The GMP Process: Cogence Alliance Proposed Methods for Improvement
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Mission + Purpose

Cogence (Latin)

“To drive together” or “Thinking that is well organized”

The purpose of the Alliance is to bring Owners and Developers, Architects and Engineers, Construction Managers and Contractors, and Allied Industry Professionals together to advocate and be a resource for improved project delivery.

For more information visit us at www.cogence.org
Common Industry Risks

- Leadership
- Communication
- Financial
- Contractual
- Project Management
- Quality
- Failed Expectations

Cogence Partner Roundtable January/March 2016.

Inspire. Educate. Unite.
What is the Cogence Method to Improve the GMP Process?

COGENECE Mission → Partner Dialog → Establish goals for GMP → Identify risks and obstacles to improve outcomes → Partners examine phases of design and construction process

Define areas where breakdown occurs → Vet and discuss process improvements → Propose COGENECE GMP Process → Identify 5 key steps to incorporate → Audience feedback on education areas 11/10 → Group Q & A → Publish for industry use 1/18

Feedback

Inspire. Educate. Unite.
Typical GMP Development Process Shortcomings

Summary Observations:

- Fail to create/confirm comprehensive project criteria at outset
- Fail to involve key players at earliest reasonable date
- Fail to employ effective information “check-back and confirmation” loop
- Fail to involve participants fully trained in the GMP process
- Fail to devote sufficient time, resources and attention to insuring an effective process
- Failure to appreciate and properly fund necessary risks
Three Phases to a *Typical* GMP Process

**Budgeting and Expectation Setting Phase**
- Owner Sets Budget
- Owner hires AE Team
- Owner may or may not have DM

**Scope Documentation and Development Phase**
- Programming
- Schematic Design
- Design Development
- Construction Documents

**From Estimate to GMP Finalization Phase**
- Documents Available
- Estimating Documents at DD and CD Phase
- Go Out for Bid
- Design Assist (if utilized)
- Present Draft Number to Owner
**Typical GMP Development Process Shortcomings**

- Communication between owner and contractor
- Clear definition/distinction between “project development” and “scope addition”
- Is risk transfer really there—same fights over change orders
- Free estimating—often times labelled as a bid opportunity but not
- Owner’s do not allow CM’s to engage design assist subcontractors early enough
- End user requests later in the process
- GMP development process is often disjointed and soiled
- CMR are taking on early bid risks in significant volatile construction market
- Designers (and sometimes the owner) want GMP to be more aggressive to allow more flexibility of scope and design money
- Tension, when items (design time or budget pressure) become overly compressed
- Lack of proper definition of scope and quality during late design stages when GMP is being constructed without drawing support
- CMs burying profits/fees/costs in other categories
- Design assist partners are not fully aware of the savings or budget status
- GMP’s are often developed without a full understanding of the scope of work
- Not a good process to track evolution/so it gets confusing
- Starts late and not enough time to resolve and vet
- Current process does not include the design team
- Some subs and suppliers do not get enough input in the process
- Client do not want to pay for risk
- CMR provides inflated estimates
- Clear, concise and complete design intent statements when not drawn are lacking
- The original conceptual “budget” was flawed
- Upfront CM and trade collaboration with the Architect
- Transparency in CMR GMP process
- Owner, Architects and CMs do not always agree on completeness of the documents
- Control of the contingency—what is the risk if the documents are 100% CD’s?

Cogence Partner Survey Results May 2017.
Goals of the Cogence GMP Process

- Fair
- Transparent
- Effective
- Reliable
- Accountable
- Increase Sophistication
- Measurable Improvement to Projects Outcomes
- Educate Participants

Inspire. Educate. Unite.
• This is an interactive session
• Work with the same keypad the entire time
• Please answer all questions
• Please tell the truth.... think of the keypad as a lie detector!
Audience Experience
1. Owner
2. Architect/Engineer
3. CM/General Contractor
4. Subcontractor
5. Other Service Provider
Cogence GMP

Survey Results from Cogence Town Hall November 2017.

Inspire. Educate. Unite.
1. For more than 67% of our work
2. For 33% to 67% of our work
3. For less than 33% of our work
4. I don’t know
Cogence GMP

I would guess that my company is involved with projects utilizing Open Book, GMP Process (by annual volume of work)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For more than 67% of our work</td>
<td>29.75%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 33% to 67% of our work</td>
<td>44.94%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For less than 33% of our work</td>
<td>21.52%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>99%</strong></td>
<td><strong>157</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Results from Cogence Town Hall November 2017.

Inspire. Educate. Unite.
1. Significant Involvement
2. Moderate Involvement
3. Limited Involvement
4. No Involvement
I have personally been involved in some aspect of the GMP development process.

Survey Results from Cogence Town Hall November 2017.

