

Document downloaded from:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10251/59106>

This paper must be cited as:

Alshubbak, A.; Eugenio Pellicer; Catalá Alís, J.; José C. Teixeira; teixe (2015). A model for identifying owner's needs in the building life cycle. *Journal of Civil Engineering and Management*. 21(8):1046-1060. doi:10.3846/13923730.2015.1027257.



The final publication is available at

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3846/13923730.2015.1027257>

Copyright Taylor & Francis: STM, Behavioural Science and Public Health Titles

Additional Information

# **A MODEL FOR IDENTIFYING OWNER'S NEEDS IN THE BUILDING LIFE CYCLE**

**Ali ALSHUBBAK**

*Department of Construction Engineering, Universitat Politècnica de València, Valencia, Spain*

**Eugenio PELLICER**

*School of Civil Engineering, Universitat Politècnica de València, Valencia, Spain  
Camino de Vera, s/n, 46022 Valencia (Spain) – E-mail: pellicer@upv.es*

**Joaquín CATALÁ**

*School of Civil Engineering, Universitat Politècnica de València, Valencia, Spain*

**José M.C. TEIXEIRA**

*Department of Civil Engineering, Universidade do Minho, Guimarães, Portugal*

# A MODEL FOR IDENTIFYING OWNER'S NEEDS IN THE BUILDING LIFE CYCLE

*Received 31 October 2012*

**Abstract.** Building life cycle is a process which covers not only the construction phase but also the feasibility, the design and the operation phases. Identifying the owner's needs in all phases of this process is of paramount importance for achieving satisfactory results for the building project. Additionally, the owner's needs should be fulfilled by the work scope of every stakeholder involved in the project. Nevertheless, these needs are not always adequately considered in building projects. Thus, the purpose of the research reported in this paper has been to develop a model that allows for the identification of the owner's needs in all phases of the building life cycle. The article presents a six level classification system for the information required in the project and a two-dimensional model that maps the life cycle and the logical actions to be undertaken in each phase. The model has been corroborated and improved by applying the Delphi technique to a panel of ten experts in two rounds. The practical use of the model is through the systematic application of a series of questionnaires built upon the information classification system for determining the owner's needs. The paper details the operation phase of the model as an illustrative example and a case study on a residential building project of twelve apartments in Spain.

**Keywords:** building, information system, life cycle, need, owner, requirement

## 1. Introduction

The construction process covers the feasibility, design, construction and operation phases (Groak, 1994; Gann and Salter, 2000; Pellicer et al., 2014). This concept of process is equivalent to the most popular life cycle concept (Levitt, 1965; Cole and Sterner, 2000), which implies a set of phases beginning with the owner's initial idea and eventually finishing with the dismantlement or demolition of the built facility at the end of its life time. According to Winch (2002 and 2006) the construction process focuses on transactions (rather than on production) and information flows (instead of material flows). Actually, information processing is vital for acquiring enough knowledge for starting the cycle successfully (Chan et al., 2002; Yu et al., 2010; Xia et al. 2014). For Tushman and Nadler (1978), processing information is twofold: identifying and capturing information, on the one hand, and classifying information, on the other hand.

Information flows affect a broad spectrum of individuals, groups or organizations involved in the project, generally called stakeholders (Winch, 2003; PMI, 2013). The owner is the stakeholder (agent, legal entity or physical person either private or public) who initiates the process (Kamara et al., 1999) and finances and operates (directly or indirectly) the construction product (i.e., the built facility). Actually, the owner (or client) is the most important stakeholder in the project (Lim and Ling 2002, Soetanto and Proverbs 2002) and has a strong interaction with the other stakeholders through communication and collaboration in order to ensure that his/her needs are met in all phases of the facility life cycle (Muller and Turner, 2005; Lima et al., 2011).

Needs are the stakeholders' expectations concerning the construction product (Kamara et al., 2000a; Chua and Yeoh, 2011) and must be processed and formally translated into requirements (Lima et al., 2011; PMI, 2013). Project management ensures the understanding of the stakeholders' needs and their accomplishment by coordinating the activities of every project stakeholder (Yuan et al., 2010; PMI, 2013; Yang and Shen, 2014).

Although there is abundant literature on the management of stakeholders' needs in general (Smith and Love, 2004; Takim, 2009; Yuan et al, 2010; Jennings et al., 2013; Yang and Shen, 2014), typical construction processes lack practical frameworks for specifically managing the owner's needs (Shen et al., 2004; Yu et al., 2010; Chua and Yeoh, 2011; Yu and Shen, 2013). In most cases, owners express their needs on the basis of their previous construction experience but the reliability of this strongly decreases with the project complexity (Kamara et al., 1999 and 2000b; Lima et al., 2011). Actually, identifying the owner's needs in order to attain his/her expectations usually requires a much deeper analysis from expert consultants so that the integration of other stakeholders' needs may be achieved (Kamara et al., 2000b; Lima et al. 2011) –either owners acknowledge it or not, this is a key issue for the success of the whole construction process (Chan et al., 2002; Yu et al., 2010; Xia et al., 2014).

Considering the first step of information processing, as explained in the first paragraph, several authors have attempted to identify and capture the owner's needs in a number of different construction projects. Owner's needs for the design and construction phases in large infrastructure projects were analyzed and foreseen using questionnaires by Hassan et al. (1999). A more in-depth study was performed by Kamara et al. (1999, 2000a, 2000b, and 2002) who developed the Client Requirement Processing Model, and applied it to concurrent engineering. This model first structures and ranks the requirements, then prioritizes the stakeholders according to their importance, and finally generates the facility design attributes. Lim and Ling (2002) proposed a different model to examine owner's needs by considering twenty attributes possibly affecting the facility life cycle, divided into five groups. On the other hand, quality management models, such as Six-Sigma (Pheng and Hui, 2004), Quality Function Deployment (Akao and Mazur, 2003; Lima et al., 2011), or the European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM, 2008), have defined quality as the fulfillment of the project owner's needs, and implement these needs as input data (Hoyle, 2009). Yang et al. (2012) went a step further and relate quality to

the definition of project requirements and its management. Nonetheless, Yu et al. (2010) concluded that managing the owner's needs for design and construction phases still raised a number of practical difficulties.

Shen et al. (2004) proposed a very interesting framework for defining client requirements at the early start of the design phase of a building project. A workshop organized by the owner, attended by the main stakeholders gathers key information through facilitation and discussion. Criteria are broken down and weighted, and acceptance thresholds are established to satisfy the owner's needs. At the building operation phase, an assessment takes place on the fulfillment of the initial requirements and building performance, thereby providing important feedback for the framework

Other tools have had substantial development in recent years, such as the Building Information Modeling (BIM) approach that generates and manages construction information in an interoperable way, allowing users to integrate and reuse it throughout the facility life cycle (Lee et al., 2006); BIM helps the owner to check that requirements have been implemented in the product during the design, construction and operation phases (Eastman et al., 2008; Teicholz, 2013), but it does not systematically identify and capture the owner's needs. Commissioning, on the other hand, is a systematic process that aims to inspect that every building system is designed, installed, and tested according to the interpretation of the owner's needs from designers and builders (Energy Design Resources, 2005; ASHRAE, 2006), but it cannot assure the real identification and fulfillment of those needs. Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of some models, normative and systems intended for processing and implementing the owner's needs.

<TABLE 1>

Regarding the classifying information step, there is a number of information classification systems already in use, such as Uniclass (RIBA, 1997), Construction Information Classification System (Kang and Paulson, 1997 and 2000), Masterformat (CSI, 2004), Omniclass (Omniclass Committee, 2013), ISO 13567 (Björk et al., 1997) and CI/SfB (Chudley and Greeno, 2010), just to mention a few of the most well-known. These classification systems have been developed for different purposes, focusing on different facility types and phases. Table 2 checks these purposes for each classification system mentioned above. In summary, these systems are mainly focused on the construction phase of the process and only consider materials, processes and products, leaving out not only an important part of the other phases, but also the managerial and procurement practices. Furthermore, the classified information does not take into consideration the time dimension of the facility life cycle. Besides, levels of the classification are not developed consistently within the same system because of the varying detail of information covered. Accordingly, these classification systems do not sustain construction as a holistic perspective of the whole facility life cycle.

