Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Development of a Plug-In to Support Sustainability Assessment in the Decision-Making of a Building Envelope Refurbishment

Bernardette Soust Verdaguer , José Antonio Gutiérrez , Carmen Llatas *

Posted Date: 16 May 2023

doi: 10.20944/preprints202305.1071.v1

Keywords: Sustainability; Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment; Building Information Modelling; Tool Development; Building Early Design Steps; Building refurbishment; Building Envelope

Article

Development of a Plug-In to Support Sustainability Assessment in the Decision-Making of a Building Envelope Refurbishment

Bernardette Soust-Verdaguer [1], José Antonio Gutiérrez [1] and Carmen Llatas [1]

[1] Instituto Universitario de Arquitectura y Ciencias de la Construcción, Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura, Universidad de Sevilla. Reina Mercedes Avenue 2, 41012 Seville, Spain.

* Correspondence: cllatas@us.es

Abstract: Existing studies provide evidence that buildings and the construction sector are the largest consumers of natural resources and carry the greatest responsibility for greenhouse gas emissions. In order to reverse this situation, future challenges involve utilising the least resources possible. To this end, building refurbishment becomes a crucial strategy given its potential to improve operational energy efficiency and to extend the life span of existing building stock, thereby reducing the environmental impact while also providing social and economic benefits to our cities. Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment (LCSA) has become one of the scientific community's most widely recognised methodologies for the evaluation of the social, economic, and environmental dimensions (Triple Bottom Line), since it assesses sustainability using quantitative metrics. However, the implementation of this methodology to support the refurbishment process at the project stage in building design tools, such as BIM, remains scarce. One of the main obstacles lies in the difficulties of accessing the building information, given that the system boundaries only cover new materials and products. Hence, this study proposes a BIM plug-in development to support the multi-dimensional building material selection in the early design steps based on the LCSA of a building during the refurbishment stage and validates its application in a case study. The results show the viability of using this tool during the early design stages and demonstrate the consistency of the results to evaluate various material and product alternatives for the refurbishment of the envelope system of a multi-family residential building. This study contributes towards the integration of decision-making by providing real-time assessment of the building envelope.

Keywords: sustainability; life cycle sustainability assessment; building information modelling; tool development; building early design steps; building refurbishment; building envelope

1. Introduction

Existing scientific studies provide clear evidence of the role played in the climatic crisis by the built environment, in that it emits 40% of greenhouse gas emissions worldwide [1]. Future tendencies indicate extreme climatic situations and a substantial depletion in biodiversity if no measures are implemented for their reduction [2]. Radical changes are therefore required in order to alter the ways of designing and conceiving our buildings and the built environment.

In the European context, strategies, such as the Green Deal [3] and the Renovation wave [4], propose the progressive and absolute reduction of carbon emissions in order to achieve carbon neutrality by 2050, and suggest an increment in the building renovation and rehabilitation, as well as the increment of the data digitalisation along the building life cycle. These ambitious objectives imply the decarbonisation of all the economic sectors, including the construction and building sector, for both the embodied and operational carbon footprints. The embodied carbon footprint is related to the materials and products that are installed in the building, and includes processes such as manufacturing, construction, and transportation [5]. In the current context in Spain, instruments such as the Climate Change Law [6] encourage the use of materials with the lowest embodied carbon footprint possible. However, these measures do not include a quantitative procedure, nor do they involve the calculation of the embodied carbon. This calculation and its declaration are now being

 doi:10.20944/preprints202305.1071.v1

integrated in several European Countries, such as Sweden [7] and the Netherlands [8]. Its expansion across European countries has been planned for development in the next few years. Indeed, the new version of the Energy Performance of Buildings Directive, EPBD [9], proposes the calculation of the carbon emissions of the whole life of buildings for both the embodied and operational carbon footprints.

In order to calculate the whole-life carbon emissions, the Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) methodology is crucial, since the "carbon footprint is the sum of greenhouse gas emissions and greenhouse gas removals in a product system, expressed as CO_2 equivalent and based on this methodology (LCA) using climate change (CC) or global warming potential (GWP) as the only impact category" [10]. However, to implement effective measures for the reduction of carbon emissions from the building sector, it is also necessary to make these measures affordable (from the economic point of view) and positive for the community (from the social point of view). Hence, the scientific community [11,12] recognises the value of methodologies such as Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment (LCSA) in addressing the triple-dimension sustainability assessment. The LCSA methodology combines three methods based on the impact quantification throughout the building life cycle: Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) (environmental dimension); Life Cycle Costing (LCC) (economic impact); and the Social Life Cycle Assessment (SLCA) (social dimension) [11]. Given the increasing necessity to address building sustainability from a holistic perspective (by integrating the environmental, economic, and social dimensions), the building design phase is crucial, since it is the phase where it is the easiest and cheapest to incur design changes [13]. A study demonstrates that the design phase has a great potential to achieve accurate LCSA results during the early design stages in design tools such as Building Information Modelling (BIM) [14]. For instance, during this stage, it is possible to estimate more than 80% of the CO_2 emissions (environmental dimension), 60% of the costs (economic dimension), and 70% of the working hours (social dimension) of the total results for product and construction impacts (A1-A3, A5 information modules ISO 21931-1[15]) in the detailed design stage.

