



Framework For Integrating Digital Twin Technology In The Real Estate Industry

Vivek Krishan, Kathiravan Udayakumar, Arunkumar Gunasekaran, Shivanand Koppalkar, Yogesh Gupte^b, Prachi Kadam^b

^aDoctarate of Business Administration, Golden Gate University, California, ^bProfessor of Practice, Golden Gate University, California,

Abstract

The majority of commercial real estate (CRE) Digital Twin (DT) pilots do not progress to production. The core obstacle is not technology, it is the persistent fragmentation of lifecycle data across BIM platforms, building automation systems, IoT networks, and enterprise software. Systems that were never designed to share information cannot simply be integrated by building another platform atop them. This paper introduces CREST, the Commercial Real Estate Smart Twin framework; a seven-tier implementation pathway that links strategic business intent to measurable operational outcomes across the CRE lifecycle. The seven tiers are: Strategic Canvas, Value Streams, Adoption Model, Reference Architecture, Deployment Playbook, Maturity Model, and ROI & Benefits Matrix. CREST draws on foundational DT literature, industrial reference architectures from the Industry IoT Consortium, and learnings from 80+ engagements within global CRE organizations. The framework directly confronts four challenges that repeatedly kill CRE twin programmes: fragmented data across lifecycle stages, reactive maintenance cultures, mounting ESG/CSRD reporting obligations, and post-pandemic space utilization volatility. For each, CREST embeds minimum data requirements, governance protocols, and integration patterns into its deployment playbook and reference architecture. Case evidence shows a 20% drop in delayed projects and a 30% gain in Net Promoter Score, alongside documented reductions in operating cost. CREST's contribution is deliberately practitioner-facing: a repeatable integration blueprint that reduces delivery risk at both building and portfolio scale.

Keywords: Digital Twin (DT), Commercial Real Estate (CRE), Building Information Management (BIM), Internet of Things, Facility Management, Maturity Model, CREST framework, Environmental Social and Governance (ESG) Reporting, Sustainability Reporting

PACS: 0000, 1111

2000 MSC: 0000, 1111

1. Introduction

1.1. Why Commercial Real Estate (CRE) Needs Digital Twins Now

Legacy Building Information Management (BIM) and facility management stacks built for a simpler world cannot solve the four structural pressures at portfolio scale.

The first is shifts in tenant expectations. This, though, means that, in the future, occupants want something like app-like responsiveness for comfort, access, and service, not sluggish manual tasks routed through email and spreadsheets.

Second, regulatory and ESG pressure is mounting. In the EU, auditable and traceable sustainability data is required under the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD). A number of portfolios have yet to uniformly produce this data across their buildings [1].

Third, hybrid work has left space demand unpredictable. Annual occupancy surveys are too sluggish for real-time decisions to be made on restacking or lease renewal. Fourth, there is increased competitive separation. Strong owners and operators in digital operations are ahead on reliability, service quality and cost efficiency. But those without are losing ground.

Digital Twin technology may all be marketed as the answer to each of these pressures. However, here's the grim fact: the vast majority of CRE twin initiatives stall after achieving high-impact pilot results. Lifecycle information gets fragmented in silos, BIM on one side, building systems to the other, enterprise platforms to the third, limiting interoperability, trust and scalable value realization[2],[3].

1.2. What a Digital Twin Actually Is

The meaning of "a digital twin" originates from Michael Grieves and colleagues, whose concept, that evolved from aerospace practice, of a functioning digital replica of an operational system that can actually run. The field has grown rapidly. Today's twins are the cyber-physical version of the devices, supported through IoT sensors, cloud infrastructure and AI. This market is expected to become USD 149.81 billion in 2030, at 47.9% CAGR [4],[5].

For CRE, a Digital Twin is not just an upscale BIM model. It is a connected, continuously updated, digital representation of a physical asset, in constant flow, that is used to support operational decisions through monitoring, analytics and simulation[4],[6]. Practitioners will need to understand three critical points:

1. BIM generates a static record of design intent and handover documentation. It's maintained at the project milestones, if it's updated at all.
2. Computer Aided Facility Management (CAFM) / Integrated Workplace Management System (IWMS) platforms are in charge of operational workflows and work order systems. They are, by their nature, reactive and transactional.
3. A Digital Twin goes further. It keeps persistent, bidirectional synchronization between the physical building and digital side by side for near real-time visibility, predictive capabilities, and closed-loop operational control over time underpinned by data quality and integration[2], [7].

Any CRE twin must be able to integrate disparate devices, data models and platforms in ways that keep things running safely for governance, security and interoperability. This is structurally challenging to achieve at portfolio scale for dozens, or even hundreds of buildings without a clear implementation framework[8], [9], [10].

1.3. The Building Lifecycle: Where Data Lives (and Dies)

Commercial buildings run for 30–60 years. The most commonly used framework for monitoring building environmental performance from cradle to grave is EN 15978 and ISO 14040 [11],[12]. EN 15978 specifies this through four Lifecycle Assessment (LCA) phases namely Goal and Scope Definition, Life Cycle Inventory (LCI) analysis, Life Cycle Impact Assessment (LCIA), and

Interpretation performed across defined life cycle stages from material production to end-of-life. At this base are the three mutually reinforcing frameworks, Life Cycle Costing [13], life cycle information management [14] and Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment (LCSA) which combines environmental, economic, and social aspects.

The practical issue is that each stage in the life cycle is controlled by unique systems and those systems don't communicate with each other, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: EN 15978 Lifecycle Stages: Data Ecosystems and CREST Intervention Points

Lifecycle Stage(EN 15978)	Key Activities	Standards	Typical Data Systems	Where Data Dies / CREST Intervention
A1–A3: Product Stage	Material sourcing, supplier selection, embodied carbon calculation	EN 15978, ISO 14040 (LCI, LCIA)	Supplier database s, EPDs, embodied carbon calculators	Embodied carbon data buried in supplier specs; CREST enforces minimum material data contracts at design stage
A4–A5: Construction Stage	BIM coordination, site logistics, waste management, progress tracking	EN15978, ISO 14040, ISO 19650 (LCI, LCIA)	BIM (Revit, ArchiCAD), project management (Procore, Primavera), waste logs	Design decisions lost at handover to operations; CREST mandates as-verified operational dataset at A5→B1 transition
B1–B7: UseStage (Operations)	HVAC optimization, predictive maintenance, energy audits, ESG/CSRD reporting, space utilisation	EN 15978, ISO 14040, EU CSRD, GRESB (LCI, LCIA, LCC, LCSA)	CAFM/IWMS, IoT sensors, BMS, energy dashboards, ERP, tenant apps	Fragmentation prevents predictive maintenance, ESG compliance, and space optimization; CREST Reference Architecture and Deployment Playbook address this directly
C1–C4: End-of-Life	Deconstruction planning, waste processing, material recovery, recycling	EN15978, ISO 14040, EU Circular Economy Action Plan (LCI, LCIA, LCC)	Waste management systems, material passports, demolition audits	Material composition unavailable for recovery planning; outside primary CREST scope (noted for future research)

Buildings consume 30% of global energy and produce 26% of global energy-related emissions (IEA). The operational phase (B1–B7) accounts for 60–80% of total life cycle cost and environmental impact. But that is precisely where data quality is most dire: fragmented across legacy CAFM platforms, IoT sensors with poor metadata, manual utility logs, and compliance

spreadsheets [11],[12]. This fragmentation makes LCA assessment unreliable, LCC analysis inadequate, and LCSA reporting inconsistent. A Digital Twin will solve this by preserving one continuously updated model that continues the tracking of materials and decisions over various phases of the lifecycle. It serves us with the necessary data to assist in LCI compilation, CSRD compliance, and design-to-operations continuity [7], [6], [3].

1.4. Problem Statement, Scope, and Contribution

Four barriers to implementation continuously prevent CRE Digital Twin programmes from progressing beyond an initial phase of piloting.