Furthermore, none of these systems explains how to get the information; they merely propose a codified organization of the targeted information.

<TABLE 2>

In summary, the literature survey showed that models proposed so far attempt to handle only one of the two steps of the processing information process: either identification and capture of the owner's needs, or information classification, but not both of them. They also have a too narrow focus, namely, construction processes and products within the construction phase. Having detected this gap in the scientific literature, the goal of the research reported in this paper has been to identify and capture the owner's needs (step one in information processing), and classifying it (step two) for all phases of the facility life cycle, taking into consideration all the logical processes involved. The facilities targeted in this study, in the sense expressed by Zavadskas et al. (2001), are residential buildings, thus the expression "building life cycle" will be used from now on.

This paper is organized as follows. Next section briefly presents the research method used in the study. Section 3 provides a general description of the model. Then, the operation phase is explained in more detail because of its singularity. Section 5 performs a preliminary validation of the model by applying the Delphi technique. Section 6 presents a case study on the implementation of the model. Finally, conclusions are drawn.

## 2. Research method

This research aims to develop a model that identifies, captures, and classifies the owner's needs in all phases of the building life cycle, taking into consideration all the logical processes involved. In order to develop the draft of the model, the following issues were taken into consideration by the research team: (a) literature review; (b) analysis of existing models; (c) revision of regulations (Spanish regulations for this particular case); (d) records of previous building projects; and (e) past experience of the authors. These issues were used to adjust the information classification system, which has been developed for capturing the owner's needs at all phases of the building life cycle. The draft was subsequently improved through many rounds by using the feedback of experts and professionals from the construction industry; this was carried out for checking and improving the model. The final version of the model is described thoroughly in Section 3 as a two-dimensional model that maps the phases of the building life cycle and the logic chain of project management actions (stages) within each phase by using a breakdown structure approach.

The model was validated by applying the Delphi technique through a panel of experts as can be seen ahead. It is a systematic, iterative and interactive process providing a reliable group opinion, or even consensus, from information given by a panel of experts in a specific subject (Rowe and Wright, 1999; Linstone and Turoff, 1975; Hollowell and Gambatese, 2010; Sourani and

Sohail, 2014). The Delphi technique was selected for a number of reasons. Firstly, it is a sound validation tool because it can cope with complex problems involving thoughtful and judgmental analysis (Sourani and Sohail, 2014). Secondly, validation requires the participation of relevant specialists who could not effectively interact in a face-to-face exchange (Hallowell and Gambatese, 2010). Other techniques such as surveys would have been risky to implement in this case because the complexity of the problem to be modeled (the owner's needs in the building life-cycle) could possibly not be understood by the interviewees in a reasonable time frame. Organizing group meetings as an alternative approach would not be feasible as the time and expense of mobilizing the group would result in the exclusion of important participants. Finally, the Delphi technique has been the preferred method among expert-based studies (Rowe and Wright, 1999; Hallowell and Gambatese, 2010) and this has given confidence to the authors on the selection of this method for validating the model.

The size of the panel is fundamental for the Delphi technique. The minimum number of experts varies according to each author surveyed: as stated by Martino (1972) there should be at least five, whereas Okoli and Pawlowski (2004) specified a minimum of eight experts, recommending ten for their studies. The information is obtained through questionnaires distributed by hand, post, e-mail, or web. The study facilitator selects the experts according to a minimum pattern, develops the questionnaires, analyzes the results, draws conclusions, and provides feedback to the participants. Experts give their anonymous opinions in iterative rounds led by the facilitator in order to achieve maximum consensus (Hallowell and Gambatese, 2010). The four goals aimed by applying the Delphi technique in this research are:

- To measure the completeness of the information included in the classification.
- To examine the reasonability of the classification structure.
- To identify possible gaps in the classification structure.
- To collect suggestions and modifications proposed by the experts.

The draft model was developed through weekly meetings of the research team during a period of two years; expert professionals joined the meetings from time to time when their expertise was needed. Finally, ten experts have been selected for a two round evaluation of the model using the Delphi technique as explained above. After completing the model, the research team implemented it in a real case study.

### 3. Description of the model

The model is displayed as a matrix comprising two dimensions: time (phases of the building life cycle) and logic (project management actions to pursue in each phase). Four main phases have been considered for the building life cycle (Cleland, 1999; Archibald, 2004; Pellicer et al., 2014): feasibility, design, construction, and

operation. Each matrix cell has been further broken down into additional levels of detail, for enabling a number of interactive questionnaires aiming to identify the owner's needs in all phases of the building life cycle. To achieve this end, information of technical, financial, economic, and legal nature, as well as other details, must be identified, gathered and classified.

The second dimension of the matrix is a logic chain of project management actions that should be followed in each project phase in order to materialize the output of that phase. These stages are based on project management theory (Morris, 1994; PMI, 2013) that proposes four stages to deal with a project: (a) start; (b) organize and prepare; (c) carry out; (d) and close. They have been adapted to the construction sector too by CIOB (2002) in a more detailed way: (a) inception and feasibility; (b) strategy and pre-construction; (c) construction; and (d) commissioning, handover and project close-out. Based on these previous contributions, and for the purpose of this research, four stages are considered: (a) planning, compiling and classifying the preparatory information for work development; (b) procurement and contract; (c) work execution according to the contract agreements; and (d) delivery of the final product to the owner. Items (a), (b), (c), and (d) form the stages of planning, procurement, execution, and delivery, respectively. In these stages, the information directly or indirectly related to the owner's needs is classified. If the owner is acting with in-house staff during a particular phase, then stages (b) and (d) may not be necessary and the logic chain is reduced.

Both dimensions have been combined into a matrix form, as shown in Fig. 1. The two dimensions of the matrix form the first and second levels of the classification: phases correspond to the first, whereas stages correspond to the second one. Accordingly, for each cell, a combination of phase-stage is specified, using a two-level code. For example, cell 4.2 can be read as the procurement at the operation phase; this specific cell will be used as an illustrative example below.

#### <FIGURE 1>

Having defined the basic two-dimensional matrix, the next step has been to look for more detailed information on the owner's needs. The diversity and amount of possible information is huge, thus certain criteria should be established in advance:

- Legal compliance with regulations: this will vary from one country to another. The model has been developed using Spanish regulations; thus, it must be adapted when implemented elsewhere.
- Information nature: technical, economic, social, professional, legal, and so forth, depending on each of the cells.
- Owner's experience and professionalism: the more detailed the information requested, the more experienced the owner must be. The owner may be advised by a technician or even specialized firms.
- Clarity and relevance of the information and its structure.
- Supplying the right information for the right phase and stage according to the chronological

development of the building life cycle.

Accordingly, four additional classification levels have been included for each phase-stage cell: field (3<sup>rd</sup> level), subfield (4<sup>th</sup> level), questions (5<sup>th</sup> level), and answers (6<sup>th</sup> level). The model could possibly go deeper, therefore providing additional levels of detail. However, feedback from experts and professionals collected throughout the research as well as the experience of the authors, advised to bring it to an end at the 6<sup>th</sup> level. The researchers determined that the additional information that may be available at the hypothetical 7<sup>th</sup> level would be obscured by the complexity of the model. Fig. 2 shows a complete model breakdown up to the 3<sup>rd</sup> level (fields).

<FIGURE 2>

According to Fig 2, two stages on different phases have been developed almost identically: the first one is the procurement stage at feasibility, design and construction; the second one is the delivery stage at the feasibility and design phases. De facto they follow related regulations and procedures instructed by the European Union (Directive 2004/18/EC on the coordination of procedures for the award of public works contracts, public supply contracts and public service contracts).