*Inspire. Educate. Unite.*
1. I have observed predominantly successful GMP development process(es)
2. I have observed both successful and unsuccessful GMP development process(es)
3. I have observed predominantly unsuccessful or disappointing GMP process(es)
4. I don’t have enough experience to answer this question
Cogence GMP

Which statement most accurately reflects your experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have observed predominantly successful GMP development process(es)</td>
<td>18.99%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have observed both successful and unsuccessful GMP development process(es)</td>
<td>62.03%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have observed predominantly unsuccessful or disappointing GMP process(es)</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have enough experience to answer this question</td>
<td>8.49%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Results from Cogence Town Hall November 2017.
I have observed major problems in the GMP process due to the following (pick all that apply):

1. Failure to organize and understand the process from the outset
2. Failure to commence process with adequate and agreed-upon criteria
3. Insufficient time to complete process
4. Failure to identify/communicate critical information until late in process
5. Poor definition of requirements for GMP Docs (e.g. 75% Set)
6. Insufficiency of GMP Docs to describe intended scope
7. Timing of GMP (too early/too late in design process)
8. Overly qualified GMP submission by CM or DB
9. Failure to effectively reconcile GMP Docs with GMP Proposal by CM or DB
10. Disputes over what is shown “or reasonably implied” in GMP Docs; failure to reconcile disputes on timely basis
I have observed major problems in the GMP process due to the following (pick all that apply):

- Failure to organize and understand the process from the outset
- Failure to commence process with adequate and agreed-upon criteria
- Insufficient time to complete process
- Failure to identify/communicate critical information until late in process
- Poor definition of requirements for GMP Docs (e.g., 75% Set)
- Insufficiency of GMP Docs to describe intended scope
- Timing of GMP (too early/too late in design process)
- Overly qualified GMP submission by CM or DB
- Failure to effectively reconcile GMP Docs with GMP Proposal by CM or DB

Survey Results from Cogence Town Hall November 2017.
Developing a Cogence GMP

Small Group Development

Insert dates of workshops

Inspire. Educate. Unite.
Cogence GMP Process

- Step 1 – Develop a Project Initiation Document
- Step 2 – Develop a Target Criteria Team (TCT) Sign Off Document
- Step 3 – Continuous TCT validation during the Design Phase
- Step 4 – GMP scope review
- Step 5 – GMP presentation and acceptance
Cogence GMP: Step 1 - Project Initiation

Public/Private Pre Feasibility
- Desired Scope
- Target Budget
- Target Schedule

Key Assumptions
- Constraints

Owner Project Vision

Early Team Selection
- Design
- CM
- Design Assist

Concept Program/Plans

Total Project Concept Estimate

Team Validated Project Plan/Expectations
- Scope
- Budget
- Schedule
- Constraints
- Organization
- Confirm delivery model
- Clear contingency maintenance plan

Business Plan
Includes Proforms, Fundraisers, Market Studies

Consensus Team GMP Documentation & Development

Trust & Collaboration

Inspire. Educate. Unite.
Cogence GMP: Step 1 - Project Initiation

Project Initiation Document:

- Define needs/ vision/ goals
- *Existing owner information*
- *Starting cost*
Cogence GMP: Step 1 - Project Initiation

Project Initiation Document:

- Information/ assumptions
- Delivery model assumptions
- Acceptable contract terms to allow COGENECE a five step process
## Cogence GMP: Step 1 – Project Initiation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>If Not Completed – Who Assumes Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work Documented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Plan Shared</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts in Place Match Cogence Process and Scope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Team Selection:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm Designers willing to work with Design Assist Trades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm Construction Manager and Design Assist Trades Willing to Openly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Qualifications Fully Vetted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify who is the Owner-totality of the owner decision making process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specialty – Med Equip – Consider entire team not just D/CA team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Analysis Complete and Documented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cogence GMP: Step 2 - Target Criteria Team (TCT)

STEP 2
Target Criteria Team (TCT) Sign Off

Program / Schematic Design → Design Development → Construction Documents

Normal OAC with CM Liaison reporting

Interface with design assist and cost validation

Consensus Team GMP Documentation & Development

Trust & Collaboration

Inspire. Educate. Unite.
Cogence GMP: Step 2 - Target Criteria Team (TCT)

Target Criteria Team Sign Off:

- *PID amended with team input;* confirm initial criteria
- Target Criteria Budget (TCB) includes total budget and schedule with milestones documented
- Develop and document available and relevant criteria and assumptions

Team Validated Project Plan/ Expectations
- Scope
- Budget
- Schedule
- Constraints
- Organization
- Confirm delivery model
- Clear contingency maintenance plan

*Inspire. Educate. Unite.*
Cogence GMP: Step 2 - Target Criteria Team (TCT)