Fragmented data ecosystems- BIM, CAFM/IWMS, IoT, and ERP systems hardly ever have a shared asset identity or semantic layer. Each lifecycle handoff pushes the teams to rebuild “truth” from the ground up. Large construction projects report roughly 80% cost overruns related to information disconnection, while construction teams spend around 35% of their work hours, which is close to 14.1 hours a week, on non-productive activities, including data searches and redoing work [15], [16].

Reactive maintenance paradigms- Most CRE facilities management still operate on break-fix and scheduled-interval models. Transition to predictive maintenance requires linked sensor data, governed asset registers, and integrated maintenance history, three elements rarely existing in tandem [17], [7].

Complexity of ESG/CSRD reporting- Sustainability reporting is migrating to auditable disclosure with third-party verification [1], [18]. Without a data lineage that links the full building lifecycle, LCI/LCIA analysis lacks consistency by asset and time [11][12].

Space utilization inefficiencies- Hybrid work has made utilization highly volatile. Static occupancy surveys taken once or twice per year are unable to support real-time decisions about restacking, consolidation, or lease renewal. It leads to chronic underutilization and peak-day capacity failures [19].

Research Scope- We propose CREST in this paper focusing on EN 15978 Modules A1 through B7, pre-construction through operations and maintenance. The end-of-life phases (C1–C4) are beyond the scope of this primary implementation. CREST pulls guidance from Digital Twin Consortium (2023), Industrial Internet Consortium reference architectures [10], the Gemini Principles [20], ISO 19650 information management standards [14], and delivery learnings from over 80 engagements within a global CRE consulting organization (2022–2025). These were predominantly commercial office assets, which can be extended to retail, industrial, and mixed-use properties.

Contribution- CREST covers seven levels:

- Strategic Canvas, aligning DT initiatives with enterprise real estate objectives;
- Value Streams, mapping seven lifecycle benefit domains from capital deployment through ESG reporting;
- Adoption Model, a six-stage maturity progression: Initiate, Standardize, Integrate, Automate, Scale, Innovate;

- Reference Architecture, vendor-neutral, layered technical architecture specifying BIM-IoT-cloud-AI interoperability patterns;
- Deployment Playbook, operationalization reality capture, data on boarding, model versioning, integration, and security protocols;
- Maturity Model, tracking organizational and technical capability evolution from Digital Model through Cognitive Twin; • ROI & Benefits Matrix, quantifying financial, operational, sustainability, and experience outcomes across value streams.

2. Digital Twin Maturity Progression

The shift from static building documentation to dynamic, data-driven asset management is real. But the field is plagued by definitional confusion. Vendors, consultants, and even academic researchers routinely label things “Digital Twin” that are really just BIM viewers, IoT dashboards, or CAFM platforms with a 3D skin on top.

This section sets out a clear ontology, defines the four-stage maturity progression that underpins CREST, and identifies the organizational threshold that separates modest efficiency gains from genuine step-change performance.

2.1. Digital Twin Ontology: Distinguishing DT from Existing CRE Systems

Calling a BIM model a “Digital Twin” is like calling a photograph a surveillance camera. The underlying technology is related, but the capability is fundamentally different. These distinctions have practical consequences around synchronization frequency, control logic, analytics capability, decision authority and what operating model they need to build around the technology, directly influencing what organizations can expect from their investments and [21]. Table 2 lays out the comparative definitions.

Table 2: Comparative System Definitions: BIM, CAFM, IoT, and Digital Twin Spectrum

System Type	Data Flow	Update Mechanism	Primary Purpose	Predictive Capability	CRE Example
BIM	Static	Manual, milestone-driven	Design coordination, handover documentation	None	Revit model for new office tower
CAFM/IWMS	Transactional	Work order manual	Maintenance workflow, space/lease admin	Limited (rulebased schedules)	Maximo tracking HVAC repairs
IoT/BMS Platform	One-way (sensor cloud)	Continuous → telemetry	Real-time monitoring, alerting	Limited (threshold alerts)	Honeywell monitoring chiller performance
Digital Model	Static	Manual, disconnected from reality	Visualization, design intent	None	Matterport 3D scan for marketing

Digital Shadow	One-way (physical → digital)	Automated from IoT/reality capture	Progress monitoring, as-built validation	None (descriptive only)	Weekly scan vs. BIM for construction tracking
Digital Twin	Bi-directional (physical digital)	Continuous automated sync	Predictive analytics, optimization, operational control	Yes (ML-driven)	Integrated system predicting chiller failure and adjusting loads
Cognitive Twin	Bi-directional + autonomous learning	Continuous + self-improving	Strategic scenario modeling, autonomous optimization	Yes (adaptive, self-tuning)	Portfolio-wide energy optimization across 100+ buildings

The distinguishing feature of a true Digital Twin is bi-directionality. The digital model does not merely reflect what the physical asset is doing, it can influence operations through control signals, diagnostics, and optimisation recommendations [22], [6]. Most CRE deployments today are Digital Shadows at best: one-way data flows from sensors to dashboards during construction monitoring, or enhanced IoT platforms for operations monitoring. True bi-directional twins with predictive capability remain the exception, validated primarily in energy optimisation and predictive maintenance use cases [6], [8].

2.2. Maturity Progression and Value Framework

Digital Twin capability does not arrive fully formed. It evolves through four stages, each delivering greater and greater business value. However, and this is crucial, the development is not strictly technical. It reflects organisational maturity in data governance, integration architecture, analytics capability, and change management. Figure 1 shows the digital twin evolution.

Table 3 visualizes the evolution of each stage in terms of type of value generated, impact on the business, typical ROI horizon and minimum organization readiness.




Figure 1: Digital Twin Evolution — Value Curve and Technology Enabler Progression

Table 3: Digital Twin Value Framework by Maturity Stage

Maturity Stage	Value Type	Business Impact	Typical ROI Timeline	Organisational Readiness
Digital Model	Visibility & Transparency	Design error reduction, stakeholder alignment, baseline documentation	Immediate (project phase)	Basic: BIM capability, reality capture
Digital Shadow	Efficiency & Productivity; Risk Reduction & Control	Construction progress automation, quality control, reduced rework	6–18 months	Moderate: Data governance, IoT deployment, integration skills
Digital Twin	Business Intelligence; Operational Excellence	Predictive maintenance, energy optimisation, compliance automation	18–36 months	Advanced: Analytics capability, operational integration, change management
Cognitive Twin	Innovation & New Business Models	Portfolio optimisation, autonomous operations	36+ months	Mature: AI/ML expertise, portfolio-scale governance, ecosystem partnerships

Value acceleration follows a non-linear pattern. The Digital Model and Digital Shadow stage yield reasonable but low returns, usually 10–20% efficiency increases. In contrast, the game changing step is true Digital Twin capability, delivering 20–30% combined operational cost reduction in energy and maintenance services, supported by building organisational capability. Deployment of technology alone does not guarantee success [17], [7], [8]. CREST has adopted an Adoption Model (Tier 3) and Deployment Playbook (Tier 5) that specifically facilitates a structured manner of organisation to pass through this threshold.

3. CRE Lifecycle and the Digital Twin Journey

CRE Digital Twin programmes do not fail because the technology is unavailable. They fail because organisations treat the twin as a one-time purchase, a product to buy at a single lifecycle stage, rather than a capability that must evolve across the entire asset lifecycle. Figure 2 maps all nine CRE delivery phases to their corresponding DT maturity stage.




Figure 2: CRE Digital Twin Journey — Phase #0 Concept through #9 Teardown, showing DT maturity progression from Digital Model Prototype through Digital Shadow, Digital Twin, and Cognitive Twin

The journey starts with 3D digital capture during pre-project planning, evolves through a Digital Shadow during active construction, and activates as a true bidirectional twin at handover, the moment when the building begins delivering operational value.

Table 4 anchors each phase to its EN 15978 module, ISO 14040 LCA alignment, and minimum viable deliverable.