In recent decades, multiple studies [16–24] have demonstrated the increasing development of life cycle-based methods in the design process and in design tools such as BIM. The main developments focus on simplifying the assessment process and workflows, and on integrating different life cycle information modules (system boundaries) for the assessment of new buildings and building refurbishment. The application of life cycle-based methods to building refurbishment presents several particularities [25]. For example, not only must the life cycle inventory focus on the new materials and components [26], but it must also consider existing materials and components to correctly model the quantities of materials. This implies the control of building information in relation to new and refurbished elements. The number of existing studies [27–29] focused on the application of the life cycle approach to building refurbishment in BIM remains limited and includes the assessment of the economic and/or environment dimension(s), without considering the social dimension (S-LCA). For example, Dauletbek and Zhou [27] focus on a refurbishment of an existing residential building using BIM-enabled LCA and simplified LCC "considering environmental compatibility, energy efficiency, and profitability based on real construction and energy consumption data". Tushar et al. [29] develop a BIM and LCA workflow to compare different precast materials for a building retrofit. Kim [28] conducts LCA studies based on different energy standards, and uses BIM to formulate refurbishment alternatives through a case study. The study also shows the correlation between LCA and LCC. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that the level of automation in the BIM-LCA application to these existing studies remains low. For instance, Dauletbek and Zhou [27] use WEBlca, a web application for the LCA that has not been integrated into the BIM methodology. Tushar et al. [29] use a combination of tools including Tally [30] for the LCA calculation, FirstRate5 for the regression analysis, and @RISK palisade for the Monte Carlo simulation.

On the other hand, the existing BIM-LCSA tools and advances [31–33] focus on new buildings. For instance, Figuereido et al. [32] develop a framework for sustainable material selection by integrating various software (such as Tally and Excel) and focus on a new building case study, which includes all the building elements in the LCSA and is limited to the A1 to A4 information modules.

In Soust-Verdaguer et al. [31], one of the main limitations is the control of the building elements that comprise the system boundaries. The plug-in neither allows the identification of the existing and new building elements, nor that of the elements that belong to the building element systems. The BIM objects library is limited to the structure system elements, and therefore fails to consider the recommended thermal transmittance values of the envelope to achieve the required operational energy performance.

The authors' previous studies are based on the development of assessment tools focused on new buildings [31], and hence this present study proceeds with the improvement of the latter's development and explores its potential for the selection of building material in building envelope refurbishment.

To the best of our knowledge, no study has yet included the LCSA in the decision-making of building refurbishment stage and supported results in BIM in real-time. This study is therefore based on a plug-in development to conduct the LCSA of a BIM model to support the decision-making in the refurbishment process. The plug-in development aims to provide a solution to the existing limitations in the LCSA in BIM.

2. Materials and Methods

In order to achieve the aforementioned goals, this study proposes a tool development following the steps described in Figure 1 and based on the methodological framework validated in several scientific publications [18,31,33].



Figure 1. Schema of the tool development strategy.

The tool development took previous development [31] into consideration to conduct the building structure evaluation based on the LCSA in BIM. The procedure to adapt said tool to the envelope building system consisted of a methodological adaptation of the LCSA to the building refurbishment assessment and a BIM-Object library enrichment. The methodological adaptation aimed to include the detected particularities to apply the LCSA to a building refurbishment as described in [26].

The BIM-TBL database is a BIM-Object library that includes alphanumeric information for the implementation of the LCSA methodology at the building element scale. The data referring to the environmental dimension (Carbon Footprint), the economic dimension (euros), and the social dimension (working hours) are organised according to the structure of the IFC Building Elements (IFC4) classes [34], and include the building elements that comprise the envelope system. The BIM model for the evaluation of the building includes the information of the building geometry and the quantification of the building elements thereof, at an intermediate level of development (LOD). The plug-in includes the LCSA calculation procedure in the BIM models and the visualisation of results in real-time developed in the native BIM modelling software: Autodesk Revit [35]. Lastly, the results and their discussion include the data extracted from the use of the plug-in to evaluate the BIM models and the building design alternatives. A brief discussion of the results in terms of operational and embedded aspects is also included.

2.1. Tool adaptation to the building refurbishment process

The plug-in definition focuses on reducing the effort, by simplifying processes and, and increasing the level of automation in the LCSA calculation in the building envelope refurbishment, thereby helping the designer visualise the best design solution (while considering environmental, economic, and social dimensions).

The tool development assumes that the definition of the BIM model geometry to be employed for the evaluation presents a relatively low level of development (LOD) [36]. Therefore, in order to apply the LCSA to the building envelope system, the alphanumeric information on the BIM objects that make up the BIM model incorporate information of a more detailed nature regarding the materials and products.

This enables the rapid evaluation of construction alternatives so that the designer is aided in their definition of the best solution that would subsequently be incorporated into the BIM model. In order to minimise the effort invested in the identification of the elements and to facilitate the verification of the system boundaries, the plug-in includes a limited list of building elements that comprise the envelope system, including the façade, windows, doors, roofs, and floors (see Figure 2).



