

1 **Bridging the gap between selection decisions of façade systems at early**
2 **design phase and detailed engineering phase: issues, challenges and**
3 **solutions.**

4 Mohamad Kassem¹ and Donald Mitchell²

5 ¹ *Technology Futures Institute, Teesside University, Middleborough, UK*

6 ² *Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering, Centre for Window Cladding*
7 *Technology, University of Bath, Bath, UK*

8 Corresponding author. Email: m.kassem@tees.ac.uk

9 **Dr. Mohamad Kassem** is an Associate Professor in Engineering Project Management at the
10 University of Teesside. He has research, teaching and enterprise interest in the field of Building
11 Information Modelling (BIM), Construction IT and Engineering Project Management. He sits on the
12 scientific committees of major Construction IT conferences and a peer reviewer for several journals in
13 this field. He has been consultant to the Brazilian government responsible for developing a policy for
14 BIM adoption in Brazil. He is involved in several R&D projects, in the UK and internationally,
15 amounting for more than €1.8 million and he has published more than 45 conference and journal
16 papers in construction IT and construction management.

17 **Prof. Nashwan Dawood** is the Director of the Centre for Construction Research & Innovation (CCIR)
18 and the Technology Futures Institute and a Professor of Construction Management and IT at the
19 University of Teesside, UK. Professor Dawood also has significant and long-standing experience of
20 working with major industrial partners in the UK and internationally to develop and apply research
21 results as part of further collaborative projects. In particular he is currently running international
22 research and development projects in South Korea, Japan, Qatar, Europe and USA in the areas of 5D
23 modelling, serious game engine technology application to training and ICT (Information and
24 Communication technologies) for energy efficient buildings. He is also regularly invited to be a key
25 note presenter in international events. Professor Dawood has published over 180 research papers, and
26 sits on the editorial board of a number of journals and conferences.

27 **Donald Mitchell** is a Graduate from the Centre for Window Cladding Technology in University of
28 Bath and Director of Operation at Deepdale Solutions Ltd. He has research interest in the procurement
29 process and design of building envelope elements and has more than 25 years of experience in
30 managing large building façade projects in the UK and overseas.

31

33 **Abstract**

34 Building façade has a significant impact on the environmental and economic
35 performance of buildings and projects. The specification of their elements at the early
36 design phase depends on numerous technical, environmental and economic factors and
37 involves several stakeholders. The procurement and delivery of the façade work
38 package from the early design phase, through detailed design and manufacture, to
39 installation is a process with several inherent risk factors due to the involved cost,
40 technical and engineering complexities and its position on the critical path in all
41 projects. This research investigates the process of selection and specification of building
42 façade elements at the early design phases with the overarching aim of identifying the
43 issues affecting specification decisions, their root causes and impact on projects. The
44 research utilizes a mixed research approach which combines a retrospective case study
45 and an industry survey as two research methods that build on each other. The findings
46 suggest that the complexity of specification at the early design phases is exacerbated by
47 factors such as the inadequate technical knowledge of stakeholders involved in the
48 decision making process; the non- involvement of building façade consultants; the late
49 involvement of specialist façade subcontractors, and in a few cases by some commercial
50 exclusivity agreements that restricts specification decisions.

51 **Keywords:** Building façade, business process, curtain wall.

52 **Introduction**

53 Building envelope (2012), façade (pavitt and Gibb, 2003) or building enclosures (Tran et al.,
54 2014) are interchangeably used terminologies to denote the physical separator between the
55 interior and the exterior environments of a building. The impact of building façade has
56 become more important than ever in determining the operational and economic performance
57 of construction projects. Indeed, the building façade accounts for anything between 15 and 25
58 per cent of the total construction costs and represents a substantial part of the technical and
59 commercial risk on any given project (Kragh, 2011a). Building façade is also an area of

60 engineering by itself and its elements such as curtain wall systems are being used in various
61 shapes and types, not only in new buildings but also during the renovation of existing
62 structures (Efstathiades et al., 2007). This role is intensified by strict evolving energy
63 performance standards and regulations (Kragh, 2011b). Procuring building façade is
64 perceived as a process with many risks due to the numerous stakeholders, cost, technical and
65 engineering requirements involved and its position on the critical path in all projects.
66 In addition, the broad range of commercial options available with varying economic,
67 environmental and technical performances increase the challenges associated with the
68 selection and delivery of building façade projects. Indeed, devising optimal building façade
69 solution is becoming increasingly difficult due to the growing number of building façade
70 components and systems (Jin and Overend, 2010). Research efforts analyzing decision
71 making in design and construction processes are often concerned with analyzing issues
72 affecting the performance of construction projects at industry-wide level as evidenced from
73 the literature review presented later. As a result, there is limited research focused on analyzing
74 specific design and engineering processes such as the selection of building façade elements at
75 the early design phase. Hence, this research aims to investigate the process of selecting
76 building façade elements at the early design phase, identifies the issues affecting accurate
77 selection decisions and presents recommendations. In the subsequent sections, related
78 research identifying causes of poor performance in the construction industry in general and
79 current research to improve building façade in particular are first presented to understand both
80 the gap and significance of the proposed research. Then, background information about the
81 factors involved in the selection of building façade elements is illustrated to help the
82 understanding of the complexity of selection decisions. Third, the research methodology,
83 which consists of a retrospective case study and an industry survey, is explained to justify

84 both the research design and research methods followed by a detailed presentation of results
85 from both the case study and the survey.

86 *Literature review*

87 Studies investigating the issues that affect the performance of projects have proliferated over
88 the last few years especially within the construction sector. Much of these studies have
89 focused on identifying factors that cause time and cost overruns and quality issues. The
90 majority of these studies is focused at sector level (i.e. construction industry) and is based on
91 quantitative survey approaches. The review of these studies can be classified in terms of
92 ‘domain’, ‘granularity’ and ‘approach’ of investigation:

- 93 • *Domain of investigation:* it represents the sector segment in which the research was
94 conducted (e.g. building, civil, residential, etc.).
- 95 • *Granularity of investigation:* it denotes the depth in the exploration of the issues
96 researched structured into three levels namely, country or sector, project and single
97 discipline or trade.
- 98 • *Approach of investigation:* it refers to the research methods used in the investigation
99 (e.g. case study, questionnaire, interviews).