Table 4: CRE Phases: EN 15978, LCA Alignment, and Minimum Viable Deliverable

CRE Phase	EN 15978 Module	LCA Phase (ISO 14040)	Minimum Viable Deliverable
#0 Concept	Pre-module(boundary setting)	Goal & Scope Definition	Lifecycle KPI & boundary charter
#1 Pre-Project Planning	Pre-A1 (site baseline)	Goal & Scope + LCI planning	Verified spatial baseline + tagging rules
#2 Engineering & De- sign	Informs A1–A3 (material specs)	LCI+ LCIA (scenario testing)	Coordinated BIM + taxonomy + GUIDs + material spec template
#3 Approvals & Per- mitting	A1–A3 (specs locked)	PLCIA + Interpretation	Model-linked submission set + compliance evidence bundle
#4 Pre- Construction	A4 (transport/logis- tics planning)	LCI planning	Construction-ready model + capture plan + ID/metadata gates
#5 Construction Phase	A5 (construction process)	LCI (actuals capture)	Deviation management workflow + installation status register

#6 Quality & Safety	A5 (continued)	LCI (quality/safety records)	Model-linked QA/QC register + evidence pack
#7 Commissioning & Handover	A5 → B1 transition	LCI Interpretation (performance baseline)	+As-verified operational dataset: asset register + point mapping + commissioning evidence + FM workflow playbook (ISO, 2018)
#8 Post-Construction Operations / Refurb	B1–B7 (use incl. B2–B5 maintenance; B6 energy; B7 water)	LCI + LCIA Interpretation (continuous)	+Operational data contract + KPI dashboard + governance cadence
#9 Teardown (com- pleteness only)	C1–C4 (end-of-life)	LCI + LCIA + Interpretation	Legacy export bundle (outside primary CREST scope)

Table 5 adds the execution layer: use cases, minimum data contracts, required integrations, and proof metrics that confirm value at each stage [11], [12], [6].

(Interoperability and integration requirements follow DT platform and industrial reference architecture guidance: [6], [8], [9])

Table 5: DT Execution Map: Use Cases, Minimum Data Contract, Integrations, and Proof Metrics

CRE Phase	DT Value Focus	DT-Enabled Use Cases	Minimum Data Contract	Key Integrations	Proof Metrics
#0 Concept	Strategic option evaluation	Portfolio scenario modelling; feasibility trade-offs	Market/GIS, financial programme, boundary assumptions	Portfolio/finance tools; GIS	Decision boundary documented; KPIs defined
#1 Pre-Project Planning	Baseline accuracy	Existing conditions capture; programme validation	Point cloud/mesh, spatial hierarchy, site constraints	Capture platform + BIM starter	Baseline accepted; reduction in "site surprise" RFIs
#2 Engineering & Design	Errorpre-vention; embodieddata readi-ness	Clash detection; virtual walkthroughs; mate-rial/spec comparison	LOD target, semantic attributes, GUID material/spec template	BIM + CDE + EPD database	Clash backlog closed pre-issue; model completeness score met
#3 Approvals & Permitting	Compliance confidence	Code compliance simulation;	Frozen geometry; simulation inputs;	Energy/simulation tools + document management	Permit resubmission count;

			permit package production	requirements mapping		approval cycle time
#4	Pre-Construction	Planning accuracy	4D/5D planning; logistics simulation; constructability reviews	Construction-ready LOD, schedule link, cost ID continuity	PMtools(Pri-mavera/Procore), estimating, 4D/5D	Quantity variance %; schedule logic conflicts resolved
#5	Construction Phase	Progress visibility; quality control	Scan-to-model verification; install status tracking; deviation alerts	Capture cadence, versioned model, install status register	Capture tools, CDE + project management	+% work areas captured on cadence; deviation closure time
#6	Quality & Safety	Risk control; audit readiness	Location-linked inspection records; defect tracking; safety monitoring	QA/QC defect log with spatial coordinates	QA/QC apps + safety systems + document management	Defect closure rate; inspection cycle time
#7	Commissioning & Handover	Operability; data continuity	Point mapping; commissioning evidence linkage; BIM→CAFM sync	Asset register completeness, point-to-asset mapping, commissioning results	BIM CAFM/IWMS BMS/IoT	Asset match rate (%); telemetry uptime %; handover completeness score
#8	Post-Construction Operations/Refurb	Operational performance + ESG reporting	Condition-based maintenance; energy/comfort optimisation; utilisation insights; ESG data lineage	Telemetry quality work history, definitions, change control	BMS/IoT + CAFM/IWMS + reporting stack	Energy intensity (kWh/m ²); PM/CM ratio; MTTR/MTBF; reporting cycle time
#9	Teardown (conceptual)	End-of-life planning	Deconstruction planning; recovery options	Asset/material inventory; intervention history Export tools + waste management tools	Export tools + waste management	Data export completeness; inventory coverage %

The research literature on built-asset digital twins reinforces a consistent finding: operational value depends on trustworthy semantic structures and on integrating monitoring into O&M decision workflows. Technology alone does not get you there [7], [2].

3.1. Common Failure Modes and CREST Countermeasures

CRE Digital Twin programmes do not typically die because of missing sensors or inadequate platforms. They die because foundational delivery disciplines get skipped, and the twin ends up treated as a technology product rather than an operating model

[3], [23].

Table 6 maps the six most common failure modes, traces each to its root cause, and identifies the CREST countermeasure that addresses it.

Table 6: CRE Digital Twin Failure Modes and CREST Countermeasures

Failure Mode	Root Cause	CREST Countermeasure
Data dies at handover (A5→B1)	Construction documents, not operational dataset	Enforce as-verified operational dataset MVD and asset match rate / telemetry uptime acceptance criteria (Table 5, Phase #7) [14]
No stable asset identity	BIM objects, CAFM assets, and IoT points lack persistent identifiers; integration becomes perpetual reconciliation	Mandate GUID scheme + taxonomy + ID continuity gates from Phase #2 through #7 [2], [10]
Dashboard twin—no workflow integration	Monitoring without CAFM/IWMS integration creates alerts no one owns; twin becomes a screen, not a system	Require work order linkage; track PM/CM ratio and fault closure cycle time as acceptance criteria [7]
Skipping maturity stages	AI/advanced analytics deployed on lowtrust data; false positives erode confidence and kill adoption	Enforce stage-progression gates and restrict advanced use cases until telemetry quality is proven [21], [6]
Unowned governance	No change control or data stewardship; model drifts from physical reality and loses trust	Implement operational change control as a deliverable: data contract + governance cadence (Table 5, Phase #8) [3],[14]
No measurement discipline	ROI is asserted, not evidenced; programmes stall when value cannot be demonstrated	Define proof metrics per phase and require pre-deployment baselines before each stage activation (Table 5, "Proof Metrics" column)

These failure modes define the primary delivery risks that any CRE Digital Twin program must contend with. Section 4 introduces CREST as the staged implementation pathway built to address each one systematically.

4. The CREST Framework

CREST is a seven-tier implementation methodology. It pulls together platform guidance from the Digital Twin Consortium (2023), reference architecture and connectivity guidance from the Industry IoT Consortium, the Centre for Digital Built Britain's Gemini Principles [20], ISO 19650 information management standards [14], and lessons from 80+ commercial real estate engagements. Figure 3 shows the framework architecture, ownership model, and tier sequence.




Figure 3: CREST Framework — Seven Tiers, Ownership Model (Executives, Governance Board, Programme Teams & Architects), and Sequential Progression

The framework is designed to be traversed in order, each tier builds on what came before. That said, organisations with existing capability can enter at the appropriate stage, provided they first run a maturity assessment through Tier 6 to confirm readiness.

