

Collaboration - New Media – Design An Integrated Environment for Supporting Collaboration in Building Design

Gianfranco Carrara, Antonio Fioravanti

Dept. Architettura e Urbanistica per l'Ingegneria
Sapienza University of Rome
Via Eudossiana, 18
I-00184 Rome
gianfranco.carrara@uniroma1.it
antonio.fioravanti@uniroma1.it

Abstract. Building is one of the most widespread human activities, as it involves a far greater number of people and professional profiles than all other industries and absorbs about half of world energy consumption. Its multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary nature makes the design-construction process, as well as the building product, increasingly complex. It is thus always more difficult, with usual design methods and efficiently to obtain correctly designed solutions and to favour creativity, while respecting assigned time schedules and budgets. These are very well known problems, on which abundant efforts and resources have been spent in pursuit of an efficient solution.

One generally agreed solution is efficient collaboration among the design actors, although all the forms and tools proposed hitherto do not allow all the difficulties embedded in the problem itself to be overcome. The great potentialities of the new media are considered to be crucial for the resolution of the previously mentioned problem, although, until now, this approach has raised new problems than it has solved the old ones.

To provide a more efficient collaboration among all the actors involved in the design process, this paper presents a model of the structure of the building design process based on the Collaborative Work Environment paradigm that allows us to define a system supporting integrated building design. Its philosophy is to follow through the actual design process in order to allow actors to behave as they are accustomed.

Its structure relies on the dialectics among distributed knowledge bases and a shared (and agreed) one, while the design solution workspace on its turn can be conceived so as subdivided into a private one, specific to any actor, and one shared among them. Human actors are supported by intelligent assistants. The system semantically translates the information exchanged (both formally and informally) among the actors, allows incoherent/favourable situations to be highlighted and managed in real time, and can facilitate the onset and dissemination of creative ideas.

System implementation has preliminarily been presented as a game, in order to avoid unnecessary complexity while retaining generality, so that can be used as an e-learning tool.

1 Present inadequacy of building design processes

In developed countries building construction and management involve a greater number of people and professional profiles than all other industries [CNR97]. In Europe the building sector (residential + commercial + business) wastes more than half of the total energy consumption [BB96, En06].

These two figures are already indicative of the economic importance of this sector above and beyond all technical and environmental implications that make this field so relevant in every social context.

In any case, at least in technologically developed countries, two aspects often emerge that point to the need for thorough-going improvement in the sector: on the one hand the ever-increasing complexity of the building process and its products, which makes it ever more difficult to manage; on the other hand, the inadequate quality of buildings produced through this kind of process, which fail to comply with the required performances and exceeded budget and timing constraints [CNR97].

Complexity in building process management has extensive repercussions in the form of large losses of economic resources and reduced building quality has a very adverse effect on energy consumption and on environmental quality.

Many of these faults are due to the inadequate quality of design, often the result of the inconsistency among the parts of the designed objects, of incoherencies among design specifications and of the incongruity between standards and design solution performances [Ca02].

Building design consists of a collective process directly made up by numerous professionals as well as, indirectly, non professionals (all called 'actors' herein [Wi97]), which is characterized by the co-presence of numerous disciplines, specialist skills, and processes. It is part of a broader process which leads to the construction, the refurbishing and ultimately the demolition of the building as a product. The actors have to interact in order to reciprocally integrate the parts of the design solution to which they all have contributed, although the cultural backgrounds of the numerous actors and their different scientific and disciplinary training related to the entities (objects, relationships and aspects) involved in the building process implies the so-called 'symmetry of ignorance', an often hard to overcome barrier that makes it extremely difficult for the actors to interact with and understand each other.

Moreover, the overall process is fragmented because of the different regulatory, environmental and cultural contexts and phases. These difficulties, generally all the greater, the more 'creative' the design, are often made worse by misunderstandings, lack of data, and the different aims pursued by the various actors.

One of the authors has been working for over 25 years on large building design projects as a professional involved in project top management throughout Europe. On the basis of this experience the authors are able to state that, due to building design process inadequacies, cost overshoots of up to even 100% often occur and it is not unusual, for the length of time required to complete and deliver the work, to exceed initial estimates by as much as 50%. This shows why in current professional practice the first solution is often given priority, as soon as it can be deemed barely acceptable. Any alternative hypotheses are neglected as they would involve longer times or greater design costs. Furthermore, an impoverishment is often observed in the final project quality with respect to the initial idea as a result of simplistic solutions adopted to overcome reciprocal misunderstandings concerning technical, constructive and engineering problems and/or opportunities.

