



<b>Title</b>	<b>Conceptual Maturity Model for Sustainable Construction</b>
<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Goh, CS; Rowlinson, SM</b>
<b>Citation</b>	<b>Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction, 2013, v. 5 n. 4, p. 191-195</b>
<b>Issued Date</b>	<b>2013</b>
<b>URL</b>	<b><a href="http://hdl.handle.net/10722/191488">http://hdl.handle.net/10722/191488</a></b>
<b>Rights</b>	<b>Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction. Copyright © American Society of Civil Engineers.</b>

# A CONCEPTUAL MATURITY MODEL FOR SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION

Goh Cheng Siew<sup>1</sup>, Steve Rowlinson<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

The construction industry has contributed substantially to not only the growth of the economy but also the development of the environment and society. In the past decades, an increasing public awareness on the environmental and social growth has promoted the application of sustainable development in construction. Triple bottom line - economy, society and environment has been widely recognized as significant dimension for measuring the performance of sustainability. Although a number of performance indicator systems are available in the current market, few of them have considered soft systems – culture and human aspects, in measuring the performance of sustainable construction. This paper therefore aims to develop a conceptual maturity model for sustainable construction to gain a deeper and richer understanding on the actual practices on sustainable construction. Five key domains are outlined in the proposed model as the metrics with the description and sub-factors of each metric. Apart from contributing to increasing competitive advantage, the proposed model can steer the construction community to improve performance in attaining the goals of sustainable construction. Nonetheless, this conceptual maturity model is still at an early development stage and it is subject to more empirical testing and research for its practicability and further refinement.

## 1.0 Introduction

The construction industry always plays a significant role in pushing the growth of a nation, especially in its contribution to economic growth. A positive correlation is found between gross domestic product per capita and various measures of construction output (Yiu et al. 2004). The gross value of construction output often contributes approximately 4 - 12% of gross domestic product (GDP) to many national economies (Spence and Mulligan 1995; Presley and Meade 2010).

Notwithstanding the contribution to economic growth, the construction industry has also created substantial negative impacts on the growth of society and environment with its extensive exploitation of natural resources and the production of huge amount of waste (Chong et al. 2009; Ding 2008; Rohrer 2001; Shen and Tam, 2002; Son et al. 2011; Spence and Mulligan 1995; Tan et al. 2011). Over the years, the promotion of sustainable development has gained increasing attention due to growing public concern over environmental and social growth.

Since sustainable projects always demand additional technical expertise and initial financial investments as well as high stakeholders' commitments, the process of delivering sustainable construction projects could be more difficult than conventional projects. Furthermore, the situation becomes even more complicated when the pursuit of sustainability does not originate from the organizations' initiative. Presley and Meade (2010) pointed out that the application is sometimes initiated by the potential business values and financial incentives provided within sustainable project. Haapio and Viitaniemi (2008) also

---

<sup>1</sup> PhD Candidate, Department of Real Estate and Construction, KB534, Knowles Building, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong. Email: goh11@hku.hk

<sup>2</sup> Professor of Real Estate and Construction, Department of Real Estate and Construction, KB508, Knowles Building, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong. Email: hrecsmr@hku.hk

42 advocated the growing market demand and public policy have driven the implementation of sustainable  
43 construction.

44  
45 It is also reported that sustainability implementation by construction practitioners arises mainly from  
46 binding legal requirements, as outlined in the regulations and legal policies to carry out their  
47 environmental duties. The government's pursuit of sustainable development has partly resulted in  
48 adjusting some elements of development and construction activities to be more socially and  
49 environmentally prudent (William and Lindsay 2007). Pearce et al (2010) also showed the adoption of  
50 different implementation plans of sustainability are being driven by the legal liability and regulations such  
51 as Occupational Safety and Health Acts (OSHA) and Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC). Although the  
52 introduction of mandatory regulations can increase the momentum of implementation drastically,  
53 adopting sustainable development in construction without a comprehensive understanding could mislead  
54 practitioners to address sustainability concerns inappropriately. Chong et al. (2009) found there is still a  
55 low knowledge level on sustainable construction and most respondents did not know how to initiate  
56 sustainability in their areas of works. A maturity model is therefore crucial to navigate a path to work  
57 towards sustainable construction holistically.

