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Soo... WIIFM?

Evidence-Based Benchmarks

Quality Project Performance
Safety, Quality, etc. above industry average

Schedule Benchmarks
On schedule or reduced

Cost Savings Benchmarks
5 – 10% cost savings
Up to 30% reduction in cost/ft²

No Claims
All potential claims resolved
Soo... WIIFM?
Evidence-Based Benchmarks

Facilitator and Workshop Fees
0.2% Project Budget

To save 10% on budget
What is Collaborative Partnering?

Collaborative Partnering Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Team</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Close-Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow-up sessions can go from monthly to quarterly based on project characteristics

**Kick-Off Workshop**
- Vision statement
- Jointly creation of project goals (on time, on budget, safe, etc.)
- Commitments on communication
- Issue Resolution Ladder
- Team signature page

**Follow-up Sessions**
- Regular meetings based on project risk
- Revision and update of Charter, project goals, and commitments
- Monitoring and resolution of project issues
- Revision of scorecards and issue resolution processes.

**Close-out and Lessons Learned Workshop**
- Joint development of a punch list
- Discussion of commissioning strategy
- Reflecting on lessons learned
- Recognition and celebration of Success

Follow-up sessions can go from monthly to quarterly based on project characteristics.
How do we Organize Collaborative Partnering?

**CLOSE-OUT**
- Partnering Charter (Tool 4)
- Issue Resolution Process (Tool 5)
- Co-Location (Tool 6)
- Partnering Training (Tool 7)
- Partnering Scorecards (Tool 8)
- Stakeholder Engagement Process (Tool 9)

**PLANNING**
- Partnering Specifications (Tool 1)

**DESIGN**
- Multi-Tier Partnering (Tool 11)
- Focus Groups (Tool 12)
- Meeting Minutes (Tool 13)
- Team Building Activities (Tool 14)

**CONSTRUCTION**
- Subsequent Partnering Workshops (Tool 10) are held during project delivery and can involve the other tools listed on the left.

Prior to project start, Partnering Facilitator (Tool 2) leads the Partnering Kick-off Meeting (Tool 3) where Partnering Charter (Tool 4) is developed. Other Partnering tools listed on the right can also be used at this stage.

Close-out Workshop (Tool 16) is held to denote end of Collaborative Partnering and project delivery.
- Partnering Recognition & Awards (Tool 15)

This figure provides a glimpse into Collaborative Partnering Tools & Process which are discussed in detail in Chapters 2 & 3.
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Methods

**Task #1: Project Start**
1. Project Start
2. Review of Key Resources
3. Development of Data Collection Plan, and Case Study Plan and Protocol

**Task #2: State-of-The-Practice**
1. Screening Survey of The Aviation Industry
2. In-Depth Study of Owner Organizations (DOTs and Airport Organizations)

**Task #3: Case Studies**
1. Content Analysis of Partnered Project Documents
2. Surveys and Structured Interviews of Project Participants
3. Analysis of Collected Data

**Task #4: Verification of Results & Guidelines**
1. Development of Preliminary Guidelines
2. Vetting of Guidelines via Expert Panel

**Task #5: Development of Final Deliverables**
1. Revision of Final Guidelines
2. Development of Final Deliverables

**PHASE I: STATE-OF-THE-PRACTICE & CASE STUDIES**

**PHASE II: VERIFICATION OF FINDINGS & FINAL DELIVERABLES**
State-of-the-Practice

Number of Survey Participants per Service Area

- **Western Service Area**
  - Airport: 9
  - DOT: 1
  - Airline: 6
  - PDE: 19
  - Contr.: 9
  - Other: 3
  - Total: 58

- **Central Service Area**
  - Airport: 5
  - DOT: 1
  - Airline: 2
  - PDE: 9
  - Contr.: 1
  - Other: 1
  - Total: 21

- **Eastern Service Area**
  - Airport: 9
  - DOT: 3
  - Airline: 4
  - PDE: 8
  - Contr.: 2
  - Other: 2
  - Total: 35

Total No. of Survey Participants: 96, of which 23 work in/represent multiple States

(in aviation construction projects)