Figure 2. Screenshot of the plug-in user interface, showing the "Select Elements" button.

To enable a quick and direct interaction of the user with the BIM model and the LCSA calculation, the plug-in includes a button for the manual selection ("Select Elements" button) of the building elements in the BIM model in 3D view. Moreover, to adapt the plug-in development to the specific aspects of the building refurbishment life-cycle techniques, the authors include, apart from the building elements filter (Figure 3 left-hand side), which is used to select the building elements that can potentially be included in the envelope, a field ("IsEnvelope") to confirm those specific elements that are included in the envelope. For example, if the slabs are not in contact with the ground or the doors are not exterior. Moreover, in order to adjust the system boundaries to the building refurbishment LCA particularities [25], the plug-in displays the "Phase" of the construction process, which could be "Existing" or "Refurbish", to filter the existing and new elements.

In Spain, specific tools and methods are employed for the calculation of the operational energy and that of the national regulations compliance [37]. Building parameters are considered, such as internal loads and operational conditions, climate zone, exterior conditions on inner and outer surfaces, building elements, thermal transmittance of materials, thermal bridges, the void factor, and transmission and radiation in opaque enclosures and the ground. From all these factors, the parameter that most influences the embodied impacts is that of the definition of the building elements and materials, especially regarding the thermal transmittance and opaque and transparent enclosures. Therefore, the building design in BIM can be limited to utilising only recommended transmittance values and recommended proportions of openings and transparent enclosures. To simplify the integration of the operational energy calculation in BIM, the plug-in includes a library of predefined solutions for building refurbishment (including walls, doors, windows, and roofs) that comply with the thermal transmittance recommended values [38] for the climate zone of the case study.



Figure 3. Screenshot of the plug-in user interface, showing the "IsEnvelope" field and "Phase" display.

2.2. Case study description

The case study is an energy rehabilitation of a multi-family building of 36 social housing dwellings located in Camas (Seville), which was conducted in 2020 and promoted by the Housing and Rehabilitation Agency of Andalusia [39]. The real total area of the building is 2,686 m^2. However, for the evaluation of the model and verification of the methodology employed, only a portion of the building was selected, as shown in Figure 4. Since the case study is a building envelope refurbishment, the verification of the usefulness of the tool focuses on the analysis of several construction alternatives.



Figure 4. BIM model of the Camas Building (left-hand-side: complete building; right-hand-side: portion of the building included in the assessment).

The information to be included in the BIM model of the building has been classified in accordance with the LOIN concept [40], wherein geometric information and alphanumeric information of the objects that comprise a BIM model are recognised.

2.3. Tool application to the case study

The methodology used for the evaluation of the case study consists of the following steps (see Figure 5):



Figure 5. Diagram of the methodology followed for the evaluation of the case study.

Step 1: Evaluation of solutions for the walls: the study compares three alternatives to determinate the best solution for this type of building element and adopts this solution before continuing onto the following step.

The three alternative construction solutions that have been selected for the rehabilitation of the façade are the following: Exterior Thermal Insulation System (ETICS), ventilated façade, and interior insulation (see Table 1). On the other hand, each of these solutions has been evaluated using two alternative materials for the insulation layer: EPS and Mineral Wool. The transmittance values for the three solutions are all the same (0.30 W/(m²K)). This value was used in the operational energy simulation to comply with the energy regulations [38] and is lower than the oriented values for this climate zone and type of element (climate zone B, element wall U value= 0.38 W/(m²K)). The supplementary data includes a detailed description of the materials and thicknesses.

Table 1. Description of the solutions for exterior walls included in the case study.

	Solution 1	**Solution 2**	**Solution 3**
Type of solution	ETICS	Ventilated façade	Interior insulation
U-value	0.30 W/(m²K)	0.30 W/(m²K)	0.30 W/(m²K)
Materials for insulation	EPS	EPS	EPS
	Mineral wool	Mineral wool	Mineral wool

Step 2: Comparison of solutions for the windows and doors of the case study, whereby the best solution is determined and adopted for the evaluation of the last element. For this purpose, three types of carpentry were considered for the windows, and two solutions for the exterior doors (steel and aluminium) and a combination of both solutions (see Tables 2 and 3).

Table 2. Description of the solutions for windows included in the case study.

Solution and material 1	Solution and material 2	Solution and material 3
Double glazing	Double glazing	Double glazing
Wood	PCV	Coated Aluminium

Table 3. Description of the solutions for exterior doors included in the case study.

Solution and material 1	Solution and material 2	Solution and material 3
Steel	Aluminium	Steel and Aluminum

Step 3: Incorporation of the roof into the evaluation of the sustainability of the envelope to obtain the results of the complete envelope system. Finally, Table 4 shows the horizontal envelope taken into account for the roof.

Table 4. Description of the solutions for the roof included in the case study.

Solution and material 1
Non-trafficable roof finished in gravel with EPS (thermal insulation)

The feasibility of this tool for the evaluation of the case study is largely due to the speed and simplicity of the procedure, which only requires the assignment of the codes corresponding to the BIM objects to be evaluated according to the characteristics specified in the BIM-TBL library [31,33] which are integrated in the plug-in.