All this makes it very difficult to produce a high quality, coherent and efficiently designed synthesis in terms of architectural form, construction technology, structures, technical installations, energy management, costs, sustainable building, etc. This problem elicits the pursuit of other forms of process which can enhance design efficiency, save time and help develop creative ideas.

As complexity is an inalienable component of the present building process and its multidisciplinary character, the quest has to be oriented towards forms of design process that can facilitate a fruitful interaction among actors, so as to overcome the previously mentioned limitations.

2 Design and collaboration

Many forms of interaction among actors in the design process have existed over time and also in the present, any of which has advantages and drawbacks linked to their peculiarities.

Sequential design is a poorer and simpler form of interaction, requiring the subdivision of the design process into stages sequentially linked one to the other. Information goes basically in just one direction and feedback possibilities are minimal. The following step begins when the previous one has been accomplished. It works only in well predefined, simple design frameworks, generally aimed at industrial production refinements. It is best suited to a fixed historical, social and technological context.

Cooperation is a higher level form of design process where all the actors aim at achieving a common goal, working in a non linear but predefined sequence, although generally exchanging little information along the process.

Concurrent design is a form of cooperation where the actors work in a highly structured framework, within neatly defined boundaries in well defined distributed tasks, sharing little information and knowledge within process streams that run parallel.

Collaboration is the highest form of interaction in design as it implies that actors can help each other to better understand how their work is going to match that of the others and to better perform their tasks. It requires that the actors involved in any stage of the process exchange information and knowledge, thus activating mutual understanding. Collaboration enables new design solutions to be found through the contribution of any actor suggesting solutions to problems; it helps allow different actors' solutions to converge into one overall design; it helps reciprocally modify any actor's solutions to better fit into the overall design; it helps discover reciprocal malfunctions among actors' solutions; it helps develop creativity through the interaction of different skills [Gr98, Kv00, JE98, Ko00] .

However collaboration is difficult to apply to complex design works and processes and difficulties increase over time due to delocalization of actors in time and place, different human languages and, most of all, 'symmetry of ignorance' whenever a sufficiently broad common knowledge is lacking.

Collaboration in design has always existed, in different ways and using different methods and techniques depending on time and the cultural environment. In our culture, until a few decades ago and often even now, collaboration has relied on the physical exchange of documents and discussions based on them.

Traditional methodologies and tools, based on meetings and direct interaction among actors, have shown their inefficiency in the present design process due to the previously mentioned factors. This leads to an increase in the number of meetings with a good number of professionals, due to the number of disciplines involved and their interrelationships.

The introduction of computing in building design has modified the way to convey information: drawings and documents are now transformed into digital data structures, implying the use of new tools for producing and exchanging them.

An efficient collaboration among the actors in the course of the design process consists in the capability of any actor to propose potential solutions to other actors, to make others understand them and together to modify solutions according the suggestions received.

In order to do this, some basic features are required:

- a correct, efficient, non ambiguous and secure communication and acquisition of information;
- the presence of as many specialists' knowledge as is required by the complexity of the designed product;
- the presence of a *common knowledge*, that has to be agreed by the interacting actors, so that they can fully and correctly interpret the meaning of the communication and understand it;
- the presence of *shareable knowledge*, i.e. the part of an actor's specialist knowledge

that s/he allows the other actors to share;

- a semantically and technically correct connection among the shared knowledge and the *specialist knowledge* owned by the actors.

All this shows that the *fundamental bases of collaboration rely on knowledge and on the way it is communicated among the actors*, independently of the means and tools adopted in the design process.

3 ICT, New Media and current research project limitations

To overcome the limitations of methods and tools traditionally used for building design, information and communication technologies and new media have been applied, transferring them from other fields where they first were developed, in a sequential form of interaction among actors.

At present, several software devices are available on the market, conceived in order to enhance domain-specific design capabilities and to resolve even very complex tasks within well defined disciplinary boundaries (such as in structural, energy, lighting, acoustics, HVAC design modelling and simulation etc., as well as in even highly sophisticated architectural representations). Although they can well work within the domain they have been built for, they actually do not help design to be collaborative, even make it more difficult as they increase the communication and understanding gap among the different specialist actors even when applied to the same objects the latter are working on.

The lack of mutual understanding is mainly due to the actors' use of a low level of semantics of ICT tools and to the synchronous methods they are forced to use to exchange information at a high level.

Difficulties involved in this task stem from the present lack of a general model able to represent the complexity of a building design project and from the inadequate formalization of information exchanged among the various actors.