58  
59 **2.0 Sustainable Construction**  
60 Hill and Bowen (1997) described that sustainable construction was initially proposed to describe the  
61 responsibility and role of the construction industry in achieving sustainability, where the construction  
62 industry is deemed to include civil engineering and building construction. It is also important to avoid  
63 viewing sustainable construction as a site activity or a specific stage in the project life cycle. Apart from  
64 the comprehensive cycle of a construction project such as feasibility study, design, construction, operation,  
65 decommissioning, demolition and disposal, a broader concern should also be addressed on the process of  
66 creating human settlements, which entails planning, design, implementation and management (Du Plessis,  
67 2007).

68  
69 Presley and Meade (2010) also supported the view by referring to sustainable construction as not only the  
70 buildings and spaces but also the process and activity as well as the infrastructure elements such as waste  
71 management, transportation, and utility transmission systems. This paper therefore views sustainable  
72 construction as the application of sustainable development to the comprehensive construction cycle, from  
73 the extraction of raw material, through the planning, design and construction of buildings and  
74 infrastructure, until final deconstruction and management of the resultant waste (Tan et al. 2011).

75  
76 **3.0 The Concept of Maturity**  
77 Oxford dictionary defines maturity as the state, fact or period of being reached in the most advanced stage  
78 in a process. In the area of software development, Paulk et al. (1993) defined maturity as a potential  
79 growth in capability and it should also signify both the richness of an organization's software process and  
80 the consistency with which it is applied in projects throughout the organization. From the viewpoint of the  
81 organization, maturity is a state where an organization is in a perfect condition to pursue its objectives  
82 (Andersen and Jessen 2003). On one hand, Lockamy III and McCormack (2004) viewed process maturity  
83 as a process with a lifecycle assessed by the extent to which the process is explicitly defined, managed,  
84 measured and controlled with the growth in process capability, richness and consistency across the entire  
85 organization. From the risk management perspective, maturity is reflected as the sophistication of an

86 organization's understanding of its risk portfolio and how to manage those risks as well as the internal  
87 business continuity systems for coping with and recovering from the eventuality (Zou et al. 2010).

88  
89 Previous studies and works have demonstrated maturity as having a strong link to the most advanced  
90 stage, potential growth in capability, perfect condition, richness, consistency, and the sophistication  
91 portfolio. Hence this paper adopts the idea of maturity as the optimized capability and capacity of an  
92 organization or project against its pursued goals.

#### 93 94 **4.0 The Development of a Maturity Model**

95 A maturity model is the development description of an entity or an anticipated, desired, and typical  
96 evolution path of the objects shaped as discrete stages (Becker and Knackstedt 2009; Klimko 2001). It is a  
97 certain result of applying life cycle approach where each entity develops over time until perfection is  
98 achieved (Klimko2001). The idea of a maturity model was first popularized by the "Capability Maturity  
99 Model" proposed by Software Engineering Institute of Carnegie-Mellon University between 1986 and  
100 1993. In the work of Paulk et al. (1993), software process maturity is defined as the extent to which a  
101 specific process is explicitly defined, managed, measured, controlled and effective. In the Capability  
102 Maturity Model, five levels namely Initial (Level 1), Repeatable (Level 2), Defined (Level 3), Managed  
103 (Level 4) and Optimizing (Level 5), are defined to assess the capability of organizations against an agreed  
104 scale (Paulk et al. 1993).