Target Criteria Team Sign Off:

- *Low side/high side* project analysis
- List from green box in Phase 1
- Confirm value based pricing
- Team sign-off

Team Validated Project Plan/ Expectations
- Scope
- Budget
- Schedule
- Constraints
- Organization
- Confirm delivery model
- Clear contingency maintenance plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>If Not Completed – Who Assumes Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Governance Structure Identified (Defined Decision Making)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Members Established (Organization Chart Built)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Building Process Enabled</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution Plan Established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Model Confirmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Generated Scheduled Developed</strong> (Pull Plan Method Applied)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent Communication of Workflow (Big-Room/ Co-Location)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Analysis Complete and Documented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team agreement on ability to execute (financially stable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cogence GMP: Step 3 - Continuous TCT Validation

Step 2: Target Criteria Team (TCT) Sign Off

Program / Schematic Design → Design Development → Construction Documents

Normal OAC with CM Liaison reporting

Interface with design assist and cost validation

STEP 3: Continuous TCT Validation in Design Phase

Consensus Team GMP Documentation & Development

Trust & Collaboration

Inspire. Educate. Unite.
Cogence GMP: Step 3 - Continuous TCT Validation

Continuous Validation

- CM Liaison to Design Process
- *CM Liaison interface* and check with DA and cost support – track and react to ebb and flow of the design
- CM Liaison report back to owner identified
- *Trending and bias of budget and schedule*
Cogence GMP: Step 3 - Continuous TCT Validation

Continuous Validation

- The Target Criteria Budget (TCB) is a living document that changes during design
- At the end of design there is a TCB that is called post design
- Define level of documentation for which conceptual estimate provided
- Confirm value based pricing
# Cogence GMP: Step 3 - Continuous TCT Validation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>If Not Completed – Who Assumes Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Criteria Team Sign Off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agenda and Schedule for OAC Inclusive of Cogence Process</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interval of Validation Established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing checks and schedule assumptions reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner priorities understood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk analysis complete and documented – (slope of risk line)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate team confidence in Project plan (all parties)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document development sufficient to move forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Scope modification tracker in place</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team agreement on ability to execute (financially stable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cogence GMP: Step 4 – GMP Scope Review

Target Criteria
Budget (TCB) Post
Design with Alternate, Backup and Risk Qualifications

Develop GMP and Bidding

STEP 4
GMP Scope Review
Meeting with Design Team, CM and Owner

Consensus Team GMP Documentation & Development

Trust & Collaboration

Inspire. Educate. Unite.
Cogence GMP: Step 4 – GMP Scope Review

GMP Scope Review Process:

- Draft GMP presented to the team
- Review assumptions and clarifications (prose statement)
- Confirm Value Based Pricing
- *Jointly compare the Pre and Post Design TCB with the GMP*
- Discussions with the CM/ Trades on how to rectify any large swings or abnormalities
Cogence GMP: Step 4 – GMP Scope Review

GMP Scope Review Process:

- Schedule and general conditions review
- *Comprehensive Team bid packages summary review “holds and allowances”*
- DA’s mini-GMP presentation if required by the team
- Evaluate and confirm risk levels and how much any residual risk is costing – “Contingency Review”
- Develop and/ or finalize alternatives, owner options and team recommendations
## Cogence GMP: Step 4 – GMP Scope Review

### Cogence GMP Step 4: Post GMP Scope Review Process Validation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>If Not Completed – Who Assumes Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Criteria Team Sign Off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document assumption and qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid packages identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope review meetings selected and scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large project cost drivers understood/ priorities aligned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestions and alternates from scope review vetted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner project initiation, team target criteria checked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner project vision on track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify remaining risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify owner level of involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm deliverables + business plan confirmation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cogence GMP: Step 5 - GMP Acceptance

Target Criteria
Budget (TCB) Post Design with Alternate, Backup and Risk Qualifications

Develop GMP and Bidding

STEP 4
Post GMP Scope Review Meeting with Design Team, CM and Owner

STEP 5
GMP Presentation/Owner Acceptance

Consensus Team GMP Documentation & Development

Trust & Collaboration

Inspire. Educate. Unite.
Cogence GMP: Step 5 - GMP Acceptance

GMP Presentation & Acceptance Process:

- *Full team presentation A/E & CM*
- Owner listens, understands and has details for a complete and executable GMP
- Owner must state if they do not have confidence in a number and request clarification and back-up
- Questions and team vetting once all information presented
- *Entire team signs off and agrees to the GMP*
## Cogence GMP: Step 5 - GMP Acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>If Not Completed – Who Assumes Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparent communication of GMP and background presented</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner questions answered and confirmations completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New team member orientation completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMP owner official acceptance documented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team acceptance document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team confidence checks in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure process was competitive – auditable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMP details – staffing model, schedule + time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How the Cogence GMP Process minimizes shortcomings of Typical GMP Process?