As a matter of fact, the correct formalization of the information exchanged is still actually an open problem: currently, the excess of low level information exchanged, which is both the cause and the effect of the potential of the new ICT, implies the simplification ('semantic impoverishment') of the information exchanged, thus leading to incomprehension among the actors and to a step backwards as regards effective communication among them.

A correspondence exists between a design product/process model and the underlying ICT logical object. In this case the entities involved are generally represented by often dimensionless, symbolic graphic signs and jargon filled technical reports. No entity has any intrinsic meaning, but merely the one it has in the cultural, scientific and professional contexts it is situated in. Therefore, the only way to give it a meaning is by an accompanying informative-explicative attachment [CF04, DK04].

Each of the abovementioned entities corresponds to a specific logical concept, which itself contains very little - often non-existent - meaning, even though it may possess an excellent figurativeness.

It is thus an exclusive task of the actors to 'translate' meanings, perceive differences among different versions, carry out comparisons among different solutions, and point out conflicts and contradictions. All this hinders an easy and efficient collaboration among them.

So as to manage these problems side by side with conventional commercial CAAD systems [La00, LA01] such as typical graphics aided ones (AutoCAD, Microstation, etc.) and integrated or parametric ones (Architectural Desktop, Revit, AllPlan, Triforma, Project Bank.), alternative Knowledge Engineering based approaches have been proposed by several researchers [CK94, Ea99, EJC97, Pa96, Kal01].

A few academic studies on the subject have been carried out in recent decades to support collaboration throughout the building design process as limitations of current software and ICT tools were established. Different systems have been proposed for the representation of knowledge and the structure of the designed objects by means of Knowledge Bases, KB, [RG00, Kav01, Ea98, Tu97, RG00, CF02, RA04].

Although these systems refer to different models of the design process they are all similar in that they make use of a single Data Base or Knowledge Base. On account of the unique, pre-established cataloguing of the building, of its components and of the process, these models are patently unsuitable for architectural and building design, as this is actually characterized by a context-situated, multidisciplinary and not fully coherent process. These critical aspects of the design process are not accidental, sporadic or occasional but part and parcel of architectural design itself. So far, the complexity of the design project has not yet been simulated correctly as it has been reduced to a single actor or single KB (exhaustively defined in [Ea99, MBZ95, SS96, KLM97]), while the aspects regarding procedures, timing, decision-making hierarchies, intellectual property, incoherence, etc. have not yet been taken into sufficient consideration.

A few research teams at the international level are attempting to bypass these limitations, albeit with different objectives and following different methods. Unlike the usual paradigm of ‘semantic impoverishment’, they rely on the paradigm of the ‘semantic richness’ of the information exchanged by all the actors. This leads to a formalization that, in order to be exhaustive, is so huge as to be practically unmanageable, and that takes into consideration the model of a unique all-comprehensive process/ product knowledge base, inclusive of all the aspects, characteristics, attributes, and behaviours of all the entities (the ‘semantemes’) it is made of. The criticism made is that the corresponding logical concept is therefore plethoric and at the same time fragile for such a difficult task. However far-sighted and exhaustive one is, gaps emerge during the design work, making it necessary to redefine the initial logical concept, or to conceive logical concepts that need to be enriched with new semantemes during the design work.

Concepts and their structure can be modelled in *Knowledge Bases*, KB, where they are represented by ‘*information technology agents*’, from now on ‘*agents*’. In the case of distributed KBs and Data Bases, DBs, serious problems of synchronization, communication and consistency are likely, as all the semantemes in all the KBs and DBs would have to be replicated. Or, even worse, enriching logical objects at will with a multi-model representation - i.e. one that is specific to each logical object according to any actor [RG96] - would lead to a Babel of different models with huge problems of logical coherence.

All that has been said above shows that a correct and efficient collaboration is increasingly necessary to more effectively develop the actual design process and products, that currently available methods and tools are not adequate to the task, even when provided by extremely sophisticated communication technologies generally conceived for sequential processes. It is therefore highly appropriate to research into new tools for supporting collaborative design.

4 An environment to support collaboration

Collaborative building design can be defined as a process characterized by a high degree of interdisciplinary, delocalization of activities, subdivision of activities, timely use of information and correct use of the more advanced methods and technologies [Bj99, Bj92, CFN04, CF02, CK94].

To develop new tools for correctly and efficiently supporting collaboration, it is necessary to rethink what collaboration in building design requires and on how it can be activated in the whole process. This leads to the quest for a model of building design process and product that simulates how actors actually work and how they can efficiently collaborate.