- **Used Partnering**
  - Total: 72

- **Did Not Use Partnering**
  - Total: 24

* A. Airport: Airport Representatives
B. DOT: Department of Transportation Representatives
C. Airline: Airline Representatives
D. PDE: Planning, Design, and Engineering Industry Representatives
E. Contr.: Construction Industry Representatives / Contractors
F. Other: E.g., Retired director of Aviation and Programming, Technology Vendor, Emergency Preparedness Consultant, and Car Rental Representative
State-of-the-Practice

(A) No. of Partnered-Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US Geography/Service Area</th>
<th>DOT Reps</th>
<th>Airport Reps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) No. of Partnered-Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Delivery Method</th>
<th>DOT Reps</th>
<th>Airport Reps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBB</td>
<td>4,567</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR/CMGC</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) No. of Partnered-Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Size*</th>
<th>DOT Reps</th>
<th>Airport Reps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $1M</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1M, $5M)</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5M, $10M)</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10M, $25M)</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[25M, $50M)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ $50M</td>
<td>27,26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(D) No. of Partnered-Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnering Intensity</th>
<th>DOT Reps</th>
<th>Airport Reps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-House Partnering</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Partnering</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-Level Partnering</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ranges indicate [min., max.], including the min. and excluding the max.
State-of-the-Practice

Average Perceived Project, Team, and Individual Performance Improvement in Partnered-Projects

Based on 5-Point Likert Scale: 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neutral, 4 agree, 5 strongly agree

Project Performance Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Scope</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Disputes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Claims</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Litigation</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Orders</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Team & Individual Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Aspect</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishing mutual trust</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to project goals</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team integration</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals attitudes</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with integrity</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field-level decision making</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships between</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents: 65

High improvement performance areas in Partnered-projects according to industry professionals’ perceptions:
- Conflict Resolution
- Reduced Disputes
- Team Integration
- Commitment to Project Goals

Figure 3: Average of Survey Participants’ Perceptions of Project, Team, and Individual Performance Improvement in Airport Construction Projects Using Partnering
9 Case Studies

- 2 Horizontal (runways) and 7 Vertical (terminals, parking garages, etc.)
- 1 Non-hub, 2 Small hubs, 2 Medium hubs, 4 Large hubs
- 2 Central, 3 East, 4 West
- Budget: $30M – $1.6B
- 4 Design-Bid-Build, 2 CM@R, 3 Design/Build
Results

- 5 of 9 on schedule or early
- 6 of 9 on Budget or under
- Benchmark Savings: 1 Project 10% under budget and 1 project 5% under budget
- No Claims on any project
- 6 of 9 - No NOPCs
- Owner’s report Partnering improved safety, quality, and overall process performance.
## Partnering Intensity Levels and Cost Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnering Intensity Level</th>
<th>Potential Risk Factors</th>
<th>Required Partnering Tools</th>
<th>Cost of Partnering per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Level 5** High Risk      | - High risks to project cost and time.  
- Construction highly interferes with key airport operations such as security checkpoints.  
- Project cost is more than $100M.  
- Project duration is more than 2 years or is subject to a highly aggressive schedule. | ✓ Partnering Facilitation must be External Third-Party Facilitation.  
✓ Kick-off Partnering Meeting must be held where the Partnering Charter and formal issue Resolution Process are developed with Stakeholders.  
✓ Monthly Partnering Workshops including Stakeholders (adopt Meeting Minutes & Partnering Scorecards).  
✓ Multi-tier Partnering w/ Stakeholders involved at Executive, Field & Core levels.  
✓ Focus Groups & Close-Out Workshop required. | $60,000 - $97,000 |
| **Level 4** Medium-High Risk | - Moderate risks to project cost and time.  
- Construction moderately interferes with key airport operations such as security checkpoints.  
- Project cost is between $50M and $100M.  
- Project duration is more than 2 years or subject to a moderately aggressive schedule. | ✓ Partnering Facilitation must be External Third-Party Facilitation.  
✓ Kick-off Partnering Meeting must be held where the Partnering Charter and formal issue Resolution Process are developed with Stakeholders.  
✓ Monthly Partnering Workshops including Stakeholders (adopt Meeting Minutes & Partnering Scorecards).  
✓ Multi-tier Partnering w/ Stakeholders involved at Executive and Field levels.  
✓ Focus Groups & Close-Out Workshop required. | $50,000 - $76,000 |
| **Level 3** Medium Risk    | - Moderate risks to project cost and time.  
- Construction moderately interferes with key airport operations but not with security checkpoints.  
- Project cost is between $25M and $50M.  
- Project duration is between 1 and 2 years or subject to a moderately aggressive schedule. | ✓ Partnering Facilitation must be External Third-Party Facilitation.  
✓ Kick-off Partnering Meeting must be held where the Partnering Charter and formal issue Resolution Process are developed with Stakeholders.  
✓ Bi-monthly Partnering Workshops including Stakeholders with use of Meeting Minutes & Partnering Scorecards.  
✓ Multi-tier Partnering w/ Stakeholders involved at Executive levels. | $30,000 - $49,000 |
| **Level 2** Medium-Low Risk | - Moderate-low risks to project cost and time.  
- Construction moderately interferes with key airport operations but not with security checkpoints.  
- Project cost is between $10M and $25M.  
- Project duration is 1 year or moderately risky. | ✓ Partnering Facilitation may be Internal or External Third-Party Facilitation (at Kick-off Partnering Meeting at least).  
✓ Quarterly Partnering Workshops including stakeholders with Meeting Minutes.  
✓ Two Partnering Scorecards (one at first Workshop, one during construction).  
✓ Partnering Charter and Issue Resolution Process (develop with Stakeholders). | $19,000 - $31,000 |
| **Level 1** Low Risk       | - Low risks to project cost and time.  
- No interference w/ key airport operations.  
- Project cost is less than $10M.  
- Project duration is 1 year or low risk. | ✓ Partnering Facilitation may be Internal or Self-Directed.  
✓ At least Two Workshops (At project start and during construction).  
✓ Issue Resolution Process (develop with Stakeholders). | $10,000 - $16,000 |