Table 7: CREST Framework Architecture Overview

Tier	Purpose	Primary Deliverable	Owner	Success Indicator
1.Strategic Canvas	Align Digital Twin with enterprise real estate objectives	One-page charter linking DT to business priorities	Executives	Board-level commitment secured; funding approved
2.Value Streams	Prioritise use cases across lifecycle	Mapped value flows from capital deployment through ESG reporting	Strategy team	Value streams ranked with ROI estimates
3.Adoption Model	Sequence organisation al capability development	Six-stage roadmap: Initiate → Standardise	Programme teams	Stage transition criteria met; repeatable

		→ Integrate → Automate → Scale → Innovate		processes established
4.Reference Architecture	Define interoperable technical foundation	Vendor-neutral layered architecture (BIM-IoTcloud- AI)	Architects	Technical blueprint approved; vendor selections aligned
5.Deployment Playbook	Operationalise repeatable implementation	Phase-specific workflows for construction, operations, and handoff	Deployment teams	Deployment checklists completed; acceptance criteria validated
6.Maturity Model	Track capability evolution	Maturity assessment: organisational and technical	Governance board	Current-state baseline; targetstate roadmap; quarterly progress reviews
7.ROI & Benefits Ma- trix	Quantify and communicate value	and Financial, operational, sustainability, and experience outcomes	Finance + Operations	Value realised tracked; baseline vs. actual performance documented

4.1. Tier 1: Strategic Canvas

The Strategic Canvas exists to prevent “technology for technology’s sake”, a trap that catches more CRE organisations than anyone in the industry likes to admit. Its purpose is to establish business outcome alignment, governance boundaries, and investment criteria before platform selection or pilot initiation [6], [3]. Without this alignment, organisations default to vendor-led scoping. The vendor optimizes for what its platform does well, not for what the business actually needs.

Three capability domains require coordinated development under the canvas: 1. Construction Project Management covers BIM integration, scan-to-BIM workflows, IoT safety monitoring, and automated compliance. 2. Real Estate Asset Management encompasses tenant experience platforms, space optimisation, and portfolio scenario planning. 3. Facility Management includes IoT-enabled energy and environmental monitoring, predictive maintenance, and ESG reporting automation.

Investment decisions across these domains should weigh five criteria: a. asset criticality, b. cost–benefit timeline, c. current DT maturity, d. AI application potential, and e. regulatory exposure.

That last criterion is increasingly material, NYC Local Law 97 imposes penalties of \$268 per tCO₂e above mandated limits [24],[1]. From our deployment evidence, organisations that skipped the Strategic Canvas and jumped straight to vendor platform selection took 2–3 times longer to scale than those that established strategic alignment first.

4.2. Tier 2: Value Streams

Value stream mapping turns strategic objectives into concrete use cases. It does this by identifying seven lifecycle domains where DT capability produces measurable returns [25], [26]. The real power of this exercise is cross-functional visibility. With a single, correctly tagged equipment record, you can save on maintenance costs, improve ESG reporting accuracy, and support tenant experience metrics. In absence of value stream mapping, organisations create siloed

implementations that never achieve these synergistic benefits. The seven value streams are shown in Figure 4.



Figure 4: CREST Value Streams — #1 Investment & Capital Deployment through #7 Sustainability & ESG

Table 8 charts each one with the phase of its lifecycle, DT use cases, and proof metrics.

Table 8: CREST Value Streams: Lifecycle Phase, DT Use Cases, and Proof Metrics

Value Stream	Lifecycle Phase	DT-Enabled Use Cases	Primary Proof Metrics
1. Investment & Capital Deployment IRR improvement; capital allocation efficiency	Portfolio planning (pre-A modules)	Portfolio-wide modelling; return	scenariosimulation; stranded-riskadjusted asset risk mitigation
2. Development & Construction	A4–A5	Clash detection; 4D/5D planning; scanto-BIM progress tracking (Zhang and Arditi, 2013); QA/QC automation; safety monitoring	Schedule variance reduction; rework cost avoidance; nonproductive time (PlanGrid and FMI, 2018)
3. Leasing & Tenant Acquisition	A5→B1 transition	Immersive 3D virtual tours; custom space visualisation; rapid fit-out scenario modelling	Days-on-market; leasing velocity; tenant acquisition cost
4. Asset & Property Management	B1–B7	Real-time performance monitoring; condition-based maintenance; capital planning from actual wear patterns	Asset uptime; maintenance cost/m ² ; NOI improvement

5. Portfolio Management	B1–B7	Cross-site benchmarking; portfolio-wide dashboards; rebalancing optimisation	Portfolio yield; operational consistency scores
6. Tenant & Workplace Experience	B1–B7	Occupancy-driven comfort optimisation; IAQ tracking; space utilisation analytics (CBRE Research, 2024)	Tenant NPS; retention rate; service response time
7. Sustainability & ESG	Full lifecycle (A–B–C)	Continuous carbon tracking; automated CSR/GRESB reporting (Directive 2022/2464; GRESB, 2025); embodied carbon optimisation	Carbon intensity (kgCO/m ² /yr); ESG rating; reporting effort reduction

Based on our evidence base, organisations that mapped value streams before deploying technology had 25–40% faster time to value and 30–50% higher user adoption than organisations that led with technology.

4.3. Tier 3: Adoption Model

The six stages of adoption model delineates an ordered roadmap for transitioning from initial pilots to enterprise scale deployment. Its main point is therefore to force implementation and to prevent the most expensive failure : deploying AI analytics prior to the functional Digital Twin underpinning capacity that delivers quality training data [3], [27]. The numbers are stark. AI-first CRE implementations fail to make it to production by 60%–70% compared to a failure rate between 15–20% for AI laid onto a mature operational twin [27], [28]. Stage gates are not bureaucratic red tape. They are the system that mitigates capability-skipping, the only proven way of destroying ROI in a Digital Twin initiative.

Table 9: CREST Adoption Model: Six-Stage Maturity Progression

Stage	Definition	Primary Activities	Transition Criteria
1. Initiate	Proof-of-concept; build awareness through high-visibility, low-risk pilots	Identify priority use case; run PoC; establish business case; secure executive sponsorship	Value case documented (\$50K–\$200K gains quantified); steering committee formed; funding approved
2. Standardise	Scale pilots to repeatable processes; establish common data standards and governance	Define DT data standards; select core platforms; build governance and training curriculum	Reference architecture approved; governance standards published; 3–5 repeatable deployments demonstrated
3. Integrate	Connect DT to enterprise systems; create seamless cross-	Integrate DT with ERP, CAFM, EAM, IoT, GIS; enable	End-to-end process maps validated; 10–15 integrated deployments; first

	functional flows	data	closed-loop design-tooperate workflows	complete A–B lifecycle view operational
4. Automate	Extend descriptive predictive prescriptive capability using AI/ML	from to and using	Apply ML for anomaly detection, predictive maintenance, energy optimisation; automate work orders from sensor thresholds	Predictive maintenance ROI quantified; 20–30% combined cost reduction across 5+ buildings documented
5. Scale	Enterprise-wide deployment across portfolios, geographies, and ecosystem partners		Scale to multiple sites (standardised playbooks); enable partner data sharing	Portfolio-wide KPIs operational across 50+ buildings; governance model for continuous scaling established
6. Innovate	DT as innovation platform; new business models; competitive differentiation		Leverage Cognitive Twin capabilities; develop performancebased contracts; participate in smart city/grid ecosystems	New business models operational with documented revenue/margin; Cognitive Twin deployed at portfolio scale

4.4. Tier 4: Reference Architecture

The reference architecture defines where DT capabilities sit within the broader IT/OT/ET landscape and how they connect to the CRE systems already in place. It exists to prevent vendor lock-in through open standards and semantic interoperability requirements that are independent of any specific product [6], [8].

Figure 5 shows the six-layer architecture — six Layers from IoT Sensors and Capture through Computational & Modelling, Hosting & Delivery, Application/Integrations, with Security cross-cutting and Network Protocols at the connectivity foundation.




Figure 5: CREST Reference Architecture

Figure 6 shows the full integration ecosystem-Physical Properties & Assets, IoT Devices, IoT Gateway & Cloud, Spatial & Digital Twin, CRE Systems, Integration Fabric, Key Enterprise Systems (ERP, HCM, CRM, Assets, EHS, ESG), Key Data Domains (BIM/Digital Models, Asset Registries, IoT & Sensor Data, Geospatial, Sustainability Metrics, Integration Fabric).




Figure 6: CREST Integration Ecosystem

Four architectural trade-offs demand explicit organisational decisions-

First, real-time streaming versus periodic batch synchronization. This choice materially affects latency, cost, and maintenance overhead. Not every use case needs real-time data.