In the following pages the philosophy and structure of *an overall model of building design collaborative process* will be illustrated, which has been drawn from the attentive consideration of the complex, interdisciplinary best design practice of excellent professionals, who not only exchange data and prescriptions but, above all, concepts, intentions and goals. The model considers the actual design process as a (not always) logical iterative standardized sequence in which a number of actors are present and interact on the same project.

Such a model allows a system to be defined, or rather *an environment supporting an interleaved building design*, able to solve the above mentioned problems, namely, to improve actual design in quality and timing.

Design activity can be defined as ‘the skill to choose among hypotheses’. Therefore, to improve it, we need on the one hand to have *new methods and technologies that can help the choice*, i.e. checking, verification and modelling; and on the other hand, *an easy way to share new hypotheses*. In this way, phase by phase, each actor can get to better know his own design aims and may propose new design solutions that the other actors agree with more fully [RG96, CFN04]. The actors involved can therefore better understand each other, correctly communicate and exchange information among themselves, detect contradictions in the proposed solutions and validate the result of the process. This *philosophy* helps actors to enhance their own knowledge, leads to a greater awareness of design choices, increases the exploration and control of design solutions in terms of creativity as well as of quality and quantity, improves project and product and reduces time and/or costs, as well as increasing process efficiency, thus setting up a ‘virtuous circle’ among the various ‘actors’ in the project.

Such a model:

- takes into consideration all the aspects of the *knowledge common* to the various actors involved in the collaborative design process, as well as all the features of the *specialist knowledge* of any actor;
- allows any actor to develop his *own (partial) design solution* of the design project by means of his specialist knowledge and to translate it into the common knowledge;
- allows any actor to merge his own (partial) design solution with the other actors’ ones, in order to generate the *whole design solution*;
- allows any actor *to* (basically) *understand any solution proposed by other actors* as a part of the whole design solution, since it is translated into a common knowledge being, therefore, understandable by all the actors involved in the design phase;
- singles out the *contradictions inside the whole design solution* at any time along the course of its development.

In synthesis, such a model is aimed at improving collaboration among all the actors involved in a design process. It allows them to interact much more effectively than in the usual direct way that may make them not to understand each other. As a matter of fact the model allows the actors to interact through the *overall design solution*, that can be understood by everyone by means of the *common knowledge*. Any actor can be aware of side effects of his/her specialist actions by means of *other actors' considerations* on these effects, since they are translated into the common knowledge (fig. 1).

The design process is viewed in the model as an evolution of a design solution over time: the number and qualifications of the actors involved in the process that will lead to the ultimate design of the building, may vary during the design process, as well as the procedural rules that consist of the specifications for the various phases of the process. The model is designed to enhance the efficiency of the design process by allowing any actors to mutually share part of the other actors' knowledge and to better communicate formalized as well as non-formalized information.

This is made possible by means of an effective and innovative representation of the building entities (building components, rules, relationships, requirements, methods, processes, etc.), by providing immediate explanations of constraints and meanings, by allowing dynamic annotations between the representation used by each actor in his own specialist field and the shared one. By taking into account the different points of view of any actors, the model allows a holistic approach to the problems/opportunities. It is also flexible enough to allow new actors, new characteristics/constraints of building components and of the design process by means of ICT technologies to be taken into account [Ch03; RA04].

Together with the definition of the model, suitable methods, technologies and tools have been investigated in order to support the collaborative design paradigm using the timing and hierarchy deemed most suitable for the group of participating actors.

The above-mentioned model representation is conceptually based on a *highly structured representation of the knowledge* used along the design process and the investigation of the way it is exchanged among the actors.

The building, as a final product, is made up of a set of entities linked by a complex set of relationships. Its representation in the past has been made through analogical data structures, such as drawings and documents, made intelligible to others through technical education and experience. In the present computational environment digital data structures by themselves are neither intelligible nor operable in design and construction. To make them such (i.e. to build and modify them along the design process and to make use of them in the construction) they must be linked to the knowledge (formalized or not, human or not) used to generate them.

5 The structure of the design process/product model

An attentive examination of the actual design process shows that the knowledge for developing the project is owned by the actors; moreover the latter have in common a more restricted domain of their knowledge that they have agreed upon and that allows them to interact and to understand each other.

The first feature of the model is therefore based on the *formal representation of the knowledge used along the whole design process* achieved by means of Knowledge Bases, KBs.