105  
106 Several attempts were made to expand the use of the maturity model to other disciplines and fields such  
107 as project management, organization, risk management, e-learning, service integration, the supply  
108 network and people capability (Andersen and Jessen 2002; Cooke-Davies and Arzymanow 2003; Dooley  
109 et al. 2001; Klimko 2001; Lockamy III and McCormack 2004; Zou et al. 2010). Klimko (2001) advocated  
110 the use of the maturity model in knowledge management on a comparison and benchmarking basis, where  
111 the description levels of each process to be achieved are clearly characterized. Zou et al. (2010) developed  
112 and validated a risk management maturity model (RM3) successfully and showed that the RM3 was user  
113 friendly, comprehensive, practical, and useful to gain a broad understanding of current risk management  
114 maturity in the industry. Dooley et al. (2001) also proved the positive correlation between high maturity  
115 level of new product development process with project success and organizational goals. They further put  
116 forth the notion of generalizing the maturity construct across both industrial and consumer sectors by  
117 indicating the direct relationship of maturity level with project performance. It is therefore rational to  
118 characterize a maturity model to measure holistically the degree of sustainable development achieved in  
119 construction.

#### 120 121 **5.0 Maturity Models in Sustainable Construction**

122 It is crucial to understand the positioning of an organization towards sustainability for continuous  
123 improvement. Dooley et al. (2001) highlighted the importance of maturity (how well the system does  
124 what it does) and diffusion (how widely and how often the organization performs the best practice) to  
125 lead to a greater organizational effectiveness and more successful products. Examining the interactions of  
126 sustainable development and built environment throughout the production and delivery processes is  
127 critical to produce favorable outcomes in the development of sustainable construction.

128

129 Although numerous sustainable assessment systems such as LEED, BREEAM, and Green Globes etc.  
130 have been developed, most of them limit their focus on the project level. Moreover, few of them have  
131 considered soft systems in measuring the performance of sustainable construction. Cooper (1999) found  
132 that BREEAM and other existing methods are largely restricted to an environmental protection and  
133 resource efficiency agenda, with limited utility for assessing socioeconomic issues. Additionally, some  
134 sustainable rating tools such as BREEAM, LEED, BEAM and BEPAC do not include financial issues in  
135 the evaluation framework, which contradicts the economic principles of sustainable development (Ding  
136 2008). Kibert (2007) also suggested a detailed review on the existing sustainability performance  
137 assessment systems such as LEED as there is a lack of scientific framework underpinning the systems.  
138 Ding (2008) also pointed out that sustainable rating systems seem to be increasingly used as design  
139 guidelines even though they were not originally designed to serve for the purposes.

140  
141 As addressed by Yao et al. (2011), the lack of an integrated approach reduces the concern for achieving  
142 balance between economic, social and environmental dimensions, and although some studies attempt to  
143 incorporate them into the practices, dynamic interactions of different factors have been neglected.  
144 Gladwin et al. (1997 cited in Cole 2005) also suggested emphasizing whole over constituent parts,  
145 relationship over specific entities, process and transformation over physical structure, quality over  
146 quantity, and inclusiveness over exclusiveness. Therefore, it is crucial to assess sustainability in  
147 construction comprehensively. Contrary to conventional green assessment systems, the proposed maturity  
148 model takes soft issues into consideration such as the culture and the management system as the metrics  
149 in examining sustainability performance.

150  
151 Since sustainable construction involves a long term development that embraces the operational life cycle,  
152 the process should be emphasized rather than only the product itself. The development of a sustainable  
153 maturity model is hence significant in assessing the status of the sustainable development process and  
154 positioning the current performance level. By evaluating the maturity level on the achievement of  
155 sustainable development construction, one organization or project can hence know its own strength and  
156 weakness as well as the external opportunity and threat.

157

## 158 **6.0 Key Attributes of a Conceptual Maturity Model for Sustainable Construction**

159 Buildings, people and systems interact with one another and form a dynamic system which could be  
160 sensitive to small changes or perturbations of interacting factors (Lu et al. 2010). Lu et al. (2010) asserted  
161 that building environmental systems are complex dynamic systems which involve building and its  
162 systems; the processes which take place in planning, designing, constructing, and operating the building;  
163 the information and communication systems; and the end users. It is therefore important to have an  
164 integrated approach to examine the holism of the maturity status of sustainable construction by  
165 scrutinizing the external influences and the subtle internal fluctuations of the environmental, socio-  
166 economic and cultural factors. Apart from technical content, the inclusion of criteria such as measurability,  
167 applicability, and communicability is acknowledged to be significant in developing a credible maturity  
168 model for sustainable construction.