The 3<sup>rd</sup> level (fields) is a farther dissection of each phase-stage cell. The aim of this level is to categorize the information in groups of the same nature, enabling to reach posterior classification levels. Similarly, the 4<sup>th</sup> level (subfields) is the development of each item of the information included in the previous level. The 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> levels are the most detailed classification levels for the identification of the owner's needs and correspond to questions and answers, respectively. These two levels have the form of record sheets, which form a set of interactive questionnaires to identify and capture the owner's needs in each phase-stage cell in all phases of the building life cycle. The 5<sup>th</sup> level allows for collecting detailed information on technical, financial, economic, and legal aspects of the building as well as other details, on the owner's interest. Questions categorize information allowing for alternative answering at the owner's choice. Finally, the 6<sup>th</sup> level develops all the possible options regarding the information in the previous level, and also allows for recording the owner's answers corresponding to its requirements or needs.

Questions and answers (5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> levels) have been developed per subfield in a record sheet on the format presented in Fig. 3. Each record sheet is specific for each sub-field (4<sup>th</sup> level) and is defined by the corresponding code (depicting the phase, stage, field, and subfield). Three basic hints are provided for each record sheet: why is this information (reason), what is it for (purpose), and what does it include (contents). The set of the record sheets developed for each phase-stage cell forms the corresponding questionnaire to identify and document the owner's needs in that cell.

<FIGURE 3>

Due to space limitations, it is difficult to present here the whole classification levels which lead to the record sheets, so that, later in the paper there is an example of a record sheet focused on the operation phase,

where the development and the structure up to the 4<sup>th</sup> level can be observed in Fig. 5. A sample of the development of last two levels 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> is presented in Fig. 6.

All in all, the volume of information that the model aims to identify and capture can be measured by the number of fields and subfields developed. Table 3 shows that the total number of fields is 102 and that the total number of subfields is 566 (the same number of record sheets developed). The average number of needs identified per record sheet exceeds ten (see Fig. 6 as an example); thus, the model is able to identify more than five thousand owner's needs. This is comparable with the information provided by current construction information classification systems as depicted in the last two rows of Table 2. Masterformat, for example, deals with a maximum number of 43 fields and four levels of breakdown against the maximum number of seven in Uniclass and Omniclass.

<TABLE 3>

Having described the structure of the model, its practical use should now be explained. The model is used through the systematic application of the questionnaires to the owner (or its representative) in order to obtain as much information as possible on the owner's needs. Every cell (phase-stage) of the two-dimensional matrix is to be analyzed according to each of its fields and corresponding subfields. Before the initiation of any stage at every phase (cell), the corresponding record sheets are retrieved from a data base which includes all the developed sheets and filled out by the owner or its representative. This will generate the set of owner's needs corresponding to that cell. After finishing the work on a specific cell, the owner's needs identified through the model can be used for checking his/her perception and possibly adjusted if significant deviations in the real work are detected. Then, the owner's needs in next cell (phase-stage) can be identified. Fig. 4 shows the model's functional architecture.

<FIGURE 4>

An in-depth description of the model from this point on is beyond the scope of this paper, because of the huge volume of information handled by the model. The complete description of the model at the subfield level (record sheets) is developed in Alshubbak (2010).

#### 4. The procurement stage at the operation phase

The operation phase has been chosen as an example in order to explain the model exhaustively, where readers can trace the progress of the classification procedure up to the record sheet. This phase is particularly interesting due to the fact that it is less considered in the literature than other phases of the building life cycle (Lai and Yik, 2007), such as the design and construction phases.

From the owner's point of view, the operation phase deals with the management of the facility as a business, as well as maintenance activities. The first one refers to economic, financing, and administrative activities that also involve the users. The second one seeks to ensure all elements, both structural and functional, in terms of

stability, safety and habitability. Thus, various types of maintenance should be performed at periodic intervals.

The procurement stage at the operation phase comprises four fields, each of which is developed in subfields as described in Fig. 5. The four fields are the following:

- Sale (home buyer): once both parties have fulfilled their contractual duties, the property title is passed on to the buyer, and the owner is relieved of its responsibilities (except for hidden defects).
- Rent (home lender or tenant): after fulfilling their contractual duties, the property title keeps on the owner's. In this case, only the temporary use is given to the tenant.
- Operation by another entity: the owner subcontracts the building operation (or part of it) to a specialized entity, taking legal form of facility management or concession.
- Owner's direct operation or use: it may also include a transition time before a final decision for the definitive use of the facility has been set up.

<FIGURE 5>

Regarding the procurement at the operation phase, the nature and scope of the four different options have to be considered. Each one of them carries different requirements, responsibilities, and administrative paperwork. Nevertheless, considering the subfield "Conditions", the questions stated are almost the same for the first three options above (sale, rent, and operation by another entity), namely: price, payment form, place and date, expenses, condominium (master deed and rules of governance), obligations, confidentiality, modifications, resolution, extinction, deadlines, renewals, jurisdiction, penalties, and arbitration. A complete record for questions (5<sup>th</sup> level) and answers (6<sup>th</sup> level) is shown in Fig. 6 corresponding to the subfield "conditions", field "sales", stage "procurement", and phase "operation".

<FIGURE 6>

## 5. Preliminary model validation: Delphi technique

A preliminary validation of the model was carried out by using the Delphi technique. A panel of ten experts was set up according to the following criteria: experts should hold a university degree in the construction field with a minimum of 15 years of practice and be available to effectively participate in the Delphi study. An invitation letter was sent to a group of 24 experts, 10 of them responded positively. The final panel consisted of four civil engineers, three architects, two industrial engineers, and one economist. Six of the experts had M.Sc. degrees and the other four hold Ph.D. degrees.

Experts were asked to assess the items considered in the model up to the 4<sup>th</sup> level of classification. Three aspects for each item were inquired: importance, completeness, and suggestions for improvement. The first two aspects were evaluated quantitatively and analyzed statistically; the latter was only assessed qualitatively.

In order to achieve a consensus, two rounds were planned, with a possible third, if the convergence would

be unsatisfactory. Each expert received a document pack that included a cover letter, an expert-profile questionnaire, an introductory explanation of the model, the schemes of classified information up to the 4<sup>th</sup> level, and the Delphi questionnaires. According to Best (1974), feedback from the experts greatly improves the accuracy of last rounds; thus, previously to the second round, the panel was individually informed about the results achieved that far. Subsequently, the experts received the second questionnaire and were asked again about every topic of the model.

A five-point Likert scale (Cohen et al., 2011) was used to measure the experts' level of agreement or disagreement regarding the importance and the completeness of the item included in the classification system. The scale had the following alternatives: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree. A score is given to each of the choices, from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree); thus, responses to these questions can be analyzed statistically by calculating their mean and standard deviation.

The convergence of the experts' opinions was measured by using the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. This ratio is a measure of the squared correlation between observed scores and true scores; the reliability is measured in terms of the ratio of true score variance to observed score variance (Yu, 2001). The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is calculated according to Equation 1, where  $K$  is the number of items,  $\delta_x^2$  the variance of the observed total test scores, and  $\delta_{y_i}^2$  the variance of item  $i$  for the current sample.

$$\alpha = \frac{K}{K-1} \left[ 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^K \delta_{y_i}^2}{\delta_x^2} \right] \quad (\text{Equation 1})$$

The stopping criteria for the Delphi rounds iteration were established to include the following points: (a) Cronbach's Alpha coefficient greater than 0.8 (minimum reliable value); (b) no response value of 1 or 2 in any case; and (c) an overall average attained greater than 4.5. The statistical analysis of the two rounds contains the average response of the experts, regarding the importance and completeness of the information included in the classification. Importance aims at measuring the perceived relevance of information that should be collected, whereas completeness relates to the amount of significant data in each project phase. Table 4 shows the average response of the experts for each cell (phase-stage) for the importance and the completeness issues. Regarding importance, the experts considered the execution of the design and construction phases and construction procurement as the most important cells; whereas the less important ones were the design delivery, and the procurement, execution and delivery at the feasibility stage in addition to planning and execution at the operation phase. Completeness, on the other hand, was worse considered for the execution of the feasibility and operation phases. On the other hand, procurement and execution at the design and construction phases, as well as design planning, were the ones considered more complete. In general, it can be deduced that experts are

more comfortable with the construction phase, and less so with the planning and operation ones. The more in-depth knowledge of the experts of the construction phase, plus the difficulty of standardizing the feasibility and operation phases because of their greater variability, can be a reason for these results.