2) Communication between owner and contractor
3) Clear definition/distinction between “project development” and “scope addition”
4) Is risk transfer really there – same fights over change orders
5) Free estimating – often times labelled as a bid opportunity but not
2) Owner’s do not allow CM’s to engage design assist subcontractors early enough
3) End user requests later in the process
4) GMP development process is often disjointed and soiled
2) Time to complete the design documenting the owner’s desires
1) Client understanding on timing and lockdown of the GMP
2) CMR taking on early bid risks in significant volatile construction market
3) Starts late and not enough time to resolve and vet
2) Designers (and sometimes the owner) want GMP to be more aggressive to allow more flexibility of scope and design money
Tension, when items (design time or budget pressure) become overly compressed
1) Lack of proper definition of scope and quality during late design stages when GMP is being constructed without drawing support
2) CMs burying profits/fees/costs in other categories
3) Design assist partners are not fully aware of the savings or budget status
1) GMP’s are often developed without a full understanding of the scope of work
2) Not a good process to track evolution – so it gets confusing
3) Some subs and suppliers do not get enough input in the process – clients do not want to pay for risk
2) CMR provides inflated estimates
2) Clear, concise, and complete design intent statements when not drawn are lacking
1) The original conceptual “budget” was flawed
1) Upfront CM and trade collaboration with the Architect
1) Transparency in CMR GMP process
3) Owner, Architects, and CMs do not always agree on completeness of the documents
2) Control the contingency – what is the risk if the documents are 100% CD’s?
# Five Step Cogence GMP Process

## Estimated Cost Summary $40M Medical Office Building

(fees below do not include project design fees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Description</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 – Develop a Project Initiation Document</td>
<td>~$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 – Develop a Target Criteria Team (TCT) Sign Off Document</td>
<td>In Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3 – Continuous TCT Validation during the Design Phase</td>
<td>~$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4 – GMP Scope Review meeting with design team and CM only</td>
<td>~$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5 – GMP Presentation and Owner acceptance meeting</td>
<td>~$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total</td>
<td>~$130,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This proposed process has relevance to work that I am undertaking or may undertake in the next few years.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Somewhat Agree
4. Neutral
5. Somewhat Disagree
6. Disagree
7. Strongly Disagree
This proposed process has relevance to work that I am undertaking or may undertake in the next few years.

Survey Results from Cogence Town Hall November 2017.
I believe this process could add value to projects that I may undertake in the next few years.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Somewhat Agree
4. Neutral
5. Somewhat Disagree
6. Disagree
7. Strongly Disagree
Inspire. Educate. Unite.

Cogence GMP

I believe this process could add value to projects that I may undertake in the next few years. (multiple choice)

Survey Results from Cogence Town Hall November 2017.
I would be interested in participating, or having someone in my company participate, in the further development of this process.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Somewhat Agree
4. Neutral
5. Somewhat Disagree
6. Disagree
7. Strongly Disagree
I would be interested in participating, or having someone in my company participate, in the further development of this process. (multiple choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>56.96%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25.32%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>6.33%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would be interested in attending, or having someone in my company attend, educational sessions to learn about the following (select up to 4):

1. Implementing the Cogence GMP process
2. Preparing a Project Initiation Document (PID) and Target Criteria Team (TCT) Sign Off Document
3. Preparing effective GMP Docs (Design Package and accompanying Narrative or “Prose Statements”)
4. Preparing effective GMP proposals (including Qualifications and Assumptions)
5. Observing a Mock GMP Facilitation/Negotiation Session to Learn Best Practices
6. Observing a Mock Project Delivery Selection Workshop (Selection of Appropriate Project Delivery System and Pricing Methodology)
I would be interested in attending, or having someone in my company attend educational sessions to learn about the following: (select up to 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing the Cogence GMP process</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.29%</td>
<td>63.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing effective GMP proposals (including Qualifications and Assumptions)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.18%</td>
<td>53.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing a Mock GMP Facilitation/Negotiation Session to Learn Best Practices in Workshop (Selection of Appropriate Project Delivery System and Pricing Methodology)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.56%</td>
<td>64.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Need your feedback...Plus/Delta
Oswald All Ohio Convocation Meeting

May 9, 2018

Next Steps for Cogence GMP 2018

- Development of GMP scope of work as a contract amendment-PMC
- Development of industry guidance and playbook-Cogence
- Develop an Educational Program

Survey Results from Cogence Town Hall November 2017.
BE Stubborn About your goals. AND Flexible ABOUT your methods.
Discipline is the bridge between goals and accomplishment.

Jim Rohn