169  
170 Five domains are identified as key metrics in developing the maturity model for sustainable construction,  
171 i.e. performance, management capability and capacity, culture, long term framework development, and  
172 research and development, as shown in Figure 1. In each domain, sub factors are assigned as the attributes

173 determining the level to be achieved in the maturity model. It is essential to define measurement  
174 indicators in each domain to allow future researchers building on this proposed maturity model for its  
175 validation and further refinement. A measurement scale of 5 points is used to assess the sub factors under  
176 each domain. An accumulated scoring basis will subsequently be used in assessing the maturity level of  
177 sustainability in construction. In the maturity model, a predefined maturity level ranging from 1 to 5 will  
178 be used to indicate the maturity index of sustainable construction applied in practice, where level 5  
179 indicates the highest level of maturity status. The characteristics of five levels employed in the maturity  
180 model are summarized in Table 1.

181

### 182 **6.1 Domain 1: Performance**

183 The measurement of the performance is a strategic plan which focuses on the short term evaluation by  
184 examining the efficiency and effectiveness of applying sustainability in the construction process. The  
185 performances are generally evaluated against nine main principles of sustainable construction, as outlined  
186 in Table 2. Several sub factors are identified in each domain to measure and determine the sustainable  
187 competitiveness of the performance achieved.

188

189 Rather than serving as a definitive metric, the measuring approach should be applied with flexibility and  
190 adaptability. The achievement of performance should not be determined by the collection of the key  
191 performance indicators only but also the sustainable values of the projects and organizations, including  
192 life cycle operation, stakeholders' expectations and intangible social benefits to gain a holistic and actual  
193 view on sustainable development. It is important to note that the actual role of sustainability played in the  
194 construction industry should not be limited as a demonstration role for the public or the fulfillment of  
195 legal requirements only.

196

### 197 **6.2 Domain 2: Management capability and capacity**

198 The capacity and capability of an organization or project play an important role in the development of  
199 sustainable construction. The leadership style of a leader, the availability and the allocation of resources  
200 significantly impact the effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation especially in the formulation  
201 of strategies. Factors used as metrics in measuring the domain of management capability and capacity  
202 include i) specialized expertise, skill and knowledge, ii) technical tools and techniques, , iii) equipment  
203 and facilities, and iv) financial capability.

204

### 205 **6.3 Domain 3: Culture**

206 A success of sustainable development in the construction industry requires extensive support from the  
207 community, society, and people. Soft issues such as culture, attitude, communication and human  
208 interaction help to determine the development and the achievement of sustainable construction  
209 implementation. Cooke-Davies and Arzymanow (2003) cited the definitions of Denison (1990) by  
210 referring to culture as “the underlying beliefs, values and principles that serve as a foundation for an  
211 organization management system as well as the set of management practices and behaviors that both  
212 exemplify and reinforce the principles”. Although culture is dynamic and changes over time, it can reflect  
213 the attitude of people and exert an influence on the decision making and practices performed by the  
214 construction players. A strong culture can also bring significant positive values to the organization and  
215 industry by attaining a shared vision and goal congruence among employees to meet organizational goals;  
216 empowering employees to be flexible; and energizing employees (Bharadwaj et al. 1993).

217

218 There are four measuring components for sustainable culture, i.e. common language, awareness, concern,  
219 and self motivation. Urgency of taking action has to be included in the awareness for developing  
220 sustainability in construction. By cultivating a sustainable culture within the organizations and industry,  
221 people can share a common ground and language on the definition, principles and concepts of sustainable  
222 construction. As different organizations may have their own sustainable tools, protocols and standards, it  
223 is hence essential to have effective communication to bridge the gaps in applying sustainability in the  
224 construction practices.