**Notes:** (1) The differentiating Partnering Tools at each level from the lower levels are bolded and italicized. (2) Regardless of the risk level, most aviation construction projects have high political significance, project complexity, team coordination, and stakeholder involvement. (3) The costs were calculated assuming the costs for Partnering Workshops at $4,500-$7,500 per workshop and Partnering Scorecards at $500-$600 per scorecard. Costs of Training, Accommodation and Refreshments, if applicable, are additional.
Methods - Task #4

**Task #1: Project Start**
1. Project Start
2. Review of Key Resources
3. Development of Data Collection Plan, and Case Study Plan and Protocol

**Task #2: State-of-The-Practice**
1. Screening Survey of The Aviation Industry
2. In-Depth Study of Owner Organizations (DOTs and Airport Organizations)

**Task #3: Case Studies**
1. Content Analysis of Partnered Project Documents
2. Surveys and Structured Interviews of Project Participants
3. Analysis of Collected Data

**Task #4: Verification of Results & Guidelines**
1. Development of Preliminary Guidelines
2. Vetting of Guidelines via Expert Panel

**Task #5: Development of Final Deliverables**
1. Revision of Final Guidelines
2. Development of Final Deliverables

**PHASE I: STATE-OF-THE-PRACTICE & CASE STUDIES**

**PHASE II: VERIFICATION OF FINDINGS & FINAL DELIVERABLES**
Collaborative Partnering Steps

Effective Implementation

Step 1
Learn about COLLABORATIVE PARTNERING and its BENEFITS & Obtain TOP MANAGEMENT Support

Step 2
Learn about COLLABORATIVE PARTNERING TOOLS

Step 3
SELECT Tools and START Using them at the Right Time in Project Delivery

Optimal Implementation

Step 4
Manage KEY TOOLS Effectively: Partnering Facilitator & Stakeholder Engagement

Step 5
Assess and improve your ORGANIZATIONAL READINESS to use Partnering

Chapter 1
Chapter 2
Chapter 3
Chapter 4
Chapter 5
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Approach to Facilitation

- Project Risk
- Level of Partnering Intensity Required
- Number and Complexity of Partnering Tools required
- Skills required to successfully implement these Partnering Tools
- Type of Facilitation required
Stakeholder Types