The non-statistical analysis corresponds to the modifications and suggestions proposed by the participating experts. The classification content was updated in accordance with these modifications. In the second round, the three stopping criteria items were completely achieved; hence, no more rounds were performed.

<TABLE 4>

## 6. Case study

The complete implementation of the model required selecting a case study from its initiation to the full operational phase. This set of activities could take many years, maybe even decades. Therefore, the authors implemented the model in a residential building project at the feasibility and design phases only. The project owner was a private company that always works with the same architect (a local consulting firm) for design and construction work inspection –this scheme is typical of the Spanish residential building sector (Pellicer and Victory, 2006). The case study consists of a 12-apartment building. Each apartment is comprised of three or four bedrooms, two bathrooms, a living room, a kitchen, and a parking box on the basement. The ground floor is for commercial stores. The building is located in one of the urban neighborhoods of Valencia (Spain). This building was chosen as a case study for four main reasons: (1) it reflects a typical Spanish building project due to its architecture, materials, contract, and management features; (2) the timing was right because the project was just starting; (3) the project team had proven experience in this field; and (4) the owner and architect agreed to participate in the research (four other similar building projects declined). Instead of the typical brief of the owner to the architect (Shen et al., 2004), the feasibility phase of the model was implemented in this case study. In the same way, the design produced by the architect was based on the implementation of the design phase of the model. The procurement stage was not implemented in any of these phases as the designer was already employed directly by the owner from the very beginning as mentioned above. If that were not the case, the identification of the owner's needs for the procurement stage should have taken place.

It was agreed with the owner to implement the model in order to define his needs for the feasibility and design phases. The owner representative was the architect who advised the owner on how to fill out the questionnaire for the feasibility phase. Subsequently, the architect filled out the questionnaire for the design phase. After each phase, the fulfilled questionnaires were analyzed by the owner, the architect and the research team (who acted as facilitator in the process) for checking if the owner's needs were really detailed for both phases.

Table 5 describes the model implementation process for this case study.

<TABLE 5>

As shown in Table 3, the total number of record sheets (subfields or 4<sup>th</sup> level of breakdown in the model) is 123 for the feasibility phase and 157 for the design phase; these figures include the procurement stage, which was not applied in any phase, since the architect was directly employed by the owner. According to Table 6, a total of 83 owner's needs were identified in the feasibility phase, and 203 in the design phase. The subfields responded totaled 44% for the feasibility phase and 79% for the design phase. In the feasibility phase, because the procurement stage was not considered due to the aforementioned reasons, the percentage is low. In the design phase, however, the owner left unanswered the remaining 21% of the subfields for two reasons: either to leave the designer some freedom for design options, or because those were considered irrelevant by the owner and beyond the scope of the project.

<TABLE 6>

Once the questionnaires corresponding to the feasibility and design phases were filled by the owner representative, the facilitators extracted each answer (selected or written down) along with the items in all previous corresponding classification levels, showing a series of items separated by slashes that started with a unique code and finished with the answer of the owner representative. The final code is formed by the sequential codes corresponding to the items of the classification levels up to the question level. Each expression corresponds to a single owner's need with the following structure: Code: Phase / Stage / Field / Subfield / Question: Answer.

Fig. 7 shows a sample of the owner's needs gathered for the design phase, which is formulated according to the breakdown structure of the model. The input is displayed in the last two levels: the owner's answer (6<sup>th</sup> level) to the corresponding previous question (5<sup>th</sup> level). These needs belong to different natures: technical, economical, contractual, managerial, etc. Note that although these needs are specific for this case study, they may be recurrent in other similar projects.

The following two owner's needs are examples to understand Fig. 7:

- 2.1.01.04.02: Design / Planning / Exterior Architecture / External Doors / Material: Metal. The external architecture design should be carried out considering the owner's requirement of installing external doors of metallic material.
- 2.1.01.04.03: Design / Planning / Exterior Architecture / External Doors / Type: Armored. The external architecture design should be carried out considering the owner's requirement of installing armored type external doors.

<FIGURE 7>

Fig. 7 shows that the owner's needs were identified and codified in the case study by applying the model developed and reported in this article. Each need is unique and formed by seven parts: a single unique code



and six classification items. All owner's needs identified in the case study were expressed by the predefined items included in the levels developed for the classification system. This provides a unique terminology that expresses the needs; in turn, all participants along the building life cycle will understand and allocate the needs in the same way. This situation prevents possible misunderstanding and loss of information.

The number of needs is proportional to the phase complexity and relative importance: 203 needs were identified for the design phase and 87 for the feasibility phase. This means that the owner pays more attention to the design stages, and intends to participate more in the definition of the design details than in other phases.

The owner and the architect showed a high level of involvement and cooperation throughout the research period. After the model was already implemented, both were interviewed in depth by the research team. They considered the application of the model as a reliable way to identify both explicit and implicit needs intended to obtain a final better product (the building). The owner stated that the collection approach of project data was greatly facilitated by the model, and further realized that most of his implicit needs were detected and specified in the design documents; in previous projects these needs did not become explicit from the beginning and had to be put forward to the architect at the very end of the design phase or during the construction phase. Therefore, the model revealed adequate both for data collection and for supporting effective design specification. The architect agreed that some "given for granted" client needs were not confirmed on the model output, and this greatly facilitated his work and prevented misinterpretation and redesigning. Accordingly, it was agreed by both of them that the required outputs (brief for the feasibility phase and design documents for the design phase) were effectively improved through the model. Therefore, in spite of the partial limitation of the model, its implementation in this case study confirmed that it can be properly applicable to current building projects, increasing project efficiency.

## 7. Conclusions

The owner is the most important stakeholder in the building life cycle while other stakeholders perform their tasks in order to comply with the owner's needs. Thus, these needs must be identified, captured, and classified (previously to their transformation into requirements of the final product). This is the goal of the research reported in this paper, which has been pursued through a model that considers the building project as a temporal process (feasibility, design, construction, and operation) developed through a set of four logical stages (planning, procurement, execution, and delivery) within each phase of the building life cycle. It is necessary to break down the information further up to a certain level that enhances a reasonable identification and classification of the owner's needs; to this end, the simplification of the problem facilitates their identification.

Thus, the proposed model considers additional levels, namely field (3<sup>rd</sup>), subfield (4<sup>th</sup>), questions (5<sup>th</sup>), and answers (6<sup>th</sup>). The model is implemented by a systematic application of the questionnaires (record sheets at the 4<sup>th</sup> level including the questions and answers levels) to the owner in order to capture his/her needs regarding the project at hand. Before each phase-stage cell, the corresponding questionnaire must be filled out generating a set of owner's needs. Once the work associated to each cell is completed, questionnaires are used to check the owner's perception on the work performed against his/her needs. This produces feedback information for additional adjustments, if necessary.

The model identifies the owner's needs in a systematic and comprehensive way, allowing for interactive generation of information and back-feeding. It gathers wider detailed information for the same level of classification than other methods surveyed. The model has been corroborated and improved applying the Delphi technique using a panel of ten experts and two rounds. It has been implemented in practice in a case study that was carried out on a residential building project of twelve apartments in Spain. After its preliminary validation and implementation, it can be concluded that the main strengths of the model are: action mapping for logic stages within each phase, time/logic approach bringing up the same relevance to all phases and actions in the building life cycle, adequate criteria for collecting information for every phase-stage, sound coding system for information classification, and a question-answer approach for information retrieval.

One of the limitations of this research is that the volume of information that the model can identify is huge: more than five thousand owner's needs. Thus, computerization of the model is required so that it may become more operational and the authors are already pursuing this line of work. Even though the proposed model has been validated by a Delphi panel and it has been applied to a real project, additional empirical investigation is needed. To achieve this goal, this model should be further tested in more building projects. However, given the time needed to complete a project from its inception to its operation, this path will deliver results very slowly. Alternatively, the model will be partially tested for the construction phase through a similar process as described for the case study. Results of this process will show the trends in the number of client claims for inconsistent design, the amount of reworking during the design phase, the number of architect claims for client change orders and other variables. Data collected will be compared to typical figures obtained by clients and architects involved in the testing project and this will hopefully evidence the benefits of using the model instead of the current procedures. Adaptation of the model to other sub-sectors (educational buildings or civil engineering works) is another challenge of this line of research; using the methodology purported in this paper, the last three levels of the model can be adapted to each scenario.