100 A classification of a non-exhaustive list of studies according to these three fields is reported in
101 Table 1. The results (Table 1) shows that the majority of existing studies are focused at sector
102 wide level and there is still lack of studies at building discipline or trade level. Table 2 reports
103 the issues identified as main causes for poor performance in projects from the same studies
104 classified in Table 1. Extensive existing reviews in this domain have also reached similar
105 conclusions. Sun and Meng (2009), in their effort to develop a taxonomy for change causes
106 and effects in construction projects, reviewed 101 articles from the same source used in Table

107 1¹. Much of the identified articles have either focused at wide industry scale using a
108 quantitative survey-based approach. Although this research approach, focusing on industry
109 and market level, is valuable in identifying the main areas of deficiencies in the industry that
110 require improvement, it suffers two limitations. The first limitation lie in the nature of causes
111 identified (see Table 2) which are often general statements of the areas where the actual root-
112 causes of poor performance lie (Table 2). The second limitation is the lack of empirical
113 evidence of the issues identified and their impact. From research design perspective, this
114 approach could have unknown, remedial or biased population sampling and data collection
115 methodologies (Succar and Kassem, 2015).

116 As a result, there is a need the need for complementing the current research approach with a
117 new methodology in which the granularity of investigation is increased from sector and
118 market-level to a single building trade level and combined with case studies to provide the
119 empirical demonstration and support.

120 One study, specific to the domain of building facades, was jointly funded by the Korean
121 government and large industrial conglomerate in South Korea (i.e. Daelim Industrial Co Ltd;
122 Better Living Space, and Doalltech Co.) and aimed to improve the lifecycle of curtain wall
123 through the integration of the supply chain through information management systems (Chin et
124 al., 2004; Hwang et al., 2006). Factors such as the difficulty of involving the right people at
125 the right time; lack of information sharing and communication; information loss due to the
126 fragmentation of processes; redundancy and inaccuracy in information flow; long lead time
127 between activities in the process, and reworks and errors due to missing and inaccurate

¹ e.g. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management; International Journal of Project Management; Construction Management and Economics; Journal of Management in Engineering; and Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management.

128 information in the documentation (Chin et al., 2004; Hwang et al., 2006) were considered as
129 issues affecting the performance of the curtain wall industry. However, neither a description
130 of the identification process nor a statistical and empirical evidence of such issues were
131 provided. Other related studies to building façade have focused on design methodologies to
132 achieve specific technical performance such as sustainability and buildability
133 (Singhaputtangkul et al., 2014; Mohsen and Elaheh, 2012).

134 This paper aims to fill this identified gap while adopting a new research approach. Such an
135 approach consists of increasing the granularity and scale of investigation by focusing on a
136 specific building discipline or trade (i.e. building façade) while considering its interactions
137 with other trades such as architectural and structural. In addition, it combines the survey
138 approach with a retrospective case study to provide empirical evidence of the issues and their
139 impacts.

140 ***The complexity of selection of building façade elements: the case of curtain wall***

141 A curtain wall is defined as a thin, usually aluminium framed wall, containing in-fills of glass,
142 metal panels or thin stone in addition to glazed-in window and door openings (Vigener and
143 Brown, 2011). Curtain wall is classified according to the method of manufacture and
144 installation as either stick systems or unit systems (Eastman et al., 2011).

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153
154

Table 1. Classification of a non-exhaustive list of previous studies according to their domain, granularity and research approach

		Odeh and Battaineh (2002)	Assaf and Al-Hejji (2006)	El-Razeket al. (2008)	Sweis et al. (2008)	Tumi et al. (2009)	Al-Hajj and Hamani (2011)	Zoya Kpamma and Adjei-Kumi (2011)	Shebob et al. (2012)	Fallahnejad (2013)
Domain of investigation	Gas & power industry									●
	Building & Residential			●	●			●		
	Public sector	●								
	Construction (not specified)	●	●			●	●		●	
Granularity of investigation	Sector / Country	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	Project						●			
	Single building trade									
Approach of investigation	Questionnaires	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	Interviews						●			
	Case study									

155

156

157

158

Table 2. Types of issues affecting industry and projects

	Issues identified
Odeh and Battaineh (2002)	- Inadequate contractor experience - Client interference - Clients financing
Assaf and Al-Hejji (2006)	- Shortage of labour - Delays in clients payments - Type of project bidding
El-Razeket al. (2008)	- Contractors finance - Delays in client payments - Clients design changes
Sweis et al. (2008)	- Contractor poor planning - Contractors finance - Clients change orders
Tumi et al. (2009)	- Improper planning - Lack of effective communication - Design errors


Al-Hajj and Hamani (2011)	- lack of awareness - excessive off-cuts resulting from poor design - rework and variations
Zoya Kpamma and Adjei-Kumi (2011)	- low recognition of sources of waste - little awareness of waste reduction tools - inadequate familiarity of the firms with lean thinking
Shebob et al., 2012	- Drawing approval delays - Adverse weather conditions - Delays to site handover to contractor
Fallahnejad (2013)	- Problems with importing materials - Unrealistic contract durations - Slow delivery of client materials

159

160 A stick system consists of a framework of site assembled components which is used to
 161 support glass and infill panels (CWCT, 2000a). A unit or unitised system is prefabricated wall
 162 which are transported to site as unitised frames, normally pre-glazed (CWCT, 2000a). The
 163 primary structural elements of curtain walls are mullions (vertical elements) and transoms
 164 (horizontal elements) (FigureFig. 1). Vertical mullion usually spans the full height of the
 165 cladding - in the case of stick systems- and they are connected to the horizontal transom using
 166 angle cleats, sleeves, spigots or proprietary brackets (CWCT, 1999). The framework of
 167 mullions and transoms supports infill panels, which may be glazing units or insulated panels.
 168 Mullions and transoms are usually made of extruded aluminium but may be made of steel in
 169 some cases (CWCT, 1999). A number of well established suppliers, mostly large and
 170 multinational companies, produce and commercialise numerous curtain wall systems. The
 171 commercial meaning of a curtain wall system is a collection of curtain wall products
 172 (mullions and transoms) having the same section shape but with different dimensions (length,
 173 high, width) in order to cover a range of performance required such as: different spans -
 174 distance between two mullions, maximum wind deflection, and different glass or infill
 175 weights.

176 The curtain walls and other building façade elements are a prerequisite in achieving occupant
 177 satisfaction, building efficiency and economic construction strategies. Their specification and
 178 selection is a challenging process due to the numerous architectural, engineering, economic

179 and environmental parameters (Table 3) and stakeholders (i.e. architect, client, engineering
 180 consultants, vendors and specialist subcontractors) involved in the decision.
 181 The thresholds of these performance parameters may vary between different countries'
 182 national building codes. For example, the air leakage rate through a curtain wall for the
 183 United States market is limited to 0.3 litres/sec*m2 at 75 Pa air pressure difference. In
 184 Canada, the air leakage rate is limited to 0.1 litres/sec*m2 at 75 Pa air pressure difference
 185 (Quirouette, 2013).