Internal Stakeholders:
• Airport Business Units

External Stakeholders:
• Airport Users and Tenants
• FAA Personnel and Regulators
• Resource Agencies and Other Governmental Units
• Other Interested Groups: Public media, local tourism board and authorities, private land developers, airport hotels, neighborhood associations, and the city disability advocates.
# Stakeholder Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Level of Involvement</th>
<th>Stakeholders’ Involvement via Partnering Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| High                             | ▪ **T3: Kick-off Partnering Meeting**: Stakeholders participate in the development of a Partnering Charter with team goals and follow-up plan.  
▪ **T5: Issue Resolution Process**: Stakeholders give feedback on and approve many major project tasks during project delivery or participated in developing systems for issue resolution.  
▪ **T9 Partnering Scorecards**: Stakeholders provide feedback on the performance of Partnering on the project on a *monthly* basis.  
▪ **T10: Partnering Workshops**: Stakeholder must participate in the Partnering Workshops on a monthly basis. They must also participate in weekly project meetings to speed up the issue resolution processes. |
| Medium-High                     | ▪ **T3: Kick-off Partnering Meeting**: Stakeholders participate in the creation of key goals.  
▪ **T5: Issue Resolution Process**: Stakeholders participate in small Task Force Teams to track and solve specific issues when needed (i.e., could be weekly, monthly, or quarterly as needed).  
▪ **T9 Partnering Scorecards**: Stakeholders provide feedback on the performance of Partnering on the project on a *monthly* basis.  
▪ **T10: Partnering Workshops**: Stakeholder participate in the Partnering Workshops on a *monthly* basis.  
▪ **T11: Multi-Tier Partnering**: Stakeholders participate as a tier at all levels (executive, core, field levels) to contribute to design and construction. |
| Medium-Low                      | ▪ **T10: Partnering Workshops**: Stakeholder participate in the Partnering Workshops on a *quarterly* basis. Stakeholders help to create mission and project goals during the Workshops.  
▪ **T5: Issue Resolution Process**: Stakeholders participate in the Issue Resolution Process even if not formally structured (For example: unplanned team meetings when issues come up). |
| Low                              | ▪ **T5: Issue Resolution Process**: Stakeholders participate in the Issue Resolution Process even if not formally structured (For example: unplanned team meetings when issues come up). |
# Organizational Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Practices to Move to A Higher Level*</th>
<th>Recommended Practices To Improve Organizational Readiness Within Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* To move to a higher level the organization must have implemented all lower level required practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Task the Partnering Steering Committee to measure organization-wide Partnering performance, possibly in comparison to non-Partnered projects</td>
<td>☐ Develop a system to consistently record and report project performance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Develop/participate in Partnering recognition/reward programs</td>
<td>☐ Conduct periodic meetings to review, reflect, evaluate and improve the Partnering program at the organization level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appoint an internal full-time Partnering program manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Task the Partnering Steering Committee to recommend Partnering policies and practices for the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Obtain Executive Sponsorship for training and continuous improvement of Partnering practices (e.g., regulatory agencies, cities, states sponsoring training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Develop Partnering Values and Institutional Goals and reflect them in organizational documents and integrate into projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTIVATED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Establish a Partnering Steering Committee to guide Partnering implementation across the organization by setting policies and identifying and overcoming barriers</td>
<td>☐ Develop consistent Partnering guidelines as the organization’s guiding document for Partnering for its team and stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appoint Partnering coordinators (champions) at internal construction programs and divisions to lead Partnering efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop meaningful Partnering performance measurement system(s) to measure Partnering performance on each project</td>
<td>☐ Draft a generic Partnering Charter reflecting the organization’s Partnering aspirations, which can be modified based on project needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Address Partnering in project Specifications</td>
<td>☐ Draft preliminary Issue Resolution guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFINED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use a Professional expert to help set up an organization-wide program level Partnering program for the organization</td>
<td>☐ Participate in a Partnering mentoring program to learn from others and share lessons-learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Use web-based and external resources/guidelines published by organizations experienced in Partnering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Obtain Top Management Support (e.g., money, time, manpower, authority)</td>
<td>☐ Obtain support of Regulatory Agencies. For example, Federal (e.g. US DOT, FAA, TSA, etc.) or state level (e.g. State DOT) agencies can mandate Partnering in grants such as FAA’s Airport Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INITIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>No Partnering program or Partnering tool used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where to Find the Guidebook

National Academies Website Link

- Visit www.nap.edu
- Search for “Airport Partnering”
Goal Alignment and the Interactions of the Team
So How Can YOU Help the Movement?

• Submit Airport Circular developed by IPI
• Recommendation for use of Partnering on FAA funded projects
• Work with FAA, Contractor’s Associations, ACC, ACI and AAAE on recommended use of partnering
• Develop more research and guidance in new sectors!
Questions?
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