## Acknowledgments

This research was partially funded by the J. Gómez-Cerezo Foundation (Spain) and the Spanish Ministry of Infrastructure (grant 2004-36). The authors thank the ten experts who participated in the Delphi study and Dr. Debra Westall who thoroughly revised the text.

## References

- Akao, Y. and Mazur, G. (2003) The leading edge in the QFD: past, present and future. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 20(1), 20-35.
- Alshubbak, A. (2010) Modelo de Identificación de las Necesidades del Promotor en el Proceso Proyecto-Construcción: INPRO, Ph.D. Thesis, Universitat Politècnica de Valencia, Valencia (in Spanish).
- Archibald, D. (2004) State of the art of project management, in Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> International Seminar on Project Management, São Paulo.
- ASHRAE (2006) ASHRAE Guideline, HVAC&R Technical Requirements for the Commissioning Process, American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Atlanta.
- Best, R.J. (1974) An experiment in Delphi estimation in marketing decision making. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 11(4), 448-452.
- Björk, B.C., Lownertz, K. and Kiviniemi, A. (1997) ISO DIS 13567 - The proposed international standard for structuring layers in computer aided building design. *ITcon*, 2, 32-55.
- Chan, A.P.C., Scott, D. and Lam, E.W.M. (2002) Framework of success criteria for design and build projects. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 18(3), 120-128.
- Chinyio, E. A. and Olomolaiye, P. O. (1998) An evaluation of the project needs of UK building clients. *International Journal of Project Management*, 16, 385-391.
- Chua, D.K.H. and Yeoh, K.W. (2011) PDM++: Planning frameworks from a construction requirements perspective. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 137(4), 266-274.
- Chudley, R. and Greeno, R. (2010) *Building Construction Handbook* (8<sup>th</sup> Edition). Elsevier, Oxford, UK.
- CIOB (2002) *Code of Practice for Project Management for Construction and Development* (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition). The Chartered Institute of Building (CIOB), Blackwell Pub., Oxford, UK.
- Cleland, I. (1999) *Project Management. Strategic Design and Implementation*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2011) *Research Methods in Education*, Routledge, London.
- Cole, R.J. and Sterner, E. (2000) Reconciling theory and practice of life cycle costing. *Building Research & Information*, 28(5/6), 368-375.
- CSI (2004) *Masterformat™ 2004 edition Numbers and Titles*, Construction Specifications Institute, Virginia.
- Eastman, C., Teicholz, P., Sacks, R. and Liston, K. (2008) *Bim Handbook: a Guide to Building Information Modeling for Owners, Managers, Designers, Engineers, and Contractors*, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken (NJ).
- Energy Design Resources (2005) *Building Commissioning Guidelines*, retrieved January 1, 2012, from <http://www.energydesignresources.com/docs/ch-complete.pdf>.
- EFQM (2008) European Foundation for Quality Management, retrieved March 11, 2010, from <http://www.efqm.org>.
- Gann, D.M. and Salter, A.J. (2000) Innovation in project-based, service enhanced firms: the construction of complex products and systems. *Research Policy*, 29, 955-972.
- Groàk, S. (1994) Is construction an industry?. *Construction Management and Economics*, 12, 287-293.
- Hallowell, M.R. and Gambatese, J.A. (2010) Qualitative research: application of the Delphi method to CEM research. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 136(1), 99-107.
- Hassan, M., McCaffer, R. and Thorpe, T. (1999) Emerging clients' needs for large scale engineering projects. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 6(1), 21-29.
- Hoyle, D. (2009) *ISO 9000 Quality Systems Handbook* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), Elsevier, Oxford (UK).
- Jennings, B.J., Vugrim, E.D. and Belasich, D.K. (2013) Resilience certification for commercial buildings: A study of stakeholder perspectives. *Environmental Systems Decision*, 33(2), 184-194.
- Kamara, J., Anumba C. and Evbuomwan, N. (1999) Client requirements processing in construction: A new approach using QDF. *Journal of Architectural Engineering*, 5(1), 8-15.
- Kamara, J., Anumba C. and Evbuomwan, N. (2000a) Process model for client requirement processing in construction. *Business Process Management Journal*, 6(3), 251-279.
- Kamara, J., Anumba C. and Evbuomwan, N. (2000b) Establishing and processing client requirements. A key aspect of concurrent engineering in construction. *Engineering Construction and Architectural Management*, 7(1), 15-28.
- Kamara, J., Anumba, C. and Evbuomwan, N. (2002) *Capturing Client Requirements in Construction Projects*, Thomas Telford, London.
- Kang, L. and Paulson, B.C. (1997) Adaptability of information classification systems for civil works. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 123(4), 419-426.
- Kang, L. and Paulson, B.C. (2000) Information classification for civil engineering projects by Uniclass. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 126(2), 158-167.
- Lai, J.H.K. and Yik, F.W.H. (2007) Monitoring building operation and maintenance contracts. *Facilities*, 25(5/6), 238-251.
- Lee, G., Sacks, R. and Eastman, C.M. (2006) Specifying parametric building object behavior (BOB) for a building information modeling system. *Automation in Construction*, 15(6), 758-776.
- Levitt, T. (1965) Exploit the product life cycle. *Harvard Business Review*, 43(6), 81-94.
- Lim, E. and Ling, F. (2002) Model for predicting clients' contribution to project success. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 9(5-6), 388-395.
- Lima, L.P., Formoso, C.T. and Echeveste, M.E.S. (2011) Proposal for a protocol for client requirements processing in low-income housing projects. *Ambiente Construído*, 11(2), 21-37.
- Linstone, H.A. and Turoff, M. (1975) *The Delphi Method: Techniques and Applications*, Addison-Wesley, London.

- Martino, J. (1972) *Technological Forecasting for Decision Making*, Elsevier, New York.
- Morris, P.W.G. (1994) *The Management of Projects*. Thomas Telford Services Ltd., London.
- Muller, R. and Turner, R. (2005) The impact of principal-agent relationship and contract type on communication between project owner and manager. *International Journal of Project Management*, 5, 398-403.
- Okoli, C. and Pawlowski, S. (2004) The Delphi method as a research tool: an example, design considerations and applications. *Information & Management*, 42(1), 15-29.
- OmniClass Committee (2000) OmniClass, retrieved August 20, 2013, from <http://www.omniclass.org/tables.asp>.
- Pellicer, E. and Victory, R. (2006) Implementation of project management principles in Spanish residential developments. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management*, 10(4), 233-248.
- Pellicer, E., Yepes, V., Teixeira, J.M., Moura, H. and Catalá, J. (2014) *Construction Management*. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford.
- Pheng, L. and Hui, M. (2004) Implementing and applying six sigma in construction. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 130(4), 482-489.
- PMI (2013) *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (5<sup>th</sup> Edition)*. Project Management Institute, Newtown Square (PN).
- RIBA (1997) *Uniclass: Unified Classification for the Construction Industry*, Royal Institute of British Architects, London.
- Rowe, G. and Wright, G. (1999) "The Delphi technique as a forecasting tool: Issue and analysis." *International Journal of Forecasting*, 15, 353-375.
- Shen, Q., Li, H., Chung, J. and Hui, P.Y. (2004) A framework for identification and representation of client requirements in the briefing process. *Construction Management and Economics*, 22, 213-221.
- Smith, J. and Love, P.E.D. (2004) Stakeholder management during project inception: Strategic needs analysis. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 10(1), 22-33.
- Soetanto, R. and Proverbs, D. (2002) Modelling the satisfaction of contractors: the impact of client performance. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 9(5-6), 453-465.
- Sourani, A. and Sohail, M. (2014) The Delphi method: Review and use in construction management research. *International Journal of Construction Education and Research*, published on line DOI: 10.1080/15578771.2014.917132.
- Takim, R. (2009) The management of stakeholders' needs and expectations in the development of construction project in Malaysia. *Modern Applied Science*, 3(5), 167-175.
- Teicholz, P. (2013) *BIM for Facility Managers*, Wiley, Hoboken (NJ).
- Tushman, M.L. and Nadler, D.A. (1978) Information processing as an integrating concept in organizational design. *Academy of Management Review*, 3(3), 613-624.
- Winch, G.M. (2002) *Managing Construction Projects: An Information Processing Approach*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Winch, G.M. (2003) Models of manufacturing and the construction process: the genesis of re-engineering construction. *Building Research & Information*, 31(2), 107-118.
- Winch, G.M. (2006) Towards a theory of construction as production by projects. *Building Research & Information*, 34(2), 154-163.
- Xia, B., Skitmore, M., Wu, P. and Chen, Q. (2014) How public owners communicate the sustainability requirements of green design-build projects. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, published on line DOI:10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000879.
- Yang, L.R., Chen, J.H. and Huang, C.F. (2012) Requirements definition and management practice to improve project outcomes. *Journal of Civil Engineering and Management*, 18(1), 114-124.
- Yang, R. and Shen, G. (2014). Framework for stakeholder management in construction projects. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, published on line DOI:10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0000285.
- Yu, A.T.W. and Shen, G.Q.P. (2013) Problems and solutions of requirements management for construction projects under the traditional procurement systems. *Facilities*, 31(5/6), 223-237.
- Yu, A.T.W., Chan, E.H.W., Chan, D.W.M., Lam, P.T.I. and Tang, P.W.L. (2010) Management of client requirements for design and build projects in the construction industry of Hong Kong. *Facilities*, 28(13/14), 657-672.
- Yu, C.H. (2001) An introduction to computing and interpreting Cronbach Coefficient Alpha in SAS, in *Proceedings of 26<sup>th</sup> SAS User Group International Conference*, 246-252.
- Yuan, J., Skibniewski, M., Li, Q. and Zheng, L. (2010) Performance objectives selection model in public-private partnership projects based on the perspective of stakeholders. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 26(2), 89-104.
- Zavadskas, E.K., Kaklauskas, A., Lepkova, N. and Zalatorius, J. (2001) Facilities management multiple criteria analysis. *Statyba*, 7(6), 481-489.