225

#### 226 **6.4 Domain 4: Development of organized and structured sustainable framework**

227 The success of sustainability cannot be gauged without a determined vision and mission as well as the  
228 tactical framework. It is vital to investigate whether sustainability features have been consistently built in  
229 or integrated into planning and daily practices. Additionally, a synergy with the core values of  
230 sustainability and the expectation of stakeholders is also needed to be attained. The importance of a well  
231 planned strategy for a short and long term cannot be overlooked since it is the main input to provide a  
232 direction for employees to focus in the present and future.

233

234 The process and strategy of a sustainable framework should embrace the following factors: i) a clear  
235 vision and the tangible mission; ii) data repository of previous projects; iii) sustainability audit and  
236 reporting, and iv) knowledge sharing platform. Tan et al. (2010) identified the importance of a clear  
237 sustainability strategy by allowing organizations to assume their commitments based on their respective  
238 backgrounds and situations. The database is important because it not only acts for self-reported metrics  
239 but also for knowledge sharing purposes. The database should be always kept in the company portfolio  
240 for ease of utilization whenever it is needed. As denoted by Chong et al. (2010), knowledge sharing  
241 among peers is critical to spread new sustainable knowledge viewing that sustainable construction  
242 concepts often need the crossover and integration of knowledge in different fields and areas

243

#### 244 **6.5 Domain 5: Research and development (R & D)**

245 Since sustainable construction highlights the long term development of economic, social and environment  
246 issues, a regular update of the latest information and technology can stimulate a continuous growth by  
247 keeping pace with the current sustainable trends. Additional insights into the exploration of the continuum  
248 of construction development could provide an advantage to outperform one undertaking from the  
249 competitors in the industry. The measurement criteria in the domain of research and development should  
250 include but not be limited to: i) innovation and ii) continuous learning.

251

#### 252 **7.0 Conclusion**

253 With an increasing public awareness of the environmental and social benefits, sustainable development  
254 has gained momentum in the construction industry. Nonetheless, there is a lack of mechanisms for  
255 examining the extent of the implementation of sustainable construction holistically. The proposed  
256 conceptual maturity model can serve as valuable benchmarking tool in determining the achievement of an  
257 undertaking towards the development of sustainable construction. Through this model, a deeper and  
258 richer understanding of the actual practice of sustainable construction can also be gained by identifying  
259 the internal strength and weakness as well as the external opportunity and threat. Five main domains  
260 namely performance, management capabilities and capacities, culture, the development of organized and

261 structured sustainable framework, and research and development are developed as the key measurement  
262 metrics in the maturity model. The model offers an initial baseline to measure the evolution of sustainable  
263 development maturity across the construction industry. Nonetheless, the model is subject to more  
264 empirical testing and research for its practicability. Further contributions can be made with the in depth  
265 validation of the model to transform it to a concrete tool for the construction industry.