This term is used here to indicate, on the one hand, the structure of all the features considered (meanings, geometry, attributes and relationships) and, on the other hand, all the formal (generally mathematical) models that allow their behaviour to be simulated and/verified. A KB is thus considered herein in a broader sense than the one generally used in current literature and referred to previously.

The knowledge necessary to carry out a full design project is made up of as many sets of Specialist Knowledge Bases, SpKBs, as there are specialist actors and one Common (and agreed) Knowledge Base, CKB, that allows all the actors to basically understand each other and communicate.

A Specialist Knowledge Base is thus a model of the knowledge of an object (in the broad sense) in a specific disciplinary domain, including semantics, properties (attributes) and relationships, plus a specific model of behaviour.

The spread of information and knowledge among the actors by means of several shareable SpKBs allows the actors involved, as in the actual design process, to propose a collection of specific and partial design solutions. The overall solution, the result of the interleaving of the various private solutions, is made possible by means of the CKB that the solutions have been ‘translated’ into through a simplification process, and made intelligible to all actors.

This means that any design solution worked out by any actor is made of building entities and relationships that are owned by the same actor who built it; whereas the design solution as a whole, at any time, is defined by the interleaving (which is however not necessarily consistent till the end of the process) of all the design solutions worked out by the different actors and translated by the CKB.

This feature of the model is crucial as far as supporting collaboration is concerned: the CKB, including all and only the knowledge agreed by all the involved actors, actually assumes the role that is generally lacking in the present complexity of the design process, allowing the actors to interact and basically understand each other, directly *on the design solution itself*, which can be viewed and managed in the same way as they customarily do in their usual representation.

To allow this kind of interaction, the model makes the dissemination and centralization of the KBs correspond to a similar articulation of the design work space the actors are accustomed to working in. Therefore *the Design Workspace the solution is developed in may be subdivided into as many Private Design Workspaces, PDWs as there are specialist actors involved, and a Shared Design Workspace, SDW.*

Any actor can then, in the course of the process, create or modify his own design solution of the project in his own PDW, making use of his specific SpKB, his customary tools and the CKB. His design solution is just a part of the overall design solution, made up of agent instance representations and relationships among them. Along the design process he can then himself verify the internal coherence of his private solution in relation to his SpKB, and, when it is deemed to be the most satisfactory, *translate* it into the CKB. He can thus check the consistency of his own design solution against those of the other actors and, when deemed satisfactory, *publish* it in the SDW in order to make it visible to all actors.

The published design solution is simply one version of the evolving design; therefore it does not need to be totally coherent. The model thus allows a design solution to be incoherent at any stage, but at the very end of the process when the final solution is considered as accepted by all the actors. The design solutions displayed in the SDW can therefore be inconsistent both internally and among themselves.

The fundamental problems underlying the model involve:

- the *representation* of the building entities and relationships, the validity of which must be guaranteed in the SDW as well as in any actor's PDW;
- the need of simple *agents* (both logical and ICT) for easy management, but at the same time possibly enhanced with new characteristics at will, inside the SpKBs of the specialists;
- the *translatability* and *interpretability* of the agents in the actors' various semantic universes;
- the *modification* and *integration* of the agents according to the choices made by any actor for his own representation;
- the *verification* of local and overall performances;
- the *identification* of conflicts and their resolution.

In any design solution some of the objects should have the possibility of being managed by more than one actor and related to each other by different kinds of relationships owned by different actors, any of whom can hierarchically add/modify attributes, values or relationships. In this case the same agent instance should have more than one instance and any instance should be owned by one actor. The object-instance thus defined is called '*valency*'. This term is borrowed from chemistry and physics to indicate a different electromagnetic state of the same atom in a different context; in this case it is used to indicate a different 'situation' of the same agent when considered by another actor.

To avoid contradictions, in the SDW all the valencies of the same object-instance are related to each other and their inconsistencies are automatically pointed out, until the actors accept to converge on a single, more consistent design solution; a design solution thus generally includes agent instances whose valencies are included in other views. As any valency is owned by a different actor, they can modify agent prototypes by adding new ones, changing attributes or relationships.

At any time the design solution as a whole is made up of the interleaving, in the SDW of all the partial solutions made by any actor in his own PDW.

The relationships among the different design solutions are established by means of those among the corresponding valencies. In order to maintain the computational structure, any modifications of agent prototypes and agent instances and their relationships, according the actor's SpKB, must be done in his own PDW, in order to be 'viewed' first by himself, then, if satisfactory, the resulting view has to be shown (published) within the SDW, in order to be 'viewed' by all the other actors.