## **CURRICULA VITARUM OF THE AUTHORS**

**Ali Alshubbak** got a civil engineer degree by the Birzeit University (Palestine). He worked in Palestine as a professional civil engineer for five years. Later he enrolled the doctorate program at the *Universitat Politècnica de València* (Spain) where he received his PhD. He currently works as a freelance in the Spanish construction industry.

**Eugenio Pellicer** received his M.Sc. degree from Stanford University, USA, and his Ph.D. degree from the *Universitat Politècnica de València*, Spain, where he works as an associate professor/senior lecturer in project management, being also in charge of the M.Sc. in Planning and Management in Civil Engineering. His research interests include innovation in the construction process and project delivery strategies in construction. He has participated in quite a few international projects with other European and Latin-American universities.

**Joaquín Catalá** is the former director of the MSc in Occupational Risk Prevention and of the Department of Construction Engineering at the *Universitat Politècnica de València* (Spain), where he is currently lecturing as professor. He obtained his PhD at this same university. He has supervised many MSc and PhD theses related to construction management in general, and occupational health and safety management in particular.

**José C. Teixeira** graduated in civil engineering from Porto University, Portugal, and holds a PhD in construction management from Loughborough University of Technology (UK). He is currently an associate professor at the University of Minho, Portugal, lecturing on construction project management at the School of Engineering. He is currently involved in several international projects with other European and Latin-American universities.

Fig. 1. Two-dimensional matrix

		<b>STAGES</b>			
<b>P H A S E S</b>	<b>FEASIBILITY</b>	<b>P L A N N I N G</b>	<b>P R O C U R E M E N T</b>	<b>E X E C U T I O N</b>	<b>D E L I V E R Y</b>
	<b>DESIGN</b>				
	<b>CONSTRUCTION</b>				
	<b>OPERATION</b>				


**Fig. 2. Fields per phase – stage cell**

	<b>1. PLANNING</b>	<b>2. PROCUREMENT</b>	<b>3. EXECUTION</b>	<b>4. DELIVERY</b>
<b>1. FEASIBILITY</b>	1.1.01. Owner's basic data	1.2.01. Contract's basic data	1.3.01. Previous analysis	1.4.01. Notification
	1.1.02. Geographical location	1.2.02. Tendering	1.3.02. Objectives	1.4.02. Provisional hand over
	1.1.03. Urban planning scenario	1.2.03. Contract requirements	1.3.03. Main constraints	1.4.03. Review process
	1.1.04. Environmental constraints	1.2.04. Warranties and insurance	1.3.04. Field works	1.4.04. Reception
	1.1.05. Basic definition of the building	1.2.05. Drafting the contract	1.3.05. Owner's cooperation	1.4.05. Warranty return
	1.1.06. Financing	1.2.06. Signing the contract	1.3.06. Outsourcing	1.4.06. Finish
	1.1.07. Marketing	1.2.07. Subcontracting	1.3.07. Supervision of works	
<b>2. DESIGN</b>	2.1.01. External architecture	2.2.01. Contract's basic data	2.3.01. Documents	2.4.01. Notification
	2.1.02. Indoor architecture	2.2.02. Tendering	2.3.02. Constraints	2.4.02. Provisional hand over
	2.1.03. Infrastructure	2.2.03. Contract requirements	2.3.03. Field works	2.4.03. Review process
	2.1.04. Structure	2.2.04. Warranties and insurance	2.3.04. Owner's cooperation	2.4.04. Reception
	2.1.05. Installations	2.2.05. Drafting the contract	2.3.05. Outsourcing	2.4.05. Warranty return
	2.1.06. Budget	2.2.06. Signing the contract	2.3.06. Change management	2.4.06. Finish
	2.1.07. Constraints	2.2.07. Subcontracting	2.3.07. Supervision of works 2.3.08. Format, layout and editing	
<b>3. CONSTRUCTION</b>	3.1.01. Preparation of key information	3.2.01. Contract's basic data	3.3.01. Start up of the building works	3.4.01. Notification of completion of work
	3.1.02. Documentation and credentials	3.2.02. Tendering	3.3.02. Technical supervision and control	3.4.02. Inspection of completion of work
	3.1.03. Managing licenses and permits	3.2.03. Contract requirements	3.3.03. Owner's cooperation	3.4.03. Delivery type
	3.1.04. Preview of the construction site	3.2.04. Warranties and insurance	3.3.04. Administration of the building site	3.4.04. Unsuitable works
	3.1.05. Technical issues to consider for contracting	3.2.05. Drafting the contract	3.3.05. Logistics of the building site	3.4.05. Reception
	3.1.06. Technical services for supporting	3.2.06. Signing the contract	3.3.06. Occupational risk prevention at the building site	3.4.06. Warranty return
	3.1.07. Marketing	3.2.07. Subcontracting	3.3.07. Environmental issues at the building site 3.3.08. Quality management at the building site 3.3.09. Waste management at the building site 3.3.10. Outsourcing 3.3.11. Completion of the work	3.4.07. Finish
<b>4. OPERATION</b>	4.1.01. Nature, mode, and scope	4.2.01. Sale	4.3.01. Business management	4.4.01. Sale
	4.1.02. Requirements	4.2.02. Rent	4.3.02. Maintenance activities	4.4.02. Rent
	4.1.03. Responsibilities	4.2.03. Operation by another entity		4.4.03. Subcontract for operation or concession
	4.1.04. Administrative procedures	4.2.04. Operation by the owner		

**Fig. 3.** Record sheet template

<b>Code</b>	<b>Content</b>
	<b>PHASE / STAGE / FIELD / SUBFIELD</b>
	WHAT? (contents)
	WHAT FOR? (purpose)
	WHY? (reason)
	FIFTH LEVEL (1)
	SIXTH LEVEL (1-1)
	...
	SIXTH LEVEL (1-p)
	...
	FIFTH LEVEL (n)
	SIXTH LEVEL (n-1)
	...
	SIXTH LEVEL (n-r)