186

187 **FigureFig. 1.** Main elements of Curtain wall

188 Table 3. Engineering and environmental parameters involved in curtain wall selection

Water tightness	Curtain wall systems have two different methods to deal with water tightness, namely: face sealed systems and drained and ventilated systems. Face sealed systems have the water penetration line at the front of the system. Drained systems allow a certain amount of water to penetrate past the first weather seal gaskets, but a pressure equalised chamber is formed in the system that causes any penetrating water to be drained back to the outside via drainage holes positioned in the exterior face (CWCT, 2000b).
Air tightness	Adequate air tightness of the curtain walling is required to prevent occupier discomfort that may occur due to draughts and/or noise (CWCT, 2000b). The lack of air tightness can result in air leakage leading to heat loss during winter and excessive energy requirements during summer.
Thermal Performance	Curtain wall systems contribute to building energy efficiencies through their thermal performance such as their conductance which is a function of the frame material, geometry and fabrication (Vigener and Brown, 2012).
Acoustic	The acoustic performance of curtain walls is mainly determined by their infill

Performance	materials. The acoustic performance can also be improved by making the construction as airtight as possible and using sound attenuating glazing and panels (CWCT, 2003)
Movement accommodation	Curtain wall systems are required to accommodate the structural movement of the building they are secured to. The capacity of accommodating building movement depends on the shape and dimensions of the curtain wall section selected (CWCT, 2007).
Wind loading	The ability of curtain wall systems to withstand wind loads depends on their shape and the way they are attached to the structure at floor slab levels through brackets that transfer the wind load to the structure. While transferring the wind loads to the structure, the curtain wall are also subject to deflection and therefore, their shapes and dimensions are crucial to insure that the maximum deflection is not exceeded (CWCT, 2000c).
Fire safety	The installation of curtain wall system influences the passage of fire and smoke. The installation usually leaves gaps between floors horizontally and between party walls vertically to allow the passage of fire and smoke. Many standard products (i.e. fire break materials) are available and are specified by the amount of time they can withstand the passage of fire and smoke (CWCT, 2011).
Maintenance	All curtain walling façades require maintenance during the building operation phase (Vigener and Brown, 2012). The degree of maintenance and inspection depends on the façade type and the intended design life. The early detection of defects can mitigate expensive repairs or even replacement. Therefore, safe and easy access for conducting maintenance operations and possible disruption to occupiers are factors that are considered in the design and selection process.
Buildability	Ease, safety and access methods are all factors associated with buildability. For example, the method of erection must be considered during the design stage by taking into account accessibility and site logistics (HSE, 2007). Regulations issued the Construction Design and Management (HSE, 2007) dictate criteria that go beyond the construction phase and stipulate that the façade must be accessible for replacement and end of life dismantling of the structure.

189

190 **Research methodology**

191 This research aims to investigate the issues affecting the selection process of building
192 façade elements such as curtain wall systems and the impact of selection decisions on
193 projects. To achieve this aim, the research utilizes mixed research methods consisting of
194 retrospective case study and an industry survey of stakeholders involved in selection
195 decisions. This approach is a form of triangulation in which the weakness in each single
196 method is compensated by the counter-balancing strengths of another (Amaratunga,
197 2002) and enables to elaborate or develop analysis, providing richer details (Rossman
198 and Wilson, 1991). The retrospective case study is used to confirm and introduce, by

199 presenting empirical evidence, some of the issues affecting building façade projects and
200 their impact on project performance. However, case studies are not generalizable to a
201 sampling universe but instead directly confirm or disconfirm theory and hypotheses
202 (Yin, 1994). As such the retrospective case study approach is utilized in this research
203 primarily to confirm the existence of issues in selection decisions and secondly to
204 illustrate the impact of incorrect selection decisions. The case study is complemented
205 with an industry survey followed by face to face and phone interviews with industry
206 experts to identify and analyze the range of issues associated with the early selection of
207 curtain wall systems. Following the retrospective case study, the business process for
208 curtain wall selection adopted on the case study project is also mapped to show the
209 deficiencies of current processes.


210 *Retrospective case study*

211 The case study is a multi-million dollar hotel located in London, UK. Curtain wall is the main
212 element of the building façade with a commercial value just over eight million dollars. This
213 project is representative of the research problem in terms of products (i.e. curtain wall
214 systems) and stakeholders (i.e. client, contractor, and architect) involved. The project's data
215 was obtained through “retrospective story telling” through three interviews with the project
216 manager responsible for the delivery of the building façade . The project manager works for
217 the specialist façade subcontractor responsible for the detailed engineering design,
218 manufacturing and installation of facade. The project manager collaboratively works with the
219 architect, contractor, curtain wall vendors and other subcontractors to resolve every façade
220 related issue on site and it is in his best interest that things go smoothly on site. Therefore, the
221 storytelling by the project manager can be considered unbiased. The three interviews with the
222 project manager respectively addressed three distinct areas: the original specification and
223 issues encountered; the corrective actions, and the impact on the project. Only one part of the

224 building façade , which is at the lower ground floor bar area, is used for this study. It should
225 be noted however, that there were similar issues encountered in other areas of the build. The
226 main contractor for the project was one of the largest contractors operating in the UK and
227 worldwide, and the architects were a major London-based architectural firm. A medium-sized
228 company was employed as a specialist sub-contractor with design responsibility for the
229 building envelope under contract to the main contractor. The curtain wall system used on the
230 project was specified before the specialist sub-contractor was appointed and was supplied by
231 one of the major three vendors which will be referred to in the remaining part of the paper as
232 vendor A, vendor B and vendor C due to confidentiality of commercial information. The three
233 vendors together have more than 70% of the UK market share valued at \$250 million in 2008
234 (Companies House 2008 tax returns) and are multinational companies operating worldwide.
235 The selected curtain wall system was also specified based on a commercial partnership
236 between the main contractor and vendor A, in which the contractor is committed to use
237 vendor's products on all projects. In addition, there were further constraints relating to
238 aesthetic and architectural aspects imposed by the architect and other structural constraints.
239 These factors will be discussed in more detail in the subsequent section of the case study.

240 *The Design Intent and issues faces*

241 The design intent and brief received by the specialist subcontractor for the ground floor bar
242 area from the architects specified structurally glazed curtain wall screens with a span 7.7
243 meters in height with mullion centers at 1.67 meters ([FigureFig. 2](#)). A mid transom split the
244 screen at a height of 3.5 meters from the bottom transom and 3.45 meters to the top transom.
245 The selected curtain wall system at the early specification phase was supplied by vendor A.



