</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$21,005</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Issue with Supplier / Sub</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4) Unforeseen Impacts</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$102,544</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 311 | $1,113,343 | 2,607
Some Vendor Comments....

• “I really like the suggestion of being a part of the planning process, instead of trying to accommodate a process that has been given to a vendor.”

• “We had virtually fired them as a client in 2013 because we could not see any opportunity to add value through the existing approach and process. It is very courageous of them and a huge cultural shift to try this and I can only hope they can make it happen and stick with it.”

• “We often feel like 'lowest price' is the law, not best quality/fit for the project. Bids feel pre-decided.”

• I’m not usually the lowest-bidder, but I consider myself the highest quality. I wouldn’t have normally bid on this project, but I saw that the University wanted to operate differently this time.
Templates, Tools, and Assessments
How To Get Started

• Small Steps
  – Pilot Project

• Takes Time

• Education is Key (FM, Vendor, Stakeholders)

• Get Us Integrated Early On