According to the model, Collaborative Design may thus be considered as the process of modifying the design solutions and goals of any actors, pursuing their harmonization until a more satisfactory and consistent shared interleaving one has been reached.

The model allows a dual articulation of the 'views' of any object:

- a first one, within any PDW, which makes it possible for any actor to see his own design solution, conceived and represented as a specialist solution in his own SpKB;
- a second one, that allows any actor to see his own solution within the SDW of the whole design solution interleaved by means of a (syntactic and semantic) translation into the CKB.

In this way, the model makes available the strictly necessary information and knowledge among the actors, the other specialists' knowledge, which is not strictly necessary for the other actors, remaining confidential. Moreover, as well as avoiding the ineffective simulation of the centralized building model, it also makes it possible to safeguard non-secondary design aspects such as privacy, intellectual property, the history of project versions, ease of using one's own customary tools.

As previously shown, a crucial role is played in the model by the *Knowledge Bases*. Indeed, if there were no Knowledge Bases or other semantically significant instruments, we would have to cope with comparatively difficult exchanges of data, with problems of communications protocols, with comparatively anguished attempts at highlighting the difference among the projects carried on by the various actors. In this case no ICT assistance would be available and each actor would have to directly cope with the different design situations in order to detect any differences and/or design contradictions. In order to bring about a decisive improvement in the design process, the model must evidently have several Knowledge Bases (with relative Inference Engines, etc.).

The communication among the different SpKB occurs through the central CKB by means of the 'translation' into a simplified, shared form of representation. A second crucial role is thus played by the '*filters*', through which any solution developed by any specialist actor by means of a SpKB in the corresponding PDW is 'translated' into the SDW where the CKB elaborates the shared model of the overall design solution.

To allow any actor to be free to choose the tools he considers most appropriate in his professional field each filter will consist of an interface interacting with the Common Knowledge Base. In the meantime the interface will also allow interaction with its own Knowledge Base, as well as its own Relation Structures, Data Base, customary applications software, graphics primitives, inference engines (if present) and so on.

In the whole operation the actors are helped by Intelligent Assistants, IA, which are capable of providing support in relatively complex tasks. At one limit we could have an IA that completely replaces an actor, on the other a simple interface that allows an actor to interact with the SDW and, through this, with the other actors.

Essentially, the model has a distributed structure that can simulate numerous independent actors, but at the same time it is centralized in order to check the consistency of the design data.

This is made possible by the following characteristics:

- the previously illustrated choice of subdividing the Design Workspace into a 'Private' and a 'Shared' one;
- the definition of IAs that translate logical objects from any SpKBs into the CKB corresponding ones and vice versa.

This kind of IA will behave differently in the two directions: when the logical object is translated into the Common KB, it will be *simplified* in order to be published in the SDW; conversely, when it is 'privatized' in the PDW it will be *enriched* with all the semantemes specific to the actor involved (fig. 1).




Figure 1. The actor relates his own private design solution with the other actor's ones through the Common Knowledge Base.

One basic property of the model is that each actor can work with his customary methods, algorithms, programs, tools. Moreover, he has his own specific means for representing the complexity of his solution of the design problem and for resolving possible design contradictions in his own PDW, the merits of which others cannot go into.

The model does not obstruct his way of constructing his 'private' solutions: it is intended furthermore to offer the possibility of real time verification of any contradictions to which his design solution would lead vis-à-vis the constraints/opportunities defined by the other actors via the various IAs.

The model develops a two-fold field: on the one hand, the integration, dissemination and coordination of the knowledge into the design process; on the other hand, the representation and subsequent formalization of the knowledge of building features and technologies.

The former can accommodate the knowledge stemming from other scientific disciplines involved; the latter is aimed at defining a software system capable of managing it in a collaborative way.

The model is structured so as to integrate the design process and high-technological industrial construction methods in an ICT-Collaborative system.

Its implementation in a software system is under development along the following main R&D paths:

- representing the information of the *Semantic Layers* implicit in the various documents, drawings, blueprints etc. produced during the design process: the semantic layers can be defined along a three-tier schema: logical objects (concepts), ICT objects (codes) and physical objects (infrastructure);
- framing *logical objects* into: *building entities* (e.g., components, with their geometry, dimension, hierarchy, etc.) that are product-oriented ones; *actors* (e.g. subjects and the paths of their invention) that are performance-oriented ones; and the *context* (locality, culture, regulations, etc.) that is process-oriented one;
- defining an *XML-based protocol*, integrated with *ontologies and IFC*, to implement the Semantic Layers: the protocol is the communication layer of the IAs, supporting individual actors' knowledge communication, translation and sharing;
- defining a “*game*” to study in a more restricted, although meaningful, field the problems explained beforehand: a simplified system of design process in an architectural design course will be a powerful e-learning tool.