Second, centralized versus federated twin topology. A centralized approach enables portfolio-wide benchmarking; a federated approach reduces data sovereignty risk. Most large organisations eventually need both.

Third, proprietary versus open standards. Open standards, such as IFC 4.3, Brick Schema, COBie, DTDL, protect against lock-in but carry higher short-term implementation complexity [29], [30], [31].

Fourth, high-fidelity capture (\$50000–\$100K per building) versus cost-effective mobile capture (\$5000–\$20K per building). The right answer depends on the precision requirements of the use case, not on technology preference [6], [8].

Critical interoperability standards across all layers include: IFC 4.3 for BIM exchange; Brick Schema/Project Haystack/ASHRAE 223P for building semantics [32], [33]; COBie for asset data handover; DTDL for twin modelling [34]; and ISO 27001/SOC 2/NIST Cybersecurity Framework for security governance [35], [36].

From our evidence base: organisations that deployed twins with a documented reference architecture experienced 30–50% lower integration costs and 40–60% faster vendor onboarding compared to those that allowed point-solution proliferation without architectural governance [10], [6].

4.5. Tier 5: Deployment Playbook

The Deployment Playbook converts the reference architecture into executable workflows. Its purpose is to reduce implementation risk, compress deployment timelines, and enforce consistency across sites [6], [14]. It operates across two deployment contexts, construction (EN 15978 A4–A5) and facility management (B1–B7), with a critical handover protocol bridging both. Tables 10 and 11 define the phase-specific activities, deliverables, and acceptance criteria.

Table 10: Construction Phase Deployment (EN 15978 A4–A5)

Phase	Primary Activities	Key Deliverable	Acceptance Criteria
1. Deployment Strategy & Site Assessment	Define scope, roles, acceptance criteria; site readiness assessment; governance establishment	Deployment charter + site readiness checklist + RACI	Charter signed; site constraints documented
2. Hardware Procurement & Training	Select reality capture & hardware; procure IoT sensors; train field teams on SOPs	Hardware inventory + training records + SOPs	Field team competency verified
3. Reality Capture Baseline	Execute initial site scan; process point cloud; georeferencing and coordinate alignment	Baseline 3D model + quality validation report	Accuracy verified against control points (\pm target mm)
4. Data Standardisation & Tagging	Apply metadata tagging per enterprise taxonomy (Brick Schema);	Tagged 3D model + GUID registry + metadata	Metadata completeness target %; GUID registry 100% populated

	assign GUIDs; link to BIM		completeness scorecard	
5.Workflow Integration	Integrate Shadow construction management platform; configure automated progress tracking [37]	Digital with BMS; validate equipment metadata to asset registers	Integration results + workflow playbooks	test API integration validated; scan operational weekly cycle
6.Change Management & Adoption	Toolbox feedback model maintenance	talks;Adoption mechanisms; healthdashboard + maintenance logs	metrics dashboard + maintenance logs	Weekly active users target %; scan uptime 95%
7.Commissioning & Handover Preparation	As-built scan; CAFM/IWMS sync; commissioning validation; handover packaging [14]	As-verified IoT dataset: 3D model + equipment metadata + commissioning records + O&M manuals	As-verified operational dataset: 3D model + equipment metadata + commissioning records + O&M manuals	Asset match rate 95%; telemetry 95%; handover completeness score met

Table 11: Facility Management Deployment (EN 15978 B1–B7)

Phase	Primary Activities	Key Deliverable	Acceptance Criteria
1.Model & Data Integration	Integrate Shadow CAFM/IWMS, analytics; validate GUID persistence; link equipment metadata to asset registers	Digital with BMS, validate equipment metadata to asset registers	Integration validation report + asset match rate scorecard
2.Maintenance Process Setup	Establish work order workflows referencing 3D model; configure PM policies; train facility teams on DTbased workflows	Workflow documentation + training records + pilot work order metrics	Asset match rate 95%; no retagging required
3.Operational Layer Optimisation	Deploy energy and comfort (HVAC, lighting); implement occupancy monitoring; establish compliance monitoring	Analytics dashboard + playbooks + compliance reports	PM schedule auto-generated; technicians locating equipment via model in <60s
			Energy KPI baseline established; occupancy data flowing; compliance alerts operational

4. Model Maintenance & Governance	Implement change management (approval workflows, control, audit trails); quarterly model health checks (ISO, 2018; Bolton et al., 2018)	Model maintenance schedule + change log + data quality scorecards	Model currency verified quarterly; change log 100% complete; data quality thresholds met
-----------------------------------	---	---	--

The Phase 7 construction-to-FM Phase 1 transition is both the most critical and the most frequently skipped handover in CRE Digital Twin programmes. The as-verified operational dataset is not a stack of PDF documents. It is a governed data state where digital asset identity, physical sensor mapping, and commissioning evidence have been reconciled and formally accepted by both construction and facility teams before operational responsibility transfers.



This table 12 maps the data flows that must cross the A5→B1 handover boundary and links each to the critical success factor it enables in the receiving domain [14], [7], [2].

Table 12: Facility Management Deployment (EN 15978 B1–B7)

Data Domain	Construction Output (A4–A5)	Handover Gate Re-requirement	FM Input (B1–B7)	Critical Success Factor Enabled
AssetIdentity	BIM objects with GUIDs; equipment specs; installation records	GUID persistence validated; no re-tagging at handover; 100% asset register population	CAFM/IWMS asset records with persistent IDs linked to physical equipment	Condition-based maintenance; work order automation; capital planning accuracy
Spatial Model	As-built point cloud + coordinated BIM; deviation register	As-verified model accepted at ±target mm accuracy; deviation register closed or risk-flagged	3D spatial reference for maintenance navigation; space hierarchy for utilisation analytics	Technician efficiency (equipment location in $60s$); space utilisation accuracy
IoT / Telemetry Mapping	Sensor installation records; point-to-asset mapping; BMS integration results	Point-to-asset map 100% complete; telemetry uptime 95% at handover; commissioning evidence linked	Live sensor feeds mapped to asset register; BMS integrated to analytics platform	Predictive maintenance; energy optimisation; ESG data lineage
Commissioning Evidence	Equipment test records; performance baselines; O&M manuals	Commissioning results linked to asset record in model; baseline performance values documented	Operational performance baselines for anomaly detection thresholds; warranty and compliance records	Fault detection accuracy; warranty claim support; CSRD/GRESB audit readiness
Environmental & Energy Data	Construction waste logs; embodied carbon records (A1–A5); utility	LCI data package compiled per EN 15978 A-modules; boundary	Operational energy baseline (B6); carbon intensity starting point for CSRD	ESG reporting completeness; LCA continuity (A→B); GRESB data

	consumption during fit-out	assumptions documented	reporting	quality (GRESB, 2025)
Governance & Change Control	Construction change log; RFI register; approved variations	Change log transferred with version controlled model; open items risk-assessed and accepted	Operational change control baseline; version history audit trail	Data trust; model currency; ISO 19650 compliance for (ISO, 2018)

Construction CSFs addressed: schedule variance reduction, rework avoidance, QA/QC compliance, safety incident rate, non-productive time reduction (PlanGrid and FMI, 2018).

FM/Operational CSFs addressed: asset uptime, PM/CM ratio, MTTR/MTBF, energy intensity (kWh/m²), carbon intensity (kgCO₂/m²/yr), tenant NPS, ESG reporting cycle time, CSRD audit readiness [1], [38].

Distinct from the strategic failure modes in Table 6, these are the in-field friction points that cause deployments to exceed budget and timeline, typically invisible during business case development but consistently observed across the 80+ engagement evidence base.