Fig. 4. Functional architecture of the model





**Fig. 5.** Classification structure up to the 4<sup>th</sup> level in operation-procurement cell

<b>4.2.01. SALE</b>	<b>4.2.02. RENT</b>	<b>4.3.03. OPERATION BY ANOTHER ENTITY</b>	<b>4.3.04. OPERATION BY THE OWNER</b>
4.2.01.01. Contract nature	4.2.02.01. Contract nature	4.2.03.01. Entity	4.2.04.01. Use type
4.2.01.02. Awarding procedure	4.2.02.02. Awarding procedure	4.2.03.02. Contract type	4.2.04.02. Management
4.2.01.03. Aim	4.2.02.03. Aim	4.2.03.03. Awarding procedure	4.2.04.03. Advertisement
4.2.01.04. Conditions	4.2.02.04. Conditions	4.2.03.04. Aim	4.2.04.04. Information
4.2.01.05. Guarantees	4.2.02.05. Guarantees	4.2.03.05. Time	4.2.04.05. Contract type
4.2.01.06. Contract writing	4.2.02.06. Contract writing	4.2.03.06. Bidding procedure	4.2.04.06. Awarding procedure
4.2.01.07. Contract signature	4.2.02.07. Contract signature	4.2.03.07. Conditions	4.2.04.07. Aim
4.2.01.08. Technical specifications	4.2.02.08. Subcontracting specifications	4.2.03.08. Guarantees	4.2.04.08. Time
4.2.01.09. Registry	4.2.02.09. Technical specifications	4.2.03.09. Contract writing	4.2.04.09. Conditions
4.2.01.10. Final close-out	4.2.02.10. Registry	4.2.03.10. Contract signature	4.2.04.10. Guarantees
		4.2.03.11. Subcontracting	4.2.04.11. Contract writing
		4.2.03.12. Technical specifications	4.2.04.12. Contract signature
		4.2.03.13. Registry	4.2.04.13. Subcontracting
			4.2.04.14. Technical specifications

**Fig. 6.** Record sheet corresponding to subfield 4.2.01.04: conditions of sale contract at the operation phase

<b>CODE: 4.2.01.04.</b>	<b>CONTENT: Operation / Procurement / Sale / Conditions</b>
WHAT?	
To define the conditions to be set in the contract that apply to both parties that sign it.	
WHAT FOR?	
To determine the responsibilities and rights of each party.	
WHY?	
To write the contract correctly.	
4.2.03.04.01. PRICE	4.2.03.04.06. OBLIGATIONS
Monthly price (€):	Indicate:
Yearly price (€):	4.2.03.04.07. CONFIDENTIALITY
Value Added Tax (€):	Indicate:
Total (€)	4.2.03.04.08. MODIFICATIONS
4.2.03.04.02. PAYMENT FORM	Indicate:
Bank transfer	4.2.03.04.09. RESOLUTION
Direct debit	Indicate:
Cash	4.2.03.04.10. EXTINCTION
IOU	Indicate:
Check	4.2.03.04.11. DEADLINES
Other	Indicate:
4.2.03.04.03. CONTRACT	4.2.03.04.12. RENEWALS
Place:	Indicate:
Date:	4.2.03.04.13. JURISDICTION
Time:	Indicate:
4.2.03.04.04. EXPENSES	4.2.03.04.14. PENALTIES
Charged to the developer:	Indicate:
Charged to the client:	4.2.03.04.15. ARBITRATION
4.2.03.04.05. CONDOMINIUM	Indicate:
Master deed:	
Rules of governance:	
Role of the developer:	

Fig. 7. Sample of owner's needs in the case study

CODE	DESIGN (PLANNING)
2.1.01.02.01	Design/planning/exterior architecture/façades/type: <b>Cladded</b>
2.1.01.02.02	Design/planning/exterior architecture/ façades/material: <b>Industrial plates</b>
2.1.01.02.03	Design/planning/exterior architecture/ façades/color: <b>Light azure and black</b>
2.1.01.02.04	Design/planning/exterior architecture/ façades/technical criteria: <b>Maintenance, thermal isolation, cleaning and security</b>
2.1.01.03.02	Design/planning/exterior architecture/windows/profile material: <b>Aluminum</b>
2.1.01.03.05	Design/planning/exterior architecture/windows/geometry: <b>Rectangular</b>
2.1.01.03.06	Design/planning/exterior architecture/windows/opening mechanism: <b>To inside</b>
2.1.01.04.02	Design/planning/exterior architecture/external doors/material: <b>Metal</b>
2.1.01.04.03	Design/planning/exterior architecture/ external doors/type: <b>Armored</b>
2.1.01.04.06	Design/planning/exterior architecture/ external doors/opening mechanism: <b>To inside</b>
2.1.01.05.01	Design/planning/exterior architecture/terrace & balcony /category: <b>Vertical gate with hanging balcony</b>
2.1.01.05.02	Design/planning/exterior architecture/terrace & balcony /geometry: <b>Rectangular</b>
2.1.01.05.04	Design/planning/exterior architecture/terrace & balcony /walling material: <b>Glass</b>
2.1.01.06.01	Design/planning/exterior architecture/rooftop/type: <b>Flat roof</b>
2.1.01.06.02	Design/planning/exterior architecture/rooftop/material: <b>Reinforced concrete</b>
2.1.01.06.03	Design/planning/exterior architecture/rooftop/technical criteria: <b>Impermeability; thermic, acoustic and vibration isolation</b>
2.1.01.06.04	Design/planning/exterior architecture/rooftop/color: <b>Light azure</b>
2.1.01.06.05	Design/planning/exterior architecture/rooftop/parapet: <b>Façade continuation (80 cm)</b>
2.1.02.02.01	Design/planning/interior architecture /distribution/spaces: <b>4 sleeping rooms model</b>
2.1.02.03.01	Design/planning/interior architecture /partitions/type: <b>light weight brackets</b>
2.1.04.01.01	Design/planning/structure/column/geometry: <b>rectangle</b>
2.1.04.01.02	Design/planning/structure/column/positioning: <b>embedded (not visible)</b>
2.1.04.05.01	Design/planning/structure/stairs/geometry: <b>Strait</b>
2.1.05.07.03	Design/planning/installation/heating/system: <b>Radiation</b>
<b>DESIGN-PROCUREMENT</b>	
N/A	
<b>DESIGN (EXECUTION)</b>	
2.3.01.01.01	Design/execution/project documents/type/type: <b>Basic and design project</b>
2.3.01.01.02	Design/execution/project documents /type/studies: <b>Health and safety plan, environmental impact assessment</b>
2.3.01.02.10	Design/execution/project documents/content/model: <b>CTE (Spanish Building Code) and the designer</b>
2.3.03.01.01	Design/execution/field works/type of data/technical: <b>Construction class, use, archeological limitations, needed installations</b>
2.3.03.01.01	Design/execution/field works/type of data/urban: <b>Needed urban permissions by City Council</b>
2.3.03.01.01	Design/execution/field works/type of data/environmental: <b>Environmental impact, assessment and prevention</b>
2.3.04.01.01	Design/execution/owner's collaboration/range/documents: <b>Property certificate, legal situation of land site, topographic map</b>
2.3.04.01.04	Design/execution/owner's collaboration/range/assistance: <b>Licenses and permits</b>
2.3.04.02.01	Design/execution/owner's collaboration/means/personal: <b>Project manager</b>
2.3.04.02.03	Design/execution/owner's collaboration/means/logistical: <b>Access to work site</b>
2.3.05.01.01	Design/execution/outsourcing/externalized works/type: <b>Site investigation and tests</b>
2.3.05.01.02	Design/execution/outsourcing/externalized works/level: <b>Partial</b>
2.3.05.02.01	Design/execution/outsourcing/limitations/economical: <b>10% of the total design budget</b>
2.3.06.03.01	Design/execution/change management/responsible/maker: <b>Designer</b>
2.3.06.03.02	Design/execution/change management/responsible/approval: <b>Designer and owner representative</b>
2.3.06.03.03	Design/execution/change management/responsible/assurance: <b>Designer and owner representative</b>
2.3.07.01.01	Design/execution/project quality control/range/subjected work: <b>Totality of design works</b>
2.3.07.01.02	Design/execution/project quality control/range/delimitation: <b>According to the applied normative</b>
2.3.07.02.01	Design/execution/project quality control/normative/quality: <b>UNE normative</b>
2.3.07.02.02	Design/execution/project quality control/ normative/technical specification: <b>CTE (Spanish Building Code)</b>
2.3.08.02.02	Design/execution/layout and edition/calculations/structural design program: <b>CYPE software</b>
2.3.08.02.05	Design/execution/layout and edition/calculations/normative: <b>CTE (Spanish Building Code)</b>
2.3.08.04.05	Design/execution/layout and edition/budget/presentation: <b>Tables</b>
2.3.08.07.01	Design/execution/layout and edition/document support/physical: <b>Paper DIN A4 and A0 folded according to UNE</b>
2.3.08.07.02	Design/execution/layout and edition/document support/electronic: <b>CD Rom</b>
<b>DESIGN (DELIVERY)</b>	
2.4.01.01.01	Design/delivery/notification/date/date: <b>dd/mm/yyyy</b>
2.4.01.02.01	Design/delivery/notification/form/model: <b>Written letter signed by the designer</b>
2.4.02.01.01	Design/delivery/provisional delivery/place/address: <b>Owner's firm address</b>
2.4.02.03.01	Design/delivery/provisional delivery/corresponding payment/quantity: <b>xxxxxxx €</b>
2.4.03.01.01	Design/delivery/procedure/meeting revision: <b>Between owner representative and the designer</b>
2.4.04.02.01	Design/delivery/reception/certification/need: <b>Needed</b>
2.4.04.02.02	Design/delivery/reception/certification/cost: <b>Paid by the designer</b>
2.4.04.02.03	Design/delivery/reception/certification/documents to certify: <b>All projects and studies</b>
2.4.04.02.04	Design/delivery/reception/certification/absence of certification: <b>Economical penalty, designer issues certification in 14 days</b>
2.4.06.03.03	Design/delivery/close out/payment/effect: <b>Contract close out</b>