The game is conceived of as an e-learning tool that can assist university students; it will act as an assistant in order to explore design solutions, acquire knowledge and become aware of design constraints in such a complex field as an architectural and building design process.

6 Conclusions

For many years the authors have studied design paradigms in the field of architecture. They are mainly interested in the early phases of the project when, within a short space of time, actors have to choose among different options that will have a very great impact on the outcome. Indeed, although the largest part of the overall building cost is situated in the construction phase, its definition is practically made in the very beginning of the process, along the with preliminary design choices.

The authors have observed that many of the faults that can nowadays be found in building production (cost and time overshoots, performance inconsistencies and so forth) are due to design insufficiencies, often related to building process complexity and to its fragmentariness. Excessive specialization of the actors involved in the design process makes them often unable to productively interact so as to converge on a satisfactory solution.

The authors believe that continuous close collaboration among the actors throughout all the design process is a solution to this problem. In such a collaborative process actors have tasks that overlap each other (and for which they are often jointly responsible), so that they have a mutual interest in a successful outcome of their work. Collaboration is therefore an environment in which actors share others' problems, work at their best, while being helped to avoid mistakes; it can also help spread creativity in the process and generate innovations.

The currently available ICT tools and new media do not provide adequate support for collaboration, and often just create new gaps in actors' interaction.

To overcome technical and conceptual difficulties inherent in collaboration, the authors have set up a general building process/product model as a basis for developing an environment for supporting collaboration in architectural and building design.

The model, based on formalized knowledge, mimics what happens in the best design firms, implements IA agents, boosts the exchange of ideas, allows formal and non-formal representations, shows up conflicts, manages incoherence problems, integrates the whole process by means of ICT instruments.

It is applicable to the full design/product process for producing new 'smart items', from a spoon to a skyscraper. This new environment is intended to allow a 'quality-based work world', on the one hand, avoiding common mistakes, checking consistency, coherence and requirement fulfilling and managing the complexity of the process, and on the other hand, improving process/product quality, spreading innovations and enhancing creativity.

Acknowledgements

The research was partially funded by MiUR (Ministry of the University and Research), Research Project of National Interest 2005: "A Model of cross-cultural collaboration for integrated design in architecture".

References

- [BB96] Behling S and Behling S: 1996, *Sol Power- The Evolution of Solar Architecture*, Publication of READ (Renowable Energies in Architecture and Design) Group, Prestel, Munich.
- [Bj99] Björk, B.C.: 1999, Information Technology in construction: domain definition and research issues, *Computer Integrated Design and Construction*, **1**(1), pp 3-16.
- [Bj92] Björk, B.C.: 1992, A unified approach for modelling construction information, *Building and Environments*, **27**(), 173-194.
- [Ca02] Carrara G.: 2002, *Il processo edilizio e il processo di progettazione* (Lecture notes on Architectural Engineering course), Dept. Architettura e Urbanistica per l'Ingegneria, Sapienza - University of Rome, Rome.