266



267 **References:**

- 268 Andersen, Erling S., and Svein Arne Jessen. "Project Maturity in Organisations." *International Journal of*  
269 *Project Management* 21, no. 6 (2003): 457-61.  
270
- 271 Becker, Jörg, Ralf Knackstedt, and Jens Pöppelbuß. "Developing Maturity Models for It Management."  
272 [In English]. *Business & Information Systems Engineering* 1, no. 3 (2009/06/01 2009): 213-22.  
273
- 274 Bharadwaj, Sundar G., P. Rajan Varadarajan, and John Fahy. "Sustainable Competitive Advantage in  
275 Service Industries: A Conceptual Model and Research Propositions." *Journal of Marketing* 57, no.  
276 4 (1993): 83-99.  
277
- 278 Chong, Wai Kiong, Sanat Kumar, Carl T. Haas, Salwa M. A. Beheiry, Lonnie Coplen, and Marvin Oey.  
279 "Understanding and Interpreting Baseline Perceptions of Sustainability in Construction among  
280 Civil Engineers in the United States." *Journal of Management in Engineering* 25, no. 3 (2009):  
281 143-54.  
282
- 283 Cole, Raymond J. "Building Environmental Assessment Methods: Redefining Intentions and Roles."  
284 *Building Research & Information* 33, no. 5 (2005/09/01 2005): 455-67.  
285
- 286 Cooke-Davies, Terence J., and Andrew Arzymanow. "The Maturity of Project Management in Different  
287 Industries: An Investigation into Variations between Project Management Models." *International*  
288 *Journal of Project Management* 21, no. 6 (2003): 471-78.  
289
- 290 Cooper, Ian. "Which Focus for Building Assessment Methods – Environmental Performance or  
291 Sustainability?". *Building Research & Information* 27, no. 4-5 (1999/07/01 1999): 321-31.  
292
- 293 Ding, Grace K.C. "Sustainable Construction—the Role of Environmental Assessment Tools." *Journal of*  
294 *Environmental Management* 86, no. 3 (2008): 451-64.  
295
- 296 Dooley, Kevin, Anand Subra, and John Anderson. "Maturity and Its Impact on New Product  
297 Development Project Performance." [In English]. *Research in Engineering Design* 13, no. 1  
298 (2001/08/01 2001): 23-29.  
299
- 300 Du Plessis, Chrisna. "A Strategic Framework for Sustainable Construction in Developing Countries."  
301 *Construction Management and Economics* 25, no. 1 (2007/01/01 2007): 67-76.  
302
- 303 Haapio, Appu, and Pertti Viitaniemi. "A Critical Review of Building Environmental Assessment Tools."  
304 *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 28, no. 7 (2008): 469-82.  
305
- 306 Hill, Richard C., and Paul A. Bowen. "Sustainable Construction: Principles and a Framework for  
307 Attainment." *Construction Management and Economics* 15, no. 3 (1997/05/01 1997): 223-39.  
308
- 309 Klimko, Gabor. "Knowledge Management and Maturity Models: Building Common Understanding." In  
310 *European Conference on Knowledge Management*, edited by Dan Remenyi, 269-78. Slovenia:  
311 Bled School of Management Bled, 2001.  
312
- 313 Kibert, Charles J. "The next generation of sustainable construction." *Building Research & Information*, 35,  
314 no. 6(2007):595-601.  
315

316 Lockamy III, A., and K. McCormack. "The Development of a Supply Chain Management Process  
317 Maturity Model Using the Concepts of Business Process Orientation." *Supply Chain Management*  
318 9, no. 4 (2004): 272-78  
319

320 Lu, Xiaoshu, Derek Clements-Croome, and Martti Viljanen. "Integration of Chaos Theory and  
321 Mathematical Models in Building Simulation: Part I: Literature Review." *Automation in*  
322 *Construction* 19, no. 4 (2010): 447-51.  
323

324 *Oxford Dictionary Online*, s.v. "maturity", assessed January 18, 2013,  
325 <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/maturity?q=maturity>.  
326

327 Paulk, Mark C; Curtis, Bill; Chrissis, Mary Beth; Weber, Charles V. "Capability Maturity Model, Version  
328 1.1." *IEEE Software* 10, no. 4 (1993): 18-27.  
329

330 Pearce, Annie R., Sushil Shenoy, Christine M. Fiori, and Zachary Winters. "The State of Sustainability  
331 Best Practices in Construction: A Benchmark Study." *Journal of Green Building* 5, no. 3  
332 (2010/08/01 2010): 116-30.  
333

334 Presley, Adrien, and Laura Meade. "Benchmarking for Sustainability: An Application to the Sustainable  
335 Construction Industry." *Benchmarking* 17, no. 3 (2010): 435-51.  
336

337 Rohracher, Harald. "Managing the Technological Transition to Sustainable Construction of Buildings: A  
338 Socio-Technical Perspective." *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management* 13, no. 1  
339 (2001/03/01 2001): 137-50.  
340

341 Shen, L. Y., and Vivian W. Y. Tam. "Implementation of Environmental Management in the Hong Kong  
342 Construction Industry." *International Journal of Project Management* 20, no. 7 (2002): 535-43.  
343

344 Son, Hyojoo, Changwan Kim, Wai Kiong Chong, and Jui-Sheng Chou. "Implementing Sustainable  
345 Development in the Construction Industry: Constructors' Perspectives in the Us and Korea."  
346 *Sustainable Development* 19, no. 5 (2011): 337-47.  
347