2.3.1. Life cycle sustainability assessment applied to the case study

The scope of the building sustainability assessment is defined in the first instance by the type of assessment of the three main dimensions: environmental, economic, and social. Moreover, by considering the methodological aspects and assumptions in order to conduct the LCSA applied to the design phase of buildings in BIM, as previously addressed in [14,18,33], the scope of this assessment covers the following aspects: the definition of elements to be included in the assessment, the definition of the building life cycle phases to be included in the assessment, and the definition of the impact categories and indicators to be used for the sustainability assessment (Section 3.5).

2.3.2. Definition of building information included in the assessment

Figure 6 shows the information modules included in this study, following the criteria defined in previous work [14,18,33], together with the data availability and the relevance of the information modules [14]. Since the case study is a refurbishment and following the criteria established in previous work [25], the sustainability assessment focused on the new materials and processes incorporated in this phase, and excluded those existing in the building. For the evaluation, the building elements employed were those detailed in the previous section that are included in the BIM model in the Refurbished/Rehabilitated phase. The study compared the embodied aspects of each solution, including the information modules A1-A3, A5, B2, B3, B4, and C1 for the new materials, products, and components incorporated in the building envelope refurbishment.



Figure 6. LCSA information modules included in the study.

2.3.3. Definition of building elements included in the assessment

The building assessment is based on the building envelope system and includes the IFC element classes listed in Table 5. The definition of the BIM objects that comprise the building corresponds to an LOD of approximately 200-300 [36]. This means that the elements included in the evaluation are modelled following the criteria detailed in Table 5, including the geometric information of the BIM model.

Table 5. Main specifications of the elements integrated in the BIM model according to BIM Forum [36].

IFC Building Element	BIM Forum Specifications
IfcDoor	LOD 200: Doors are either modelled as a single component or represented with single frame and panel. Approximate unit size, location, and type are provided.
IfcRoof	LOD 200: These are defined as generic objects separated by material type with an approximate total thickness represented by a single layer. Designs and locations are still flexible.
IfcWall	LOD 200: These collect the size, shape, location, and orientation of the element. They are defined as generic objects separated by material type with an approximate total thickness represented by a single layer. Designs and locations are still flexible.
IfcWindow	LOD 200: Windows approximated in terms of location, size, count, and type. Units are either modelled as a single monolithic component or depicted with single frame and glazing.

2.3.4. Definition of impact categories and indicators

Considering the three dimensions (environmental, economic, and social) the assessment included the following impact categories and indicators: Global Warming Potential (GWP) in CO_2 equivalent emissions, Costs (euros), Working hours (hours).

One of the contributions of the methodological development of the LCSA [16] and the BIM-TBL database is the harmonisation in the structure of environmental, economic, and social data given by the BCCA [41]. This database uses a systematic structure [42] to organise the information of the building and its elements, as well as the materials and processes that are necessary from the product phase, construction, use to the end-of-life phase.

For the evaluation of the case study, generic BIM objects were used. These BIM objects include information on environmental, economic, and social impacts of general BIM elements from the BIM-TBL library and include generic data on environmental impacts (kg CO_2 eq.) extracted from the ecoinvent v3.7.1 database [43] and systematically organised through the BCCA [43]. Economic (euros) and social (working hours) data was extracted from the BCCA [43].

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Case study LCSA results

After applying the evaluation procedure to all the technical solutions detailed in Section 2.3, the best solution was that which includes ETICS -EPS in the façade, wooden windows, and aluminium for the main door and exterior doors (see Figure 7).

From the results obtained, the EPS solution for the exterior walls was indicated as the best performing option in the environmental dimension. However, when analysing the material variation between the EPS and mineral wool ETICS solution, it is possible to see that the impacts per kg of mineral wool for the manufacturing process are lower than those of EPS. The results extracted from the ecoinvent v3.7.1 database [42] for the GWP impact category (IPCC 2013) show that the impacts per functional unit (kg) of EPS are 3.541593 kg CO_2 eq. and of mineral wool these are 1.306912 kg CO_2 eq. Due to the differences in the density of the two materials, the results of the environmental assessment turn in favour of EPS when similar thicknesses are installed as thermal insulation in the building to obtain equivalent thermal transmittance values.



Figure 7. Results obtained from the evaluation of the ETICS-EPS façade solution, wooden windows, aluminium doors and non-transitable roof.

This demonstrates the importance of using assessment tools and methods that are close to the real materials and quantities installed in the building. Other types of comparisons that simply compare impacts (e.g., per kg) without considering the totality of the characteristics of the materials installed in the building could lead to erroneous decisions. On the other hand, it should be borne in mind that the results of this assessment are limited to the inclusion of one impact category (GWP) which is mainly focused on the product and construction phase (A1-A3 and A5). In this respect, it is understood that the order of the alternatives evaluated could be modified if, for example, another life

 doi:10.20944/preprints202305.1071.v1

cycle phase is included or the results of the benefits of recycling or reuse of the materials and products utilised (module D) are communicated.

The evaluation of the window solutions (Table 6) shows that the wooden solution yields the best results for all three dimensions (environmental, economic, and social), since it presents the lowest CO_2 emissions and costs, and can generate the most local working hours.

Table 6. Results of the window solutions and the best solution for walls.