246

247

Figure Fig. 2. Drawing of the curtain wall screen

248

When the design brief and early specification was received by the specialist building façade

249

subcontractor for detailed engineering design stage, several issues were encountered:

250

- Deflection of the selected mullion exceeded the maximum deflection allowed: The selected mullion specifies a maximum deflection as the ratio between the length of the curtain wall screen and '300' which gives in this case a deflection of 25.7 mm (i.e. $7700/300$) that exceeds 15mm – the recommended maximum deflection by BS EN 13830:2003. Therefore, the product specified at early design stage does not meet the structural requirement.

256

- Maximum glass weight supported: The maximum glass weight that the transoms of the selected system could support was 250 kgs according to the specification of the vendor. The weight of the glass is usually calculated using the empirical formula that each 1 msq of glass weighs 2.5 kgs per 1 mm thickness. The thickness is a function of the barrier loads. In this case, the barrier loads dictated that the glass thickness required was 10mm

260

261 outer panes and 13.8 mm inner panes. The section size in this case is 5.84 msq (i.e. 1.67 m
262 x 3.5 m) and the glass weight is 347.5 kgs (i.e. 5.84 m² x 2.5 kgs x 23.8 mm), which
263 exceeds 250 kgs – the maximum glass weight that could be supported by the selected
264 product.

- 265 • Mullions length available: The selected off-the-shelf curtain wall system is supplied by
266 vendor A with mullions having a length of 6.5 meters only. Therefore, this system cannot
267 satisfy the height to the top transom (i.e. 7.005 m) required at the ground floor bar area of
268 the build.

269 It is important to emphasize that the issues encountered were spotted at the construction stage
270 during which any design change affect the overall project delivery time and cost as widely
271 known in the literature. The subsequent section describes the systematic effort undertaken to
272 explore options to rectifying the identified issues.

273 *Actions taken*

274 A number of actions were systematically undertaken to address each the encountered issues
275 while simultaneously considering commercial, structural and aesthetic constraints:

- 276 • Deflection issue: Sections with larger width from a curtain wall system supplied by the
277 same vendor (i.e. vendor A) were examined as an alternative. A 65 mm wide box section
278 was identified. However, structural analysis showed that this box size cannot meet the
279 required deflection even with the inclusion of steel inserts. Another alternative section,
280 whose width is 15 mm larger than the width of the system initially specified, could be
281 meet the deflection requirement but it requires a joint in its length to satisfy the maximum
282 length required. This architect rejected this solution as no secondary steel was allowed to
283 be used between the mullion span points. This would be visible and totally unacceptable
284 to the architectural intent.

- 285 • Glass weight: The curtain wall system selected could not support the required glass
286 weight. To overcome this issue, it was proposed to bolt the transom to the mullion's shear
287 jointing blocks. The architects rejected this option as any face fixings on the curtain wall
288 screen was not allowed. Then, an extra transom could be introduced to cut the glass size
289 down and consequently bring the glass unit weight within acceptable limits. The architects
290 rejected also this solution as it affects the initial design intent and requires planning re-
291 approval. Therefore, it appeared that there were no solutions to this problem without the
292 need to reconsider planning permissions.
- 293 • Mullions' length available: The mullions of the selected curtain wall off-the-shelf system
294 were available in 6.5 m lengths only. Vendor A was approached to enquire if a special
295 length mullion could be produced. The vendor could not satisfy this requirement. An
296 alternative was to introduce a spigot joint in the mullion at suitable points to achieve the
297 lengths required. The architects rejected this option as a seamless mullion span was a key
298 aesthetic requirement. Then, the technical department of the curtain wall's supplier (i.s.
299 vendor A) was requested whether they can grant a concession for using the selected
300 product with the exceeding glass weight. The supplier did not approve this concession.

301 *Consequences*

302 The issues encountered were not resolved after exhausting all possible solution options.
303 At this stage, it was decided to investigate whether alternative systems supplied by other
304 vendors (i.e. vendors B and C), who are not even part of the project's supply chain, can
305 resolve the issues. An off-the-shelf product, supplied by vendor B, having mullions with
306 standard length of 7 meters, was identified as a potential solution. This product would not also
307 require the use of joints and/or reinforcement. This system was proposed to and accepted by
308 the architects. However, this caused some further commercial issues. The alternative product
309 is supplied by Vendor B – main competitor of vendor A and not part of the project supply

310 chain – required a sign-off from the central control office of the general contractor who has
311 commercial exclusivity with Vendor A whose approval was also needed. This process caused
312 program delays as site curtain wall work package is on the critical path of getting the building
313 weather proofed. In addition to the delays associated with this approval, there exploration of
314 the engineering options discussed earlier had negative on the project program and cost. In
315 particular:

- 316 • The project’s schedule was delayed by more than four weeks to the extra design and
317 research time spent on looking for alternative systems and in exhausting all possible
318 options based on the preferred selected system. The extra time spent stretched also design
319 resources and had a ripple effect on other areas of design, for the project, that needed to be
320 progressed.
- 321 • The architects who were directly responsible to the main client for quality control had to
322 be fully and formally convinced and informed that the original system could not be used.
323 This was a time consuming process that meant reissue of drawings and technical data
324 showing and justifying the issues encountered.
- 325 • The new system identified had to be submitted for approval. This included the issue of
326 samples from a new supplier, drawings, technical data and warranties that eventually need
327 to be issued to the client for approval.


328 Together these consequences, resulted from the inaccurate selection of building façade
329 element, represented a significant wastage of resources and caused time and cost overruns for
330 all the stakeholders involved (i.e. architect, client, contractor, suppliers, specialist building
331 façade contractor and structural consultant).

332 ***The current business process for selecting building façade elements***

333 The retrospective case study revealed some issues related to the early selection of building

334 enveloped elements such curtain wall systems. Using the results from the retrospective case
335 study and the experience of the project manager – case study story teller – who has 30 years
336 of experience in managing building façade projects, this section depicts the current business
337 process used to select curtain wall systems in construction projects. This process will be
338 verified with the results from the following industry survey. The selection decisions are
339 represented in business process which is defined as a set of coordinated tasks and activities to
340 achieve a project objective (Kassem et al., 2011). The current business process, reflecting
341 current practices, is depicted in ~~figure~~Fig. 3. ~~Figure~~Fig. 3 shows the key of issue of the late
342 appointment and involvement of building façade specialist consultants and subcontractors
343 which is currently made after the selection decisions have been made at the early and design
344 phases. It is known that design decisions have the biggest impact on the project lifecycle
345 phases and building performance (Schade et al., 2011) and incorrect design decisions bring
346 adverse impact on project participants and are responsible for many of construction failures
347 (Andi and Minato, 2003). Rework, which is often experienced in construction projects, is
348 regularly attributed to errors made during the design process (Love, 2000). These statements
349 were proven in the case study earlier. Together the delayed involvement of façade consultant
350 and subcontractor specialists and the limitations of off-the-shelf building façade elements
351 were very detrimental to projects as evidenced in the retrospective case study. The early
352 opportunity to build for greater flexibility and give broader scope in the selection of building
353 façade elements is missed in current business processes. ~~Figure~~Fig. 3 shows the three entry
354 points (shaded boxes) at which façade consultants and/or specialist subcontractors could be
355 involved to overcome such issues in a proactive manner. A further validation of this business
356 process and a comprehensive overview of the issues depicting current selection business
357 processes will be the subject of the industry survey.