**Table 1.** Main characteristics of models, normative and systems which process and implement the owner's needs

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Sector</b>	<b>Phases</b>	<b>Owner's needs as input</b>	<b>Input Data Gathering</b>
<b>Hassan et al. (1999)</b>	To identify client's business and IT requirements of large scale engineering projects	Large civil structures	Design and Construction	✓	Questionnaires
<b>CRPM (Kamara et al., 1999, 2000a and 2000b)</b>	To process the client requirement in construction	Concurrent engineering	Design	✓	Voice of the client: client vision of the proposed facility
<b>Lim and Ling (2002)</b>	To predict the client's contribution to project success	Construction project management	General; project performance	Five general attributes	Questionnaires
<b>Shen et al. (2004)</b>	To identify and rank the client's requirements	Building projects	Design	✓	Workshop
<b>Building Information Modeling</b>	To generate and manage construction information in an interoperable way	Building projects mainly	Design, construction and operation	✓	N/A
<b>Commissioning</b>	To verify that all systems and components of a building are designed, installed, tested, operated, and maintained according to the requirements of the owner.	Residential and industrial buildings	Predesign, design, construction and operation	✓	Owner's program of requirements (OPR) by the commissioning agent
<b>Six-Sigma</b>	To measure and improve quality control	General-Applicable to construction	General, mostly business level	✓	N/A
<b>Quality Function Deployment</b>	To help define, design and build a product which satisfies the client	General-Applicable to construction	General, mostly business level	✓	Voice of the client
<b>European Foundation for Quality Management</b>	To understand the connection between an entity's work and the achieved results	General-Applicable to construction	General, mostly business level	✓	N/A

**Table 2.** Main characteristics of construction information classification systems

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Phases</b>	<b>Type of facility</b>	<b>Fields</b>	<b>Max. levels</b>
<b>UNICLASS</b>	United Kingdom (RIBA, 1997)	Listing construction elements, materials, products and processes; a single table of general managerial activities	Mainly the construction phase	Buildings and landscape	16	7
<b>CICS</b>	United States (Kang and Paulson, 1997 and 2000)	Classifying the facilities, spaces, elements and operations by type of construction work	Mainly the construction phase	Civil engineering	4	4
<b>MASTERFORMAT</b>	United States and Canada (CSI, 2004)	Organizing data about construction requirements, products, materials and activities	Different phases	Mostly commercial building	43	4
<b>OMNICLASS</b>	United States (Omniclass Committee, 2012)	Organizing and retrieving information of construction elements, materials and products	Different phases	Different construction types	16	7
<b>ISO 13567</b>	Switzerland (Björk et al., 1997)	Classifying the building elements in construction	Mainly the project (design) phase	Different construction types	Uniclass & Ci/SfB	Uniclass & CiSfB
<b>Ci/SfB</b>	Sweden (Chudley and Greeno, 2010).	Classifying the physical environment, elements, construction forms, materials, activities and requirements.	A brief of planning but mainly construction phase	Residential buildings and singular buildings	4	3

**Table 3.** Number of fields / subfields per phase-stage cell

	<b>Planning</b>	<b>Procurement</b>	<b>Execution</b>	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>Feasibility</b>	7 / 35	7 / 46	7 / 20	6 / 22	<b>27 / 123</b>
<b>Design</b>	7 / 54	7 / 46	8 / 35	6 / 22	<b>28 / 157</b>
<b>Construction</b>	7 / 29	7 / 46	11 / 74	7 / 28	<b>32 / 177</b>
<b>Operation</b>	4 / 24	4 / 47	2 / 14	5 / 24	<b>15 / 109</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25 / 142</b>	<b>25 / 185</b>	<b>28 / 143</b>	<b>24 / 96</b>	<b>102 / 566</b>

**Table 4.** Average response for the importance and completeness facets per cell (phase-stage)

PHASE-STAGE	IMPORTANCE		COMPLETENESS	
	1 <sup>st</sup> Round	2 <sup>nd</sup> Round	1 <sup>st</sup> Round	2 <sup>nd</sup> Round
Feasibility – Planning	4.5	4.6	4.1	4.6
Feasibility – Procurement	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.8
Feasibility – Execution	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.5
Feasibility – Delivery	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.6
Design – Planning	4.6	4.7	4.3	4.9
Design – Procurement	4.4	4.7	4.3	4.8
Design – Execution	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.9
Design – Delivery	4.1	4.2	4.5	4.6
Construction – Planning	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.7
Construction – Procurement	4.6	4.8	4.3	4.8
Construction – Execution	4.7	4.9	4.2	4.8
Construction – Delivery	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.7
Operation – Planning	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.7
Operation – Procurement	4.5	4.7	4.3	4.8
Operation – Execution	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Operation – Delivery	4.5	4.6	4.1	4.7
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.44</b>	<b>4.59</b>	<b>4.34</b>	<b>4.71</b>
<b>Cronbach's Alpha</b>	<b>0.814</b>	<b>0.937</b>	<b>0.849</b>	<b>0.867</b>

**Table 5.** Model implementation process in the case study

<b>Role</b>	<b>Task</b>
Owner Research Team	First contact and understanding of the model and roles assigned
Owner Representative	Reception of the model questionnaire for the feasibility phase Response to the questionnaire for the feasibility phase
Research Team Owner Representative Owner	Questionnaire assessment for the feasibility phase
Owner Representative	Brief (output for the feasibility phase)
Owner Representative	Reception of the model questionnaire for the design phase Response to the questionnaire for the design phase
Research Team Owner Representative Owner	Questionnaire assessment for the design phase
Owner Representative	Normative and specifications appraisal Conversion into specific requirements Calculations, drawings, technical specifications and budget
Owner Representative	Design documents (output for the design phase)



**Table 6.** Quantitative data of the case study implementation

	Feasibility Phase / Design Phase				
	Planning	Procurement	Execution	Delivery	Total
# Subfields (model)	35 / 54	46 / 46	20 / 35	22 / 22	123 / 157
# Subfields (answered)	25 / 42	0 / 0	12 / 25	17 / 21	54 / 88
# Extracted needs	46 / 128	0 / 0	18 / 43	23 / 32	87 / 203
# Owner's needs per Subfield (answered)					1.6 / 2.3
% Subfields (answered)					44% / 79%