	Main material solution	Environmental kg. CO_2 eq.	Economic €	Social h working hours
1	Façade: ETICS -EPS, Windows: Wood	5790.01	45274.93	4263.44
2	Façade: ETICS -EPS, Windows: Coated Aluminum	6094.88	59353.22	4258.11
3	Façade: ETICS -EPS, Windows: PVC	6743.41	57349.72	4256.71

Finally, the results were calculated for the three dimensions including the best solutions for the façade, windows, external doors, and roof. The multidimensional (environmental, economic and social) assessment gave equal weight (33.3%) to all dimensions. Table 7 shows the three best solutions for the façade, windows, and doors.

Table 7. Normalised results for the multi-dimension assessment of the three best solutions for the envelope system.

	Combination of material solution	Environmental	Economic	Social	Total
1	Façade: ETICS -EPS, Windows: Wood, Main exterior door: Steel, Exterior doors: Aluminium	0	0	0	0
2	Façade: ETICS -EPS, Windows: Wood, Main exterior door: Steel, Exterior doors: Steel	0.88282628	- 0.88280478	0.8825072	0.882529
3	Façade: ETICS -EPS, Windows: Wood, Main exterior door: Aluminium, Exterior doors: Aluminium	-1.11276295	1.11278286	- 1.11305839	- 1.113038

3.2. Advantages of the tool developed

The results show that the triple dimension assessment (environmental, economic, social) of the building envelope refurbishment can be conducted in real-time using a BIM model. The tool enables the comparison of various materials and technical solutions in real-time, enabling the logical and orderly organisation of the evaluation of the elements that comprise the building envelope, thereby facilitating the calculation of the LCSA. However, the normalisation of the results, and the weighting of the three dimensions (environmental, economic, and social) has manually implemented.

It was possible to perform the assessment and attain coherent values for the information modules included. For instance, the values obtained for the environmental dimension are consistent when compared with other similar work [44]. In Hollberg et al. [44], the reference values obtained for the case of external walls vary between 0.82 to 3.82 kg CO_2 eq. per square metre per year. In this study these values are lower (0.38 kg CO_2 eq. per square metre per year) due to the fact that it is a building refurbishment, and hence the structure system and other building systems are excluded from the system boundaries. Other studies [27] that were focused on comparing two scenarios for refurbishment

 doi:10.20944/preprints202305.1071.v1

of multi-residential buildings assumed different U-values for the external walls: 0.23 W/m²k and 0.62 W/m²k. The results for the study vary from 5.74 to 3.79 kg CO_2- eq. per kg of building material per square metre per year, considering all the building systems that comprise the building envelope.

The study demonstrates the adjustability in the definition of the system boundaries of the building for a building refurbishment LCSA, and its correlation with the 3D-view BIM model. The tool focuses on the envelope design at the material and geometry level, which can help optimise the building performance. Therefore, by focusing the building envelope design on the material thermal transmittance parameters, a reduction is facilitated in the effort required in the operational energy calculation. This can help towards optimising the embodied impacts, while leaving other variables that affect the calculation of operational energy (such as form factor and occupancy) at fixed values.

3.3. Limitations and future developments

Limitations in the scope of the assessment and of the information modules included have been detected. For example, several information modules, such as C3, C4, and D, are not included in the case study validation. Although the integration of the building elements has been limited to the building elements implemented in the real building, the authors aim to maintain the scope of the study close to the expected theoretical values for operational energy demand (33.07 kWh/m²yr.) and to provide a fair comparison of the solutions.

The results demonstrate that the EPS solution is better than that of mineral wool if solely the Product, Construction, and Deconstruction processes (C1 module) are considered, which is also aligned with other studies such as [45–47]. However, waste processing and benefits beyond the building system are not included. Other studies [48], that have focused on the material circularity analysis, provide evidence that the flame-retardants in polystyrene materials in the existing stock make polystyrene-based materials less suitable for recycling than mineral-based insulation.

The study focused on the use of predefined combinations of materials and precalculated thermal transmittance in accordance with the recommended values for the climate zone of the case study (Seville, B4 according to the CTE [38]). Future studies can include the dynamic calculation to verify a wide range of options for the building envelope, or could include a more comprehensive number of values for the various climate zones in Spain [38]. Future research could therefore be focused on its automatic integration into the plug-in development. For example, as highlighted in Soust-Verdaguer et al. [31], multi-criteria decision methods such as TOPSIS (Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution) [49] and AHP (Analytic Hierarchy Process) [50] could support automatic weighting and performance of a multi-criteria assessment in the plug-in.

4. Conclusions

The application of the plug-in and the methodology developed to carry out the quantitative evaluation of sustainability during the design phase of buildings have enabled the identification of the best construction solutions, materials, products, and processes to be used in building refurbishment, without the necessity of attaining high levels of detail in the BIM models. The results presented herein provide evidence of the special consideration that should be taken into account in the application of the building refurbishment LCSA in BIM. The main contribution of the tool lies in the flexibility in the use of the data regarding the BIM model to conduct the LCSA, in order to comply with the requirements of the application of the LCSA for building refurbishment.