358
359



360
361

Fig. 3. Business process adopted for the selection of curtain wall systems

362 *Industry survey*

363 The results of the case study cannot be generalised to all projects or to the whole sector. An
364 industry survey, followed by face to face and phone interviews with industry experts, was
365 used for explorative purposes to obtain a thorough understanding of the issues associated with
366 selection and specification decisions of building façade elements. Two criteria in sampling
367 participants and conducting the survey aimed to respectively increase the internal and the
368 external validity of findings. The first criterion is that all participants must be actively
369 involved in or are stakeholders who can influence the early selection of curtain wall systems.
370 The second criterion is that the sample size must allow the findings to be generalised at sector
371 level. To meet the sampling criteria, participants were selected from renowned and leading
372 architectural, consultancy and contracting organizations and included in the sample only if
373 they are actively involved in large commercial and residential construction projects where
374 curtain wall systems are mostly used as main elements of building façades. According to

375 these sampling criteria, 60 individuals were preselected with the support of two project
376 managers who have more than 20 years of experience in the sector. 54 participants expressed
377 interest in taking part and commitment to give information and came from organisations
378 operating at European and international scale such as Laing O Rourke, Mace, Balfour Beatty,
379 Morgan Ashurst, Bovis Lend Lease, Bennett's Architects, CWA Architects, Axismason
380 Architects, RMA Architects, Galliford Try, Barr Construction, Dandara, and Berkeley First.
381 Both semi-structured questionnaires followed by either a face to face dialogue or telephone
382 interview were used in the industry survey. To increase further the internal validity of the
383 survey, two actions were undertaken. First, a pilot questionnaire was tested with an operation
384 director who has 30 years of experience in the façade industry. This ensured that the questions
385 in the survey were perceived as both clear and relevant. Second, the telephones and face to
386 face interviews were used with most participants to gather more information about the open-
387 ended statements given by participants.

388 To adequately answer the issues researched, the questionnaire was organised into three
389 sections having distinct objectives:

- 390 • Awareness of stakeholders about commercially available curtain wall systems
- 391 • Knowledge of stakeholders about the engineering and technical performance of
392 commercially available curtain wall systems that affect selection decision
- 393 • Value of available product selection guidance offered by vendors

394 The commercially available curtain wall system considered in many questions and supplied
395 by vendors denoted as vendor A, vendor B and vendor C statistically represent the curtain
396 wall market as the three companies together have more than 70% of the European market.

397 | This was verified in the case of the UK with actual ~~figure~~Fig.s from the Companies House -
398 executive agency of the Department for Business Innovation and Skills – and the three

399 vendors considered in this study had just more than 70% of the UK market valued at \$ 250
 400 million in 2008 (Companies House 2008 tax returns).

401 The questions asked under each section and answers obtained are respectively summarised in
 402 Tables 4, 5 and 6 respectively.

403 Table 4. Awareness of stakeholders about available curtain wall systems

Q. 1	how well you know the façade and curtain wall industry?						
	very well (8%)	quite well (70%)	not very well (11%)	not at all(11%)			
Q. 2	do you employ a façade consultant?						
	yes (6%)	no (65%)	occasional (11%)	never (18%)			
Q. 3	how many curtain wall systems are you aware of?						
	1 to 3 (24%)	3 to 6 (41%)	6 to 9 (31%)	more than 10 (4%)			
Q. 4	how many curtain wall systems have you had experience of working with?						
	1 to 3 (78%)	3 to 6 (17 %)	6 to 9 (5%)	more than 10 (0%)			
Q. 5	if asked to name major curtain wall systems used in the UK which would you name?						
	system A (54%)	system B (42%)		system C (4%)			
Q. 6	given the choice which system would prefer to work with?						
	system A (48%)	system B (39%)		system C (13%)			
Q. 7	does the company you work for have a specified system, i.e. the choice is already made due to exclusivity deal with a particular supplier?						
	yes (6%)			no (94%)			
Q. 8	what would be your main criteria for choosing a certain system?						
	familiarity and past experience (23%)	cost (28%)	recommendation (12%)	engineering aspects (12%)	aesthetic (17%)	technical help (8%)	lead time (0%)

404

405

406

Table 5. Knowledge of stakeholders about the engineering and technical performance

Q. 9	when selecting a curtain wall systems at the concept design stage, how confident are you that it will meet the engineering requirements (i.e. accommodate the building movement, deflections and imposed loads etc.)?			
	not confident (15%)	fairly confident (15%)	Confident (61%)	very confident (9%)
Q. 10	who would you rely on to confirm that the system will meet the project needs in terms of engineering capabilities?			
	specialist subcontractor (54%)	own knowledge (31%)	system vendor (15%)	façade consultant (0%)
Q. 11	have you ever had experience of the specified envelope elements being changed due to their incapability of meeting engineering and technical requirements?			
	never (67%)	sometimes (33%)	often (0%)	
Q. 12	do you think you are given enough information upfront - before system selection and specification?			
	yes (31%)		no (69%)	
Q. 13	is the information required in question 12 readily available from suppliers?			
	yes (37%)		no (63%)	
Q. 14	do you think there is a difference in the amount of building movement that can be accommodated between different system supplier's products?			
	yes (18%)	no (15%)	not sure (67%)	

Table 6. Value of available product selection guidance offered by vendors

Q. 15	are you aware of any specifier guidance documentation / technical notes?			
	British standard (8%)	trade bodies (8%)	CWCT (31%)	others (11%)
Q. 16	do these technical notes / guidance information give any specific system advice?			
	yes (8%)	no (72%)	not sure (20%)	

410 Findings and discussion

411 The retrospective case study provided empirical evidence of the impact that inaccurate
 412 selection and specification of building façade elements can have on program's schedule and
 413 costs. The identified issues and challenges are causing time and cost overruns in construction
 414 projects in the form of: time to re-producing new drawings or amend existing drawings,