Table 13: Technical and Operational Deployment Challenges and Mitigations

Challenge	Where It Appears	Root Cause	Mitigation
IoT protocol fragmentation	Construction (#5) and FM commissioning (#7)	Legacy devices (BACnet, LonWorks) incompatible with cloud platforms without layers	Mandate BMS/OT use protocols (Modbus, OPC UA/MQTT) as standard in procurement specs; budget for protocol translation gateways at mobilisation stage (OASIS, 2019; OPC Foundation, n.d.)
BIM-tooperations semantic gap	Handover Phase (#7)	BIM objects for coordination (discipline, type) not for workflows (maintainable maintenance equipment hierarchy)	Enforce design level, FM asset, zone, hierarchy) ready taxonomy (Brick Schema/Project Haystack) from Phase #2 Engineering & Design; validate at handover, not

			after (Balaji et al., 2016; Project Haystack, 2021)
Telemetry data quality degradation	FM Phase 3 (Operational Optimisation)	Sensor drift, firmware gaps, and network interruptions create sparse or noisy time-series data; ML models trained on degraded data produce false positives	Implement data quality thresholds as operational acceptance criteria; establish automated data quality scoring with escalation protocols before analytics deployment
Change resistance from FM teams	FM Phase 2 (Maintenance Process Setup)	Facility managers perceive dashboards surveillance as additional administrative burden rather than workflow enablers	Co-design FM workflows with maintenance teams before deployment; demonstrate time-saving (equipment location ;60s) in training; link DT use to personal KPIs
GUID loss at system integration	Handover (#7) → FM Phase 1	Different platforms assign internal identifiers; cross-system joins break when IDs are not preserved during BIM→CAFM→BMS integration	Establish universal asset identifier (UUID/GUID) as contractual requirement across all platform integrations; validate in integration testing before go-live (Boje et al., 2020; Lin et al., 2023)
Scope creep on integration work	FM Phase 1 (Model Data Integration)	Undiscovered legacy & system complexity (unsupported APIs, end-of-life CAFM	Conduct legacy system audit at Stage 1 (Initiate) before

		versions, undocumented data schemas) surfaces during integration, expanding cost and timeline	integration architecture is finalised; include integration contingency of 25–35% in FM deployment budgets
Analyticsmodel cold-start	FM Phase 3 (Operational Optimisation)	Predictive maintenance models require 12–24 months of quality operational history before reliable predictions are possible; organisations expect immediate ROI	Set stakeholder expectations at business case stage; plan phased analytics deployment (descriptive → informative → predictive) aligned to Maturity Model stage gates

4.6. Tier 6: Maturity Model

The Maturity Model demonstrates the changes in both organisational and technical adoption over time. It allows an objective quarterly view of progress to the governance board, which is critical for managing executive commitment across multiyear deployment cycles [39], [21]. CREST’s five-level maturity taxonomy is based on the established frameworks for digital transformation in the construction and built environment industries. Such paradigms consistently classify five to six levels of capabilities, from simple documentation to autonomous operations. The finding across them is that the binding constraint in multiple transitions is organisational readiness (governance, skills, process integration) and not technology availability [40], [6], [39].

What CREST contributes is specificity on the CRE asset lifecycle. Levels of maturity are connected to the EN 15978 module progressions, CREST tier deployment sequence and the value types defined from Tier 2. The result is a maturity assessment that directly informs program priorities and investment decisions, not an independent benchmarking exercise. The CREST Maturity Pyramid and CREST technical capability Maturity Model are detailed in Figure 7 and Table 14 respectively.




Figure 7: CREST Maturity Pyramid — Level 1 Passive through Level 5 Master

Table 14: CREST Technical Capability Maturity Model

Level Stage	Description	Technical Characteristics	Value Delivered	CRE Use Cases	
1	Passive (Descriptive)	Structured virtual foundation; accurate as-built model	Static 3D/BIM; manual updates; visualisation and documentation	Transparency; design error prevention	Construction progress visualisation; regulatory submission; asbuilt documentation
2	Starter (Informative)	Dynamic value through IoT integration; real-time visibility	Digital Shadow (oneway flow); automated progress tracking; threshold alerts	Efficiency gains; quality control; automated reporting	Scan-to-BIM deviation; safety energy detection; monitoring; dashboards
3	Progressive (Predictive)	Historical + real-time analytics; forecasting and proactive resolution	ML models; predictive maintenance; energy/occupancy forecasting	Operational excellence; risk reduction; mitigation	Equipment failure 30–90 days ahead; HVAC optimisation space; utilisation casting fore
4	Mature (Comprehensive)	Real-time simulation; what-if scenario analysis	Physics-based simulation; multi-objective optimisation; closedloop bi-directional control	Strategic planning; performance guarantees	Retrofit ROI simulation; evacuation modelling; carbon pathway optimisation
5	Master (Autonomous)	Self-learning; autonomous action under policy constraints	AI-enabled Cognitive Twin; reinforcement learning; continuous self-improvement	Innovation; new business models	Portfolio-wide energy optimisation across 100+ buildings; autonomous HVAC; performance-based contracts

Quarterly maturity assessments score both organisational adoption (strategy, leadership, operating model) and technical capability (data integration, analytics, automation, AI deployment) on a 1–5 scale. For each dimension below target state, the assessment yields a gap analysis identifying missing people, process, technology, and governance components, as well as a remediation plan comprising owners, timelines, and budget. This discipline helps avert a governance failure we see on a regular basis; programmes that report on the progress of new technology deployment when it stumbles on adoption and value realization.

4.7. Tier 7: ROI & Benefits Matrix

The ROI & Benefits Matrix provides a structured measurement framework for quantifying financial, operational, sustainability, and experience outcomes across value streams. It tackles the moment that pilots tend to be canceled most often, when executive patience dies down and no one can show measurable value [41], [42]. The framework spans four academic disciplines as shown in Table 15 and ROI Benefits Matrix in Table 16.

The crucial discipline here, one that organisations conveniently bypass, is collecting baselines before deployment, not after. But metric selection is not the only solution. A solid value framework also needs an attribution methodology, the logic that separates DT-driven performance improvement from concurrent operational changes, market shifts, or seasonal variation. Without attribution logic, value initiatives lack credibility and are susceptible to being contested during governance evaluations.

Table 15: Value Measurement Framework: Attribution Methodology

Component	Definition	Implementation Requirement	Common Failure
Baseline Establishment	Pre-deployment performance measurement across all target metrics using existing systems	Minimum 3-month pre-deployment baseline; documented measurement methodology; approved finance operations	Baseline collected retrospectively after deployment begins; comparison data corrupted by concurrent changes
Attribution Logic	Methodology separating DT-driven improvement from other contributing factors	Define variables asset type, season, comparable occupancy); where possible use A/B comparison across buildings at different maturity stages	Entire performance improvement attributed to DT without accounting for occupancy changes, weather variation, or parallel maintenance programmes
Measurement Cadence	Frequency and ongoing performance tracking	Monthly automated collection of source systems; quarterly business review comparing actuals vs. baseline; annual recalibration of targets	Annual review only — too infrequent to detect value degradation or trigger corrective action before executive patience expires

Audit Trail	Documented evidence chain from raw data to reported value	Source system exports with calculation methodology versioned and approved; independent verification for material ESG claims (Directive (EU) 2022/2464; GRESB, 2025)	Value reported from dashboards without traceable source data — fails ESG assurance requirements and internal audit scrutiny
-------------	---	---	---

Table 16: ROI & Benefits Matrix: Value Categories, Metrics, and Evidence Ranges

Value Category	Key Metrics	Evidence Range	Measurement Source
Energy & Carbon	Energy intensity (kWh/m ² /yr); carbon intensity (kgCO/m ² /yr)	15–30% energy cost reduction; 26% avg. EUI savings (IESve, 2024; Deloitte, 2023; Bortolini et al., 2022; Cespedes-Cubides et al., 2024)	BMS/smart meter telemetry; automated CSRD pipeline
Maintenance & Reliability	PM/CM ratio; MTTR; unplanned downtime	3–5× cost reduction vs. reactive; 35–45% reduction in unplanned downtime (Industrial Internet Consortium, 2022; IBM, 2026)	CAFM work order history; sensor telemetry
Construction De-livery	Schedule variance rework avoidance; nonproductive time	20% reduction in delayed projects; 35% reduction in non-productive time (PlanGrid and FMI, 2018)	PM scan platform; deviation reports
Space Utilisation	Utilisation rate (%); occupancy confidence; hoteling efficiency	15–30% optimisation in hybridwork environments (CBRE Research, 2024)	Occupancy sensor data; space booking platforms
Tenant Experience	NPS; response time; comfort complaint rate	30% service time; (internal evidence, 2022–2025)	NPS improvement deployments; Tenant service request logs
ESG & Compliance	Reporting cycle time; resolution rate; GRESB score	60% reduction in manual ESG reporting effort (AI-driven ESG reporting studies, 2025; GRESB, 2025)	ESG reporting platform; data lineage logs

Financial	NOI improvement; \$10K–\$15K cost savings	Finance/ERP;
	capex avoidance; per project; \$100K	compliance
	compliance additional revenue from	monitoring
	penalty risk market differentiation	
	reduction (internal deployment	
	evidence, 2022–2025)	

A finding from our evidence base and the importance of this evidence: organisations that defined metrics in the pilot phase but did not follow the metrics postdeployment experienced 60–80% higher programme rework and implementation failure rates than those who had a strict quarterly value review. The art of measuring performance vs. performance metrics, and identifying corrective actions when gaps start to emerge, is what keeps programmes going.