Moreover, the study proposes a design methodology not only to reduce the GWP of buildings and the building life cycle costs (e.g., materials that help to minimise maintenance costs and require the least number of replacements over the life cycle of the building), but also to increase the social benefits, following element optimisation based on its relevance in the building geometry design. From the results attained herein, the integration of various dimensions (economic, environmental, social) in the building design demand special attention, especially in building refurbishment where the return of the investment needs to be assessed not only from the economic dimension (savings in energy consumption), but also from the environmental (embodied and operational impact optimisation) and social dimensions.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 16 May 2023 doi:10.20944/preprints202305.1071.v1

5. Patents

The software is under the authorship and patent registration of the University of Seville.

Author Contributions: Conceptualisation, B.S-V. and C.L.; methodology, B.S-V. and C.L.; software, J.A.G.M.; validation, B.S-V., J.A.G.M., and C.L.; formal analysis, B.S-V.; investigation, B.S-V.; J.A.G.M.; resources, B.S-V. and J.A.G.M.; data curation, B.S-V. and J.A.G.M.; writing—original draft preparation, B.S-V. and J.A.G.M.; writing—review and editing, B.S-V., C.L., and J.A.G.M.; visualisation, B.S-V.; supervision, B.S-V. and C.L.; project administration, C.L.; funding acquisition, C.L. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: The authors thank the Spanish Ministry of Ecological Transition and the Demographic Challenge, which supported the project Grant TED2021-129542B-I00, the Junta de Andalucía and the ERDF A way of making Europe, for supporting the research project Grant P20_00541, and the Junta de Andalucía, Consejería de Fomento, Infraestructuras y Ordenación del Territorio for supporting the research, Grant US.20-03.

Acknowledgements: The authors thank AVRA for providing information on the building case study. The authors also thank the participants in the research project Grant P20_00541, the research project Grant US.20-03, and the research project Grant TED2021-129542B-I00 for their direct and indirect inputs to the study.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare there to be no conflict of interest.

Appendix A

Table A1. Description of the façade solutions.

Solution 1	Solution 2	Solution 3
ETICS	Ventilated façade	Interior insulation
		
New materials	New materials	New materials
1. Cement or lime mortar for masonry and rendering/plastering 1000<d<1250: 1.50cm 2. EPS Expanded Polystyrene or mineral wool (0.029 W/m.k): 6.00cm 3. Cement or lime mortar for masonry and rendering/plastering 1000<d<1250: 1.50cm	1. Cement or lime mortar for masonry and plastering/rendering 1000<d<1250: 1.50cm 2. Cellulose cement board: 0.80cm 3. Air chamber: 6.00cm 4. Gypsum plasterboard (PYL) 750<d<900:1.00cm 5. EPS Expanded Polystyrene or Mineral wool (0.029 W/m.k): 6.00cm 6. Cement or lime mortar for masonry and rendering/plastering 1000<d<1250: 1.50cm	7. EPS Expanded Polystyrene or Mineral Wool (0.029 W/m.k): 6.00cm 8. Gypsum plasterboard 750<d<900: 1.30cm 9. Gypsum mortar: 1.50cm
Existing materials	Existing materials	Existing materials

4. ½ foot perforated brick metric or Catalan 40mm <G< 60mm: 11.50 cm 5. Cement or lime mortar for masonry and plastering 1000<d<1250: 1.50cm 6. PUR Hydroflurocarbide HFC projection (0.028 W/m.k): 2.00com 7. Double hollow brick board (60mm<E<90mm):7.00cm 8. Gypsum mortar:1.50cm	7. ½ foot perforated brick metric or Catalan 40mm <G< 60mm: 11.50 cm 8. Cement or lime mortar for masonry and plastering 1000<d<1250: 1.50cm 9. PUR Hydroflurocarbide HFC projection (0.028 W/m.k): 2.00com 10. Double hollow brick board (60mm<E<90mm):7.00cm 11. Gypsum mortar:1.50cm	1. Cement or lime mortar for masonry and plastering/rendering 1000<d<1250: 1.50cm 2. ½ foot perforated brick metric or Catalan 40mm <G< 60mm: 11.50 cm 3. Cement or lime mortar for masonry and plastering 1000<d<1250: 1.50cm 4. PUR Hydroflurocarbide HFC projection (0.028 W/m.k): 2.00com 5. Double hollow brick board (60mm<E<90mm):7.00cm 6. Gypsum mortar: 1.50cm

Table A2. Description of the roof solution.