415 suspension of construction works, submission of new planning permissions, delays in
416 procurement and fabrication due to new lead times, and in some cases, commercial issues,
417 when there are exclusivity deals. This is very detrimental, not only to the building façade
418 work package, but to the entire project as curtain wall completion is always on the critical
419 path for getting the building weather-proof in all construction projects. The case study
420 introduced also some of the preliminary issues causing such a negative impact. The results of
421 the survey provide further evidence by showing that cases where curtain wall systems,
422 specified at the early design stage, had to be changed later on in the project due to their
423 inability to meet engineering requirements are not unusual (question 11). On the one hand,
424 this is partly caused by the limited knowledge of stakeholder, involved in the early
425 specification, of engineering performance of curtain wall systems (questions 1, 9 and 14).
426 Similar findings were identified in other studies, where a survey of architects ranked the ‘lack
427 of in-house expertise’ and ‘lack of industry expertise’ as major limitations at design stage
428 (Jaillon and Poon, 2010). On the other hand, the appointment of specialist façade consultants
429 and subcontractors is often left until late in the business process as evidenced in the mapping
430 of the business process (~~figure~~Fig. 3) once the opportunity of influencing specification
431 decisions and their impact is already missed. This was also confirmed in the survey where
432 more than 65% of participants acknowledged that they do not appoint a façade consultant
433 (question 2). In follow up telephone interviews, only three participants confirmed that they
434 employ a façade consultant to support the selection of the façade system. Interviewees
435 explained that in the majority of cases consultants are only called in to investigate and solve
436 post, or during construction, unforeseen problems. Most interviewees justified this fact on a
437 cost cutting ground and indicated that they do not deem this initial cost value for money.

438 Façade consultants were generally seen as a “necessary evil” – as expressed by one
439 participant - once problems had become apparent. Façade consultants are either hired later

440 once the issues have occurred or not appointed at all as occurred in the retrospective case
441 study. Also, in common with the retrospective case study where an exclusivity deal existed
442 between the main contractor and curtain wall system vendors, the survey showed that in some
443 cases (6%) there are commercial influences such as an inclusivity deals between the
444 contractor and the curtain wall vendor (question 7). Participants interviewed confirmed that in
445 those cases, the specification options for architects and consultants are even further restricted
446 and technical issues could become unavoidable in those cases. One specialist subcontractor
447 stated “we have the most to gain if the right system is selected and we can ensure that the
448 right system is selected. However, we have very little opportunity to influence the decision
449 due to our usual late appointment”.

450 The availability of information from curtain wall vendors is inadequate and difficult to obtain
451 (question 12 and 13). Early specifiers are aware of just a limited number of curtain wall
452 systems and usually adopt the system they know best until a problem arises (question 3 and 4)
453 or “specify the systems of those suppliers that appear to offer the most secure warranties and
454 technical assistance”, noted one the participants.

455 The limited awareness of participants of available curtain wall systems can have significant
456 commercial implications on the market share. Vendors with the highest marketing budget and
457 capabilities would have their systems specified on more and more projects and their market
458 share increasingly growing.

459 Merging together four of the survey findings (i.e. 1- limited knowledge of stakeholders of
460 engineering performance 2- technical guidance and information are either unavailable or not
461 user-friendly 3- the non-appointment of façade consultant and 4- the late appointment of
462 façade subcontractor) give indications of the root-causes of the challenges and risks affecting
463 the selection process in this considerable and expensive industry. If the four issues are seen as
464 constraints in the current industry business processes, a solution that concurrently addresses

465 them is to bring forward engineering information of building façade elements to the early
466 specification phase in a simplified and integrated manner – to cover all commercially
467 available systems – simplistic and user friendly format – to match the limited knowledge of
468 stakeholders.

469 The first contribution of this research was to provide the empirical evidence, by illustrating a
470 real case study and an industry survey of the major players, of the challenges affecting the
471 selection of façade systems at the early design phase and to identify the root causes of issues
472 creating wastage in the building façade sector. Indeed, together the case study and the
473 industry survey depicted a holistic identification and explanation of both the issues and their
474 implications. The findings from both the case study and industry survey can be used to
475 classify the issues into four distinct categories:

- 476 • Limited understanding by the decision makers, involved in the early specification, of
477 the engineering and technical parameters of façade systems;
- 478 • Tendency or reluctance to appoint specialist consultants and subcontractors early in
479 the business process;
- 480 • Lack of tools or methodologies that provide information in a user friendly and
481 simplistic format that match the level of experience of the early decision makers, and
- 482 • Commercial influences that affect the early specification and restricts the available
483 selection options.

484 Research and development efforts that aim to address the identified issues need to distinguish
485 between the issues that are rooted in the industry mindset and those that are purely related to
486 technical issues. The latter can be addressed in the short and mid-term compared to the former
487 that require a long-term cultural change. Indeed, as noted by three participants in the follow-
488 up interviews, some of the identified issues such as the delayed appointment of specialist
489 contractors and the reluctance to appoint consultants are rooted in the construction industry

490 and could persist in the short and mid-term despite several studies researching and invoking
491 the need for early stakeholder involvement. For example, studies focusing on the importance
492 of early stakeholder involvement (Wikstrom et al., 2010; Kagioglou et al., 2000) and
493 interaction (Tribelsky and Sacks, 2011) and their impact on value creation (Mitropoulos and
494 Howell, 2002) have proliferated since more than one decade and was emphasized in notable
495 industry report (i.e. Egan Report (1994) – Rethinking Construction). However, issues related
496 to the lack of involving stakeholders at suitable decision points in construction projects are
497 still occurring as this case study and survey have demonstrated. Early stakeholder
498 involvement give projects the opportunity to utilize and exploit a richer knowledge base
499 (Ramaswamy and Gouillart, 2010). In the case of building façade, as it was demonstrated in
500 the case study and the survey, the specialist knowledge of building façade consultants and
501 specialist subcontractors is not exploited due to their late or non-involvement.

502 A recent study, investigating the state of integration in the AEC community concluded that
503 despite integration is important for the industry on the whole, the effort to include integration
504 varies by discipline (Uihlein, 2013). This study unrivalled some of the collaboration issues
505 which are specific to the building façade sector. In the short term, it is challenging to present
506 solutions to rooted issues in the industry such as the culture of non-involving all relevant
507 stakeholders in the early design phase. However, it is possible to address some technical
508 issues such as the lack of simple and user-friendly technical guidance, the complexity and
509 fragmentation of guidance and the limited knowledge of stakeholders involved in early
510 selection decisions. For example, a solution option is to facilitate specification and selection
511 decisions by developing information management and decision support systems that bring
512 forward engineering and technical information in a simplistic and user friendly manner to the
513 stakeholders involved in the specification decisions (Kassem et al., 2012). This solution helps

514 filling the knowledge gap of stakeholders and improving the communication and
515 understanding of engineering performance at the early specification stage.