5. Ethical, Regulatory, and Governance Considerations

CRE Digital Twins are socio-technical systems. They observe spaces, infer human behavior patterns, and, in advanced deployments, recommend or automate operational decisions. This changes the risk profile in fundamental ways compared to conventional BIM, CAFM, or BMS installations [3], [39]. Ethical governance, regulatory compliance, and strategic risk controls must be designed as first-class requirements within the Strategic Canvas (Tier 1) and Reference Architecture (Tier 4). They cannot be bolted on after a pilot proves technically feasible. The question organisations should be asking is not “can we collect this data?” but rather “should we collect it, for this purpose, at this level of granularity, with these safeguards?”

5.1. Ethical Dimensions

Four ethical domains govern proportionate CRE Digital Twin design: Privacy and Consent, Transparency, Equity, and Environmental Responsibility of the twins own infrastructure. The underlying challenge across all four is power asymmetry. Asset owners gain unprecedented visibility into how occupants move, use space, interact with building systems, and request services. Occupants often have limited understanding of what is being collected, what gets inferred from that data, and how long it persists.

1. Purpose limitation (Privacy and Consent): define explicitly what the data will be used for, comfort optimisation, safety monitoring, maintenance planning, energy management, and prohibit scope creep. Individual performance monitoring, for example, should not happen without contractual disclosure and legal basis [43]. Additionally, Data minimization will need to default to the least invasive signal that satisfies the use case. Zone-level occupancy counts, not individual-level movement traces. Store high-risk raw data, video footage, Wi-Fi association logs, for the shortest feasible retention period.
2. Transparency and contestability: provide visible disclosure, understandable policies, and opt-in/opt-out mechanisms for tenant-facing analytics. Any AI-driven recommendations, work orders, HVAC adjustments, anomaly flags, must carry evidence traces (telemetry readings, rule thresholds, confidence scores) that allow challenge [39], [44].
3. Fairness and workforce impact (Equity): operational analytics must not become surveillance by default. Governance must explicitly separate space performance analytics from individual monitoring. Responsible change management for FM workforce role transitions is an ethical obligation, not a discretionary nicety [3].
4. Environmental responsibility extends to the twin itself. Edge-first processing, thoughtful telemetry sampling policies, and storage tiering prevent the twin from increasing compute and storage emissions while it works to reduce the building’s operational carbon [3].

5.2. Regulatory Landscape

CRE Digital Twins operate across four overlapping regulatory regimes. Jurisdictional layering adds complexity, owner, tenant, cloud hosting provider, and support team may each sit in different regulatory environments.

Table 17: Regulatory and Ethical Domains: Risks, Controls, and DT Architecture Implications

Domain	Typical Risk in CRE Twins	Practical Controls	DT Architecture Implication
Privacy & Data Protection	Occupant tracking, inference, re-identification; tenant/landlord data boundary violations	Purpose limitation; data minimisation; consent/notice flows; anonymisation; short retention schedules; DPIA-style risk reviews	Data classification at ingestion; retention automation; anonymisation pipelines; explicit tenant data boundary in integration fabric [43]
AI Transparency & Accountability	"Black-box" comfort/maintenance decisions; uncontested automation; unclear liability	Explainable model outputs; the-loop safety/comfort critical actions; contestability pathways; decision authority model (recommend vs. automate)	Audit logs for recommendations, approvals, overrides, and outcomes; confidence score exposure in UI [39], [44]
Cybersecurity (OT/IT)	Expanded attack surface when connects to BMS/OT; "twin breach" = potential safety/service continuity incident	OT/IT network segmentation; DT MFA/RBAC/ABAC; patch and vulnerability management for IoT/gateways; incident response and audit logging suited to OT constraints	Zero-trust patterns; Layer 6 security architecture (Section 6.4); penetration testing schedule [35], [36]
ESG & Reporting Assurance	CSRD/GRESB claims without traceable source data; "dashboard reporting" failing audit	Data lineage (source → calculation → boundary → version history); reproducible metrics; controlled model change; evidence packs	Assurance-grade data pipeline; versioned KPI logic; evidence bundle generation [1], [38]
Building Performance Penalties	Carbon cap penalties (NYC LL97)	Continuous performance monitoring; regulatory threshold alerts; penalty	Live compliance dashboard; automated penalty

	\$268/tCO ₂ e); MEPS non-compliance; GreenMark obligations	risk quantification in ROI model	exposure calculation [24]
Accessibility	Digital-only service access; non- compliant tenant interfaces	WCAG2.2-aligned UI; non-digital service alternatives; multilanguage support	Accessible UI patterns in application layer; non-app service request channels [45]

5.3. Strategic Risk Management

Four risk clusters recur consistently across CRE DT programmes regardless of deployment scale or geography.

Table 18: Strategic Risks and CREST-Aligned Mitigations

Strategic Risk	How It Appears in CRE DT Programmes	CREST-Aligned Mitigation
Stage-skipping	AI pilots fail on low-trust data; "blackbox" recommendations rejected by FM teams; ROI undemonstrable	Tier 3 Adoption Model stage gates + Tier 6 Maturity Model "readiness to automate" checks; block advanced use cases until telemetry quality and asset match rate thresholds are met
Vendor lock-in	Proprietary models/connectors prevent migration; export rights not contracted	Tier 4 Reference Architecture open standards mandate; contractual portability requirements; API quality as procurement acceptance criterion (Digital Twin Consortium, 2023; Industry IoT Consortium, 2022)
Accountability gaps	Disputes over authorised change"; ESG audit trail missing	Tier 5 operational logs; human-in-the-loop governance; decision authority model defining recommend vs. automate boundaries
Adoption failure	Twin becomes a dashboard no one uses; FM teams revert to legacy workflows	Tier 5 workflow embedding in CAFM/work order processes; Tier 7 adoption KPIs tracked with same rigour as

energy savings;
workforce enablement in
each Adoption Model
stage

5.4. Minimum Governance Package

To make ethical and regulatory requirements operational rather than aspirational, every CREST deployment requires six governance artefacts established before go-live:

1. Data classification and retention policy covering occupancy, access, imaging, and IoT data, with explicit retention periods and anonymization thresholds [43].
2. Tenant/occupant transparency pack with plain-language notices, FAQs, and consent mechanisms where required by jurisdiction.
3. Cyber-physical security pattern library containing OT boundary controls, IAM configuration, and incident playbooks aligned to NIST CSF and ISO 27001 [35], [36].
4. Model change control and audit log protocol with versioning of geometry, metadata, and KPI logic, approval workflows, and seven-year retention.
5. Use-case review board that approves new analytics and automation features against a risk tier framework before deployment (NIST, 2023; European Union, 2024).
6. ESG assurance readiness package containing evidence bundles, data lineage documentation, and reproducible calculation methodology for CSRD/GRESB submissions [44], [38].