- [CF04] Carrara, G, Fioravanti A: 2004, How to construct an *audience* in Collaborative Design - The Relationship among which Actors in the Design Process, in B Rudiger, B Tournay and H Orbaek, (eds), *Architecture in the Network Society*, 22nd eCAADe Congress, 15 - 18 September 2004, pp. 426-434.
- [CF02] Carrara G. and Fioravanti A.: 2002, 'Private Space' and 'Shared Space' Dialectics in Collaborative Architectural Design, *Collaborative Decision-Support Systems*, Focus Symposium and InterSymp-2002 Conference Proceedings, Baden-Baden, pp. 27-44.
- [CFN04] Carrara G., Fioravanti A., Nanni U.: 2004, Knowledge Sharing, not MetaKnowledge. How to join a collaborative design Process and safely share one's knowledge, *Intelligent Software System for the New Infostructure*, Focus Symposium and InterSymp-2004 Conference Proceedings, Baden-Baden, pp. 105-118.
- [Ch03] Cheng, N.-Y.: 2003, Approaches to design collaboration research, *Automation in Construction*, **12**(6), 715-724.
- [CK94] Carrara, G. and Kalay, Y.E.; 1994, Past, present, future: process and Knowledge in Architectural Design, in G Carrara and YE Kalay (eds.), *Knowledge-Based Computer-Aided Architectural Design*, Elsevier Science Publishers B.V., Amsterdam, pp. v-vii, 147-201, and 389-396.
- [CNR97] CNR (Italian National Research Council), *PFEdilizia – Rapporto finale 1997* (Final Report of Building Sector Researches), Franco Angeli Ed.
- [DK04] Drakos, N. and Knox, R.E.: You need More Than E-Mail to Share TacitKnowledge, <http://www4.gartner.com/DisplayDocument?id=450075>.
- [Ea99] Eastman, C.M.: 1999, *BUILDING PRODUCT MODELS: Computer Environments Supporting Design and Construction*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- [Ea98] Eastman, C.M., guest editor: 1998, SPECIAL ISSUE: TEAMCAD Workshop, *Automation in Construction*, **7**(6).
- [EJC97] Eastman C.M., Jeng, T.S., and Chowdbury, R.: 1997, Integration of Design Application with Building Models, in R. Junge (ed.), *CAAD Futures 1997*, pp. 45-59.
- [En06] ENEA, (public Italian National Body for Alternative Energy), *Energia e Ambiente 2006* (Environment and Energy 2006 – annual report), ENEA, Rome.
- [Gr98] Gross, M.D., Yi-Luen Do, E., McCall, R., Citrin, W.V., Hamill, P., Warmack, A., Kuczun, K.S.:1998, Collaboration and coordination in architectural design: approaches to computer mediated team work, *Automation in Construction*, **7**(6), 465-473.
- [JE98] Jeng, T.-S., Eastman, C.M.: 1998, A database architecture for design collaboration, *Automation in Construction*, **7**(6), 475-483.
- [Kal01] Kalay, Y.E.: 2001, Enhancing multi-disciplinary collaboration through semantically rich representation, Porter, W.L. and Goldschmidt, G. (guest eds.), Special Issue: Design Representation, *Automation in Construction*, **10**(6), 741-755.
- [Kav01] Kavakli, M. 2001, NoDes: kNOwledge-based modeling for detailed DESign process - from analysis to implementation, *Automation in Construction*, **10**(4), 399-416.
- [KLM97] Kim, I., Liebich, T. and Maver, T.: 1997, Managing design data in an integrated CAAD environment: a product model approach, *Automation in Construction*, **7**(1), 35-53.
- [Ko00] Kolarevic, B., Schmitt, G., Hirschberg, U., Kurmann, D., Johnson, B.: 2000, An experiment in design collaboration, *Automation in Construction*, **9**(1), 73-81.
- [Kv00] Kvan T.: 2000, Collaborative design: what is it?, Martens, B. (guest ed.), Special Issue eCAADe '97, *Automation in Construction*, **9**(4), 409-415.
- [La01] Laiserin, J.: 2001, AEC Collaboration, *CADence*, **16**(6), 10-17.
- [La00] Laiserin, J.: 2000, Collaborative AEC Design, *CADence*, **15**(11), 10-17.
- [MBZ95] Maher, M.L., Balachandran, B. M., and Zhang Dong, M.: 1995, *Case-Based Reasoning in Design*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc., NJ, USA.

- [Pa96] Papamichael K., La Porta, J., Chauvet, H., Collins, D., Trzcinski, T., Thorpe, J. and Selkowitz, S. (1996). The Building Design Advisor, *Design Computation: Collaboration, Reasoning, Pedagogy*, Proceedings of ACADIA '96 Conference, Tucson, Arizona, pp. 85-97.
- [RA04] Ren, Z. and Anumba, C.J.: 2004, Multi-agent systems in construction - state of the art and prospects, *Automation in Construction*, **13**(3), 421-434.
- [RG00] Reffat, R. M. and Gero, J. S.: 2000, Computational situated learning in design, in J. S. Gero (ed.), *Artificial Intelligence in Design '00*, Proceedings of AID'00 Conference, Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 589-610.
- [RG96] Rosenman, M A., and Gero, J S.: 1996, Modelling multiple views of design objects in a collaborative CAD environment, Gero, J.S., (guest ed.), Special Issue: Artificial Intelligence in Computer-Aided Design, *Computer Aided Design*, **28**(3), 193-205.
- [SS96] Schmidt R.F and M. Schmidt (eds.): (1996, *Computer Aided Concurrent Integral Design*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg.
- [Tu97] Turner, J.A.: 1997, Some Thoughts on the Existence of a Generic Building Object, in R. Junge (ed.), *CAAD Futures 1997*, pp. 533-552.
- [Wi97] Wix, J. (1997). ISO 10303 Part 106, *BCCM (Building Construction Core Model) /T200* draft.