516 Very few studies , aimed at addressing the aforementioned issues with the specific focus on
517 the façade industry, are available. Chin et al. (2004) and Hwang et al. (2006) presented a
518 conceptual framework with three dimensions: production management; organization
519 management, and information management. The production management dimension aims at
520 clarifying the performance requirements for curtain wall and reducing design reworks through
521 manufacturability and constructability review. The organization management dimension is
522 tackles the nontechnical issues such as the need to change owner's and architect's attitude,
523 and the need for improving contractual arrangement. Finally, the information management
524 dimension consists of an 'alternative information-based solution' for each of the reported
525 issues. However, subsequent papers published by the authors (i.e. Hwang et al., 2006) have
526 focused only on the processes downstream the design stage (i.e. manufacturing, delivery and
527 installation) and therefore, did not address the specification decisions at the early design
528 phases. Also their framework made no distinction between off-the-shelf and bespoke curtain
529 wall systems. The retrospective case study and survey showed that the use of off-the-shelf
530 systems are a popular choice on projects and due to the limitations of such systems, issues
531 arise in design and construction phases. A proposed decision support system to aid the
532 selection process of off-the-shelf curtain wall systems was developed for the products of three
533 major vendors (Kassem et al., 2012). The system enables users to identify products that meet
534 the project and engineering requirements. However, the development of the proposed system
535 revealed further challenges. One major challenge consisted of the need for a taxonomy that
536 can to be adopted across all vendors' systems to uniquely represent key technical parameters
537 between vendors' systems. Resolving the taxonomy challenge in the representation of
538 engineering parameters and performance of building façade products across different

539 supplies will facilitate information management systems and consequently increase the
540 sharing of information between stakeholders. This will also contribute to unravelling some of
541 the less known building façade systems to the stakeholders involved in selection decisions.

542 The final contribution and implication of this research is to instigate or complement
543 methodological approaches in the subject area of ‘investigating and identifying issues
544 affecting construction projects’ with a new approach in which the granularity and scale of
545 investigation is increased to project and disciplinary level (i.e. building façade), without
546 overlooking the link with other disciplines (i.e. architectural and structure). As evidenced
547 from this research, this approach proved to be effective in identifying the very nature of issues
548 and their root causes.

549 **Conclusions**

550 The overarching aim of this research was to empirically identify the issues and challenges
551 affecting the selection of building façade at the early design; the impact of their specification
552 decisions on construction projects, and potential solutions. The use of the retrospective case
553 study, process mapping and the industry survey helped to achieve this aim. The case study
554 systematically demonstrated some of the issues affecting the early selection and building
555 façade elements and their impact. The lack of involvement of façade consultants and
556 specialist façade sub-contractors is resulting in selection of building façade systems that do
557 not meet the project and engineering requirements. Such issues, revealed only at the late
558 construction phase, have adversarial effects not only on the project’s schedule and cost but
559 also on the commercial relationships between stakeholders in some circumstances. The
560 industry survey contributed to identify an exhaustive list of the issues affecting the business
561 process of building façade selection and the root cause of such issues. The root cause of issues
562 were classified into four categories, namely: limited understanding of engineering parameters
563 by stakeholders involved in the early selection; reluctance in the appointment of specialist

564 consultants and subcontractors at early stages of the procurement process; lack of tools or
565 methodologies that provide information in a user friendly way to match the limited technical
566 knowledge of stakeholders, and commercial constraints such as exclusivity deals that restricts
567 the options available. In addition to filling this research gap in literature, this study adopted
568 and instigated a new methodological approach in this research domain. This approach
569 consisted of increasing the granularity of investigation by focusing on a specific building
570 trade and providing empirical evidence of the issues and their impacts. This will warrant an
571 incisive inquiry into the very nature of issues affecting the subject investigated. In such a
572 context, this research instigates:

- 573 • Domain researchers, who are interested either in exploring issues (time, cost or quality
574 related) in construction projects in general or in understanding how to bridge the gap
575 between early decision design decisions and engineering implications, to increase the
576 depth of investigation from sector-wide level to a more granular level such as a single
577 building trade;
- 578 • Industry players to develop methodologies and systems that bring forward engineering
579 information in a simplistic and user-friendly manner to all the stakeholders involved in the
580 selection process, and
- 581 • Researchers and industry players to build a taxonomy of technical terms and concepts
582 across all façade systems' vendors to facilitate the comparison of engineering
583 performance at the early design process in a systematic manner.

584 **References**

585 Al-Hajj, A. and Hamani, K. (2011). Material Waste in the UAE Construction Industry: Main
586 Causes and Minimization Practices, *Architectural Engineering and Design Management*, 7
587 (4), 221-235.

588 Amaratunga, A. Baldry, D., Sarshar, M. and Newton, R. (2002). Quantitative and qualitative
589 research in the built environment: application of “mixed” research approach, *Work Study*, 51
590 (1), 17-31.

591 Andi, A. and Minato, T. (2003). Design documents quality in the Japanese construction
592 industry: factors influencing and impacts on construction process. *International Journal of*
593 *Project Management*, 21(7), 537-46.

594 Assaf, S.A. and Al-Hejji, S. (2006). Causes of Delay in Large Construction Projects.
595 *International Journal of Project Management*, 24, 349 - 357.

596 Centre for Window and Cladding Technology (2000a). Cladding types. CWCT Technical
597 Note, No. 14. Centre for Window and Cladding Technology (2000b). Weather tightness and
598 drainage. *CWCT Technical Note*, No. 17.

599 Centre for Window and Cladding Technology (2000c). Introduction to wind loading on
600 cladding. *CWCT Technical Note*, No. 2.

601 Centre for Window and Cladding Technology (2003). Introduction to building envelope
602 acoustics. *CWCT Technical Note*, No. 37.

603 Centre for Window and Cladding Technology (2007). Movement accommodation in building
604 envelope. *CWCT Technical Note*, No. 55.

605 Centre for Window and Cladding Technology (2011). Fireperformance of curtain walls and
606 rainscreen. *CWCT Technical Note*. No. 73.

607 Centre for Window and Cladding Technology, 1999. Introduction to structural design of stick
608 curtain walling. *CWCT Technical Note*, No. 26.