Solution 1	
Non-trafficable roof	Trafficable roof
	
Existing materials	Existing materials
1. 5 cm gravel layer with aggregate between 16 and 32 mm diameter: 5.00cm 2. 5 cm mortar layer reinforced with fiberglass mesh: 5.00cm 3. Geotextile anti-zonation separator filter: 0.10cm 4. 80mm extruded polystyrene insulation panel: 8.00cm 5. Geotextile anti-zonation separator filter: 0.10cm 6. Separation sheet and waterproofing sheet IBM-4.8:0.10cm 7. Existing slope formation cleaned and resurfaced: 6.00cm 8. Ceramic interlocking 25cm:25.00cm	1. Ceramic tiles 14x28cm: 2.00cm 2. 5 cm gravel layer with aggregate between 16 and 32 mm diameter: 5.00cm 3. 5 cm mortar layer reinforced with fiberglass mesh: 5.00cm 4. Geotextile anti-zonation separator filter: 0.10cm 5. 80mm extruded polystyrene insulation panel: 8.00cm 6. Geotextile anti-zonation separator filter: 0.10cm 7. Separation sheet and waterproofing sheet IBM-4.8:0.10cm 8. Existing slope formation cleaned and resurfaced: 6.00cm Ceramic interlocking 25cm:25.00cm

References

1. IEA (International Energy Agency) Global Status Report for Buildings and Construction: Towards a Zero-Emissions, Efficient and Resilient Buildings and Construction Sector; 2019.
2. Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis | Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis Available online: https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/ (accessed on 22 April 2023).
3. European Commission; European Parliament The European Green Deal. Eur. Comm. **2019**, doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004.
4. European Commission Renovation Wave Available online: https://ec.europa.eu/energy/topics/energy-efficiency/energy-efficient-buildings/renovation-wave_en (accessed on 22 April 2023).
5. IEA EBC IEA EBC ANNEX 57 Available online: http://www.annex57.org/ (accessed on 22 April 2023).

6. BOE Ley 7/2021 de Cambio Climático y Transición Energética; 2021.
7. Finansdepartementet Klimatdeklaration För Byggnader; 2020.
8. J. Quelle-Dreuning MPG-Grenswaarde Een Feit! (In Dutch)Duurz. Gebouw. Februari 2 (2017) 66–67.; 2017.
9. Euorpean Parliament Amendments 14/03/2023 for Energy Performance of Buildings Directive (Recast); 2023.
10. ISO ISO 14067:2013 Greenhouse Gases — Carbon Footprint of Products — Requirements and Guidelines for Quantification and Communication. Int. Organ. Stand. **2013**.
11. Kloepffer, W. Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment of Products (with Comments by Helias A. Udo de Haes, p. 95). In Proceedings of the International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment; 2008.
12. Valdivia S; Ugaya, C.; Sonnemann, G.; Hildenbrand, J.; (eds) Towards a Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment. Making Informed Choices on Products.; Paris, 2011; ISBN 978-92-807-3175-0.
13. Kohler, N.; Moffatt, S. Life-Cycle Analysis of the Built Environment. UNEP Ind. Environ. **2003**, 26, 17–19.
14. Soust-Verdaguer, B.; Bernardino Galeana, I.; Llatas, C.; Montes, M. V.; Hoxha, E.; Passer, A. How to Conduct Consistent Environmental, Economic, and Social Assessment during the Building Design Process. A BIM-Based Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment Method. J. Build. Eng. **2021**, 45, 103516, doi:10.1016/J.JOBE.2021.103516.
15. ISO 21931-1:2022 Sustainability in Building Construction -- Framework for Methods of Assessment of the Environmental, Economic and Social Performance of Construction Works -- Part 1: Buildings; 2022.
16. Obrecht, T.P.; Röck, M.; Hoxha, E.; Passer, A. BIM and LCA Integration: A Systematic Literature Review. Sustain. **2020**, 12, doi:10.3390/su12145534.
17. Soust-Verdaguer, B.; Llatas, C.; García-Martínez, A. Critical Review of BIM-Based LCA Method to Buildings. Energy Build. **2017**, 136, 110–120, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.12.009.
18. Llatas, C.; Soust-Verdaguer, B.; Passer, A. Implementing Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment during Design Stages in Building Information Modelling: From Systematic Literature Review to a Methodological Approach. Buiding Environ. **2020**, 182, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2020.107164.
19. Mora, T.D.; Bolzonello, E.; Cavalliere, C.; Peron, F. Key Parameters Featuring BIM-LCA Integration in Buildings: A Practical Review of the Current Trends. Sustain. **2020**, 12.
20. Santos, R.; Aguiar Costa, A.; Silvestre, J.D.; Pyl, L. Development of a BIM-Based Environmental and Economic Life Cycle Assessment Tool. J. Clean. Prod. **2020**, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121705.
21. Santos, R.; Costa, A.A.; Silvestre, J.D.; Vandenbergh, T.; Pyl, L. BIM-Based Life Cycle Assessment and Life Cycle Costing of an Office Building in Western Europe. Build. Environ. **2020**, 106568, doi:10.1016/J.BUILDENV.2019.106568.
22. Santos, R.; Costa, A.A.; Silvestre, J.D.; Pyl, L. Informetric Analysis and Review of Literature on the Role of BIM in Sustainable Construction. Autom. Constr. 2019.
23. IEA EBC IEA EBC ANNEX 72 Available online: http://www.iea-ebc.org/projects/ongoing-projects/ebc-annex-72/ (accessed on 22 April 2023).
24. Hollberg, A.; Genova, G.; Habert, G. Evaluation of BIM-Based LCA Results for Building Design. Autom. Constr. **2020**, 109, 102972, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2019.102972.
25. Vilches, A.; Garcia-Martinez, A.; Sanchez-Montañes, B. Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) of Building Refurbishment: A Literature Review. Energy Build. **2017**, 135, 286–301, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.11.042.
26. Mileto, C.; Vegas, F.; Llatas, C.; Soust-Verdaguer, B. A Sustainable Approach for the Refurbishment Process of Vernacular Heritage: The Sesga House Case Study (Valencia, Spain). Sustain. **2021**, 13, 1–18, doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/su13179800.
27. Dauletbek, A.; Zhou, P. BIM-Based LCA as a Comprehensive Method for the Refurbishment of Existing Dwellings Considering Environmental Compatibility, Energy Efficiency, and Profitability: A Case Study in China. J. Build. Eng.
28. Kim, K.P. BIM-Enabled Sustainable Housing Refurbishment—LCA Case Study. In Sustainable Construction Technologies: Life-Cycle Assessment; 2019.
29. Tushar, Q.; Zhang, G.; Bhuiyan, M.A.; Navaratnam, S.; Giustozzi, F.; Hou, L. Retrofit of Building Façade Using Precast Sandwich Panel: An Integrated Thermal and Environmental Assessment on BIM-Based LCA. Buildings.
30. KT Innovations; Autodesk Tally-Autodesk Available online: http://choosetally.com/ (accessed on 22 April 2023).

