

# IPD: Degrees of Collaboration

	“Classic” Collaboration	“Non-Multi Party” IPD	“True” IPD
Level of Collaboration	Lower ←————→ Higher		
Philosophy or delivery method?	<b>IPD as a Philosophy</b>	<b>IPD as a Philosophy</b>	<b>IPD as a Delivery Method</b>
Nicknames	?	Non Multi-Party IPD; IPD “Lite”; Technology Enhanced Collaboration IPDish	Multi-Party Contracting; “Pure” IPD; Relational Contracting; Alliancing; Lean Project Delivery
Delivery Approaches:	CM at-Risk or Design-Build	CM at-risk or Design-Build	<b>IPD</b>
Typical Selection Process:	Qualifications Based Selection of all team members or Best Value Proposal	Qualifications Based Selection of all team members	Qualifications Based Selection of all team members
Nature of Agreement:	Transactional	?	Relational
Key Characteristics:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No contract language requiring collaboration</li> <li>• Limited team risk sharing</li> <li>• CM or DB share in savings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contract language requiring collaboration</li> <li>• Some team risk sharing</li> <li>• All parties compensation tied to project success</li> <li>• Co-location of team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owner-Designer-Contractor (and possibly other key team members- IPD Subs) all sign one contract that contracts collaboration</li> <li>• Team risk sharing-incl. A/E</li> <li>• Team decision making</li> <li>• Optimizing the Whole</li> <li>• Pain / Gain Sharing</li> <li>• Limits on litigation</li> <li>• Co-location of team</li> </ul>
Typical Basis of Reimb.	GMP	GMP	No GMP or GMP (some costs guaranteed)