609 Chin, S., Yoon, S.W., Kim, C.D., Choi, Y.K., and Chun, J.Y. (2004). An analysis of the Life-
610 Cycle Curtain Wall Process through Supply Chain Management. *Proceeding of International*
611 *Group of Lean Construction*, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 2004.

612 Eastman, C., Teicholz, P., Sacks, R. and Liston, K. (2011). *BIM Handbook: A Guide to*
613 *Building Information Modeling for Owners, Managers, Designers, Engineers and*
614 *Contractors*, 2nd Ed., John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New Jersey.

615 Efstathiades, C., Baniotopoulos, C.C., Nazarko, P., Ziemianski, L. and Stavroulakis, G.E.
616 (2007). *Application of neural networks for the structural health monitoring in curtain-wall*
617 *systems*. *Engineering Structures*, 29 (12), 3475-3484.

618 El-Razek, M.E.A., Bassioni, H.A. and Mobarak, A.M. (2008). Causes of Delay in Building
619 Construction Projects in Egypt. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 134,
620 831-841.

621 Fallahnejad, M.H. (2013). Delay Causes in Iran Gas Pipeline Projects. *International Journal*
622 *of Project Management*. 31(1), 136-146.

623 Health and Safety Executive (2007). *The Construction Design and Management Regulations*,
624 HSE, UK.

625 Hwang, D.W., Choi, S.W., Song, Y.W. and Choi, Y.K. (2006). Information exchange of
626 curtain wall work for the application of supply chain management system, *Proceedings of the*

627 23rd International Symposium on Automation and Robotics in Construction, 2006 (ISARC),
628 Tokyo, Japan, October.

629 Jaillon, L. and Poon, P.S. (2010). Design issues of using prefabrication in Hong Kong
630 building construction. *Construction Management and Economics*, 28(10), 1025-1042.

631 Jin, Q. and Overend, M. (2010). A thermal performance analysis model for the design
632 optimisation of high performance glazed facades. *Engineered transparency International*
633 *Conference*, Glasstec, Düsseldorf, Germany 29 and 30 September 2010.

634 Kassem, M., Dawood, N. and Mitchel, D. (2012). A decision support system for the selection
635 of curtain wall systems at the design development stage, *Construction Management and*
636 *Economics*, 30 (12), 1039-1053.

637 Kassem, M., Dawood, N. and Mitchell, D. (2011). A Structured Methodology for Enterprise
638 Modeling: a Case Study for Modeling the Operation of a British Organization, *Journal of*
639 *Information Technology in Construction*, 16, 677-690.

640 Kpamma, E. Zoya and Adjei-Kumi, T. (2011). Management of waste in the building design
641 process: the Ghanaian consultants' perspective, *Architectural Engineering and Design*
642 *Management*, 7 (2), 102-112.

643 Kragh, M. (2011a). Façade Engineering and the design team of the future, Society of Façade
644 Engineering, *Executive Boardroom Commentary*, 30-36.

645 Kragh, M. (2011b). The decade of the façade Engineer, Society of Façade Engineering,
646 *Intelligent Glass Solutions*, 1, 44-51.

647 Love, P.E.D., Mandal, P., Smith, J. and Li, H. (2000). Modelling the dynamics of design error
648 induced reworking construction. *Construction Management and Economics*, 18(5), 567-74.

649 Sun, M. and Meng, X. (2009). Taxonomy for change causes and effects in construction
650 projects, *International Journal of Project Management*, 27(6), pp. 560-572.

651 Mitropoulos, P. and Howell, G.A. (2002). Renovation projects: design process problems and
652 improvement mechanisms. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 18 (4), 179-185.

653 Mohsen, F. and Elaheh, N. (2012) Building envelope as an environmental apparatus:
654 integrating architectural and natural systems. *ICSDEC 2012*, 268-275.

655 Odeh, A.M. and Battaineh, H.T. (2002). Causes of Construction Delay: Traditional
656 Contracts?. *International Journal of Project Management*, 20, 67-73.

657 Pavitt, T. and Gibb, A. (2003). Interface management within construction: in particular,
658 building façade, *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 129 (1), 8-15.

659 Quirouette, R. (2013). *Glass & Aluminium Curtain Wall Systems*, Ontario Association of
660 Architects .

661 Ramaswamy, V. and Gouillart, F. (2010). *The power of co-creation: build it with them to*
662 *boost growth, productivity and profits*. Free Press, New York, NY, USA, 2010.

663 Rossman, G.B. and Wilson B.L. (1991). Number and words revisited: being ‘shamelessly
664 eclectic’, *Evaluation Review*, 9 (5), 627-643.

665 Schade, J., Olofsson, T. and Schreyer, M. (2011). Decision making in a model-based design
666 process, *Construction Management and Economics*, 29(4), 371–82.

667 Shebob, A., Dawood, N., Shah, R.K. and Xu, Q. (2012). Comparative Study of Delay Factors
668 in Libyan and the UK Construction Industry. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural
669 Management*, 19(6), pp. 688 – 712.

670 Succar, B., Kassem, M. (2015). Macro-BIM adoption: Conceptual structures, *Automation in
671 Construction*, vol. 57, September 2015, pp. 64-79.

672 Sweis, G., Sweis, R., Hammad, A.A. and Shboul, A. (2008). Delays in Construction Projects:
673 The Case of Jordan, *International Journal of Project Management*, 26, 665 – 674.

674 Tran, D., Behr, R., and Parfitt, M. (2014). Global Differences in Building Enclosures, *Journal
675 of Architectural Engineering*, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)AE.1943-5568.0000146](http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)AE.1943-5568.0000146)

676 Tribelsky, E. and Sacks R. (2011). An Empirical Study of Information Flows in
677 Multidisciplinary Civil Engineering Design Teams using Lean Measures, *Architectural
678 Engineering and Design Management*, 7 (2), 85-10.

679 Tumi, S.A.H., Omran, A. and Pakir, A.H.K. (2009) Causes of Delay in Construction Industry
680 in Libya, in: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Economics and Administration*,
681 265-272.

682 Uihlein, M. (2013). State of integration: investigation of integration in the A/E/C community,
683 *Journal of Architectural Engineering*, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)AE.1943-
684 5568.0000139](http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)AE.1943-5568.0000139)

685 Vigener, N. and Brown M. (2012). *Building Envelope Design Guide - Curtain Walls*,
686 National Institute of Building Sciences, Washington, DC, U.S.

687 Wikstrom, K., Artto, K. and Kujala, J. and Soderlund, J. (2010). Business models in project
688 business. *International Journal of Project Management*, 28 (8), 832-841.

689 Yin, R.B. (1994). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (2nd ed). Sage Publications,
690 Thousand Oaks, CA.

691

692

693

694

695