31. Soust-Verdaguer, B.; Gutiérrez Moreno, J.A.; Llatas, C. Utilization of an Automatic Tool for Building Material Selection by Integrating Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment in the Early Design Stages in BIM. Sustain. 15, 2274.
32. Figueiredo, K.; Pierott, R.; Hammad, A.W.A.; Haddad, A. Sustainable Material Choice for Construction Projects: A Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment Framework Based on BIM and Fuzzy-AHP. Build. Environ. **2021**, 196, 107805.
33. LLatas, C.; Soust-Verdaguer, B.; Hollberg, A.; Palumbo, E.; Quiñones, R. BIM-Based LCSA Application in the Early Design Stages Using IFC. Autom. Constr. **2022**, 138, 104259, doi:10.1016/J.AUTCON.2022.104259.
34. buildingSMART BuildingSMART Available online: https://www.buildingsmart.org/ (accessed on 22 April 2023).
35. Revit, A. Autodesk Revit. Architecture **2021**, 1, About Revit Architecture.
36. BIM Forum Level Of Development (LOD) Specification Part I & Commentary; 2020;
37. Ministerio para la Transición Ecológica y el Reto Demográfico Condiciones Técnicas De Los Procedimientos Para La Evaluación De La Eficiencia Energética, 2020.
38. CTE Spanish Building Technical Code. Real Decreto 314/2006 17 marzo 2006, BOE 74, 11816–11831.
39. Junta de Andalucía Agencia de Vivienda y Rehabilitación de Andalucía Available online: https://www.juntadeandalucia.es/avra/ (accessed on 22 April 2023).
40. EN 17412-1 Building Information Modelling - Level of Information Need - Part 1: Concepts and Principles.; 2021.
41. Andalusian Government BCCA. Base de Costes de La Construcción de Andalucía. Clasificación Sistemática de Precios Básicos, Auxiliares y Unitarios; 2017.
42. Soust-Verdaguer, B.; Potrč Obrecht, T.; Alaux, N.; Hoxha, E.; R M Saade, M.; Röck, M.; Garcia-Martinez, A.; Llatas, C.; Gómez de Cózar, J.; Passer, A. Using Systematic Building Decomposition for Implementing LCA: The Results of a Comparative Analysis as Part of IEA EBC Annex 72. J. Clean. Prod. **2023**, 284.
43. ecoinvent Ecoinvent Available online: https://www.ecoinvent.org/ (accessed on 22 April 2023).
44. Hollberg, A.; Lützkendorf, T.; Habert, G. Top-down or Bottom-up? – How Environmental Benchmarks Can Support the Design Process. Build. Environ. **2019**, 153, 148–157, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.02.026.
45. Michalak, J.; Czernik, S.; Marcinek, M.; Michalowski, B. Environmental Burdens of External Thermal Insulation Systems. Expanded Polystyrene vs. Mineral Wool: Case Study from Poland. Sustain. **2020**, 12, doi:10.3390/su12114532.
46. Füchsl, S.; Rheude, F.; Röder, H. Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) of Thermal Insulation Materials: A Critical Review. Clean. Mater. **2022**, 5, doi:10.1016/j.clema.2022.100119.
47. Tingle, D.D.; Hathway, A.; Davison, B. An Environmental Impact Comparison of External Wall Insulation Types. Build. Environ. **2015**, 85, 182–189, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2014.11.021.
48. Mertens, M.; Slaughter, R. R2pi Project Report; 2019.
49. Ren, J. Multi-Criteria Decision Making for the Prioritization of Energy Systems under Uncertainties after Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment. Sustain. Prod. Consum. **2018**, 16, 45–57, doi:10.1016/j.spc.2018.06.005.
50. Hossaini, N.; Reza, B.; Akhtar, S.; Sadiq, R.; Hewage, K. AHP Based Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment (LCSA) Framework: A Case Study of Six Storey Wood Frame and Concrete Frame Buildings in Vancouver. J. Environ. Plan. Manag. **2015**, 58, 1217–1241, doi:10.1080/09640568.2014.920704.