348 Spence, Robin, and Helen Mulligan. "Sustainable Development and the Construction Industry." *Habitat*  
349 *International* 19, no. 3 (1995): 279-92.  
350

351 Tan, Yongtao, Liyin Shen, and Hong Yao. "Sustainable Construction Practice and Contractors'  
352 Competitiveness: A Preliminary Study." *Habitat International* 35, no. 2 (2011): 225-30.  
353

354 Yao, Hong, Liyin Shen, Yongtao Tan, and Jianli Hao. "Simulating the Impacts of Policy Scenarios on the  
355 Sustainability Performance of Infrastructure Projects." *Automation in Construction* 20, no. 8  
356 (2011): 1060-69.  
357

358 Yiu, C. Y., X. H. Lu, M. Y. Leung, and W. X. Jin. "A Longitudinal Analysis on the Relationship between  
359 Construction Output and Gdp in Hong Kong." *Construction Management and Economics* 22, no.  
360 4 (2004/05/01 2004): 339-45.  
361

362 Williams, Katie, and Morag Lindsay. "The Extent and Nature of Sustainable Building in England: An  
363 Analysis of Progress." *Planning Theory & Practice* 8, no. 1 (2007/03/01 2007): 31-49.  
364

365 Zimmermann, M., H. J. Althaus, and A. Haas. "Benchmarks for Sustainable Construction: A Contribution  
366 to Develop a Standard." *Energy and Buildings* 37, no. 11 (2005): 1147-57.

367  
368  
369  
370

Zou, Patrick X. W., Chen Ying, and Chan Tsz-Ying. "Understanding and Improving Your Risk Management Capability: Assessment Model for Construction Organizations." *Journal of Construction Engineering & Management* 136, no. 8 (2010): 854-63.

## TABLE


Table 1 The characteristics of maturity level in the conceptual sustainable development maturity model (adopted from Paulk et al. 1993)

<b>Maturity Level</b>	<b>Characteristics</b>
Level 1: Initial	The organizations or the projects are characterized as ad hoc and occasionally chaotic. The structure of organizations and projects are ill defined and individual efforts are emphasized for the success.
Level 2: Repeatable	Certain processes are established to track and monitor the cost, time and functionality. The necessary process discipline is applied for similar projects.
Level 3: Defined	The processes are documented, standardized and integrated into organization practices. Rather than fixed, the processes can always be tailored to address individual project needs.
Level 4: Managed	Detailed measures of process and products are clearly specified. Organizations can quantitatively understand and control the process and products.
Level 5: Optimizing	Continuous improvement is enforced by monitoring feedback from the process. Innovative ideas and technology will be developed.

Table 2            Nine (9) main principles of sustainable construction

<b>Principles</b>	<b>Sub Factors</b>
1. Resources and Materials Consumption:	a) Recycling and reuse of materials and waters b) Resource usage efficiency c) Land use
2. Environmental impact:	a) Waste management, b) Toxics elimination c) Carbon emission d) Ecosystem e) Water efficiency
3. Quality of comfort:	a) Occupational health and safety b) Indoor environment quality (air, noise, lighting, ventilation, temperature and humidity) c) Indoor chemical and pollutant source control d) Controllability of Systems (Lighting, temperature, ventilation) e) Occupants and owner's satisfaction
4. Energy efficiency	a) Renewable energy (Biomass, wind energy, solar energy) b) Optimum energy performance
5. Design Process	a) Daylight b) Thermal comfort c) Ventilation d) Spaces flexibility and adaptability e) Ecological innovation
6. Life cycle costing	a) Cost efficiency b) Financial return c) Payback period
7. Functional applicability	a) Market demand and supply
8. Life span	a) Service life /durability of building and design b) Maintenance and Refurbishment
9. Heritage and cultural preservation	a) Heritage preservation b) Cultural preservation

1 **FIGURE**



2

3 Figure 1 The Conceptual Maturity Model of Sustainable Construction