Table 19: CREST Governance Stack: Five Layers Aligned to Framework Tiers

Layer	Governance Focus	CREST Tier Alignment	Key Controls	"Done" Criteria
1.Strategic Intent	Use-case boundaries; tenant trust posture; risk appetite; what data is explicitly out of scope	Tier 1: Strategic Canvas	Boundary decisions documented in charter; explicit out-of-scope list; executive risk appetite statement	Charter signed with data governance annex
2.Ethical Layer	Proportionality; minimisation; transparency; antisurveillance defaults; workforce impact	Tier 1–2: Canvas + Value Streams	Purpose limitation policy; minimisation rules; workforce enablement plan	Ethical review completed; policies published
3.Regulatory & Cyber Layer	Data protection; OT/IT cybersecurity;	Tier 4–5: Reference Architecture +	DPIA completed; OT segmentation implemented;	Compliance sign-off from legal, IT security

	accessibility	Deployment	WCAG	audit	
		Playbook	passed;	penetration	test
			completed		
4.Assurance & Accountability Layer	Decision authority; ESG audit logs; model change control	Tier 5–7; Playbook + Maturity + ROI	Decision authority model; operational; evidence versioned logic	audit log ESG bundle; KPI	First grade ESG report produced from twin data
5.Outcomes Layer	Value with integrity	verified Tier ROI Benefits Matrix	7: Adoption & incident equity alongside energy/cost/carbon	KPIs; data trust scores; rate; metrics	Quarterly governance review showing actual s vs. baseli ne across all five layers

6. Future Socio-Technical Convergence Opportunities

CREST maturity does not plateau at portfolio-scale optimisation. As organisations progress through the Automate and Scale stages, the Digital Twin evolves from an internal operational tool to a governed participant in broader urban and energy ecosystems. The five convergence opportunities below are sequenced by organisational readiness, not by technology availability. In every case, the binding constraint is socio-technical: trust boundaries, governance models, incentive alignment, and the economics of sharing value across stakeholders (Gil et al., 2024; Todorean et al., 2025).

6.1. From Buildings to Precincts: Federated District-Scale Twins

When multiple buildings within a district achieve stable asset identity, trusted telemetry, and workflow integration (CREST Stage 4–5), their outputs can feed precinct-scale simulation, pedestrian flow, microclimate modeling, heat island mitigation, resilience planning, shared infrastructure optimisation. The barrier is not modeling capability. It is data rights. Occupancy intensity and energy performance data directly influence leasing and asset positioning. Nobody wants to share information that could weaken their competitive position. The scalable answer is federated urban digital twins: data remains decentralized and sovereign while shared semantics and mediator patterns enable cross-asset insights without exposing proprietary telemetry [46].

The harder problem is governance. Who sets the semantic standards? Who arbitrates disputes? Who owns the shared analytics layer? These are policy design questions requiring industry coordination, not technology solutions.

6.2. Energy Transition: Buildings as Grid-Interactive Assets

A CREST-mature twin creates the preconditions for buildings to participate in demand response and flexibility services, pre-cooling, peak shaving, load shedding, battery dispatch, all bounded by comfort, IAQ, and service constraints [47], [48].

This shifts the ROI model from internal cost savings to market participation: flexibility revenue, avoided peak charges, grid-services value. But grid-interactive buildings require auditable evidence

that actions were executed, constraints were respected, and outcomes are attributable. This is exactly the assurance infrastructure that CREST Tier 7 provides[48].

6.3. Generative AI: Closing the Design-to-Operations Loop

One of CRE's most persistent structural weaknesses is the broken feedback loop between operational reality and design decisions. GenAI design tools, when paired with longitudinal twin data, space utilization patterns, comfort complaint hotspots, maintenance burden by zone, energy/IEQ trade-offs, can generate and rank refurbishment options grounded in evidence rather than intuition. This changes capital planning from single-solution advocacy to multi-option exploration with explicit constraints and testable performance hypotheses. The governance challenge is that the "best" layout becomes a negotiated objective function balancing comfort against density against cost. Ensuring representativeness, controlling for bias, and maintaining explainability and contestability of generated alternatives are design governance problems that CRE organisations have not yet built the structures to handle [49].

6.4. Circular Economy: Material Passports and Secondary Market Readiness

Longer-term convergence points toward material passports, components linked to identity, provenance, specifications, and condition history, that convert the twin into a secondary market manifest enabling selective deconstruction and traceable material reuse. The core obstacle is not scanning or modeling fidelity. It is multidecade identity continuity: ensuring that asset identifiers persist across ownership changes, system migrations, vendor turnover, and corporate lifespans. This is a sociolegal permanence problem that requires contract design, regulatory frameworks, and industry-wide identifier standards [50].

6.5. GenAI FM Copilots: From Knowledge Retrieval to Bounded Action

A twin-backed GenAI copilot, combining governed retrieval over approved sources (O&M manuals, commissioning records, SOPs, incident histories) with live telemetry context and CMMS/CAFM integration, can compress FM cycle time substantially. It does this by replacing coordination overhead with structured operational artefacts: fault hypotheses with evidence pointers, diagnostic checklists, work-order drafts, and verification plans [51]. Near-term viability requires bounded deployment: role-based access control, sourcegrounded outputs, audit logging, and recommend-only defaults until automation readiness gates and safety constraints have been formally cleared [51]. Organisations that have completed CREST Tier 5 deployment with full workflow integration are best positioned to introduce this capability without creating ungoverned AI in safety-relevant FM decisions.

Table 20: Future Convergence Opportunities: Readiness Horizon, CREST Prerequisites, and Primary Risk

Opportunity	Readiness Horizon	CREST Prerequisite Tiers	Primary Value Shift	Primary Risk
Federated district-scale twins	3–7 years (asset-by-asset)	Tier 3–5: Stable identity, trusted telemetry, open standards compliance	Precinct-scale simulation; shared infrastructure optimization	Data sovereignty disputes; federation governance vacuum

Gridinteractive energyparticipation	2–5 years (regulatorydependent)	Tier 4–7: High-trust energy telemetry, controllable loads, assurancegrade audit trail	Flexibility ; avoided peak charges; grid-services value	Operational revenue accountability gaps; cybersecurity exposure of OT systems
GenAI design-to-ops closure	2–4 years (data maturitydependent)	Tier 3–6: Longitudinal operational data (2+ years); semantic consistency; maturity Stage 4+	Evidence-grounded refurbishment decisions; multi-option capital planning	Bias generated in governance of objective function; contestability requirements
Material passports & circular economy	5–15years (regulatorydriven)	Tier 4–5: Persistent GUIDs; component-level metadata; cross-ownership identity continuity	Secondary market value; deconstruction planning; embodied carbon recovery	Multi-decade identity persistence; sociolegal permanence across ownership changes
GenAIFM copilots	1–3 years (bounded deployment)	Tier 5: Full workflow integration; governed document repositories; CAFM linkage; audit logging	FM cycle-time compression; knowledge retrieval at point of need	Ungovernanced AI in safety-relevant decisions; source hallucination without retrieval guardrails

7. Recommendations to Business Leaders

Seven recommendations follow from CREST’s deployment evidence base and the analytical framework presented in Sections 3 through 6. They are sequenced by organisational readiness. The first applies universally regardless of current maturity; the later ones apply progressively as capability deepens.

7.1. Start with the Strategic Canvas — Before Platform Selection

Establish business outcome alignment, governance boundaries, and investment criteria before engaging any vendor, evaluating any platform, or initiating any pilot

[6], [3].

Why this matters more than it seems: vendor-led scoping optimizes for platform capability, not business value. The organisation that starts with a vendor inevitably deploys what that vendor sells.

The Strategic Canvas forces a different question, “what problem are we solving, for which asset, at what level of maturity, with what evidence of success?”, before commercial commitments are made.

7.2. Enforce Stage Gates, Resist the Temptation to Skip to AI

Follow the Adoption Model’s six-stage sequence: Initiate → Standardise → Integrate → Automate → Scale → Innovate. Block advanced analytics and AI until Stage 3 (Integrate) prerequisites, trusted telemetry, stable asset identity, workflow integration have been verified [3], [27].

Why this matters: AI is a multiplier. Applied to clean, well-governed operational data, it accelerates value. Applied to fragmented, low-trust data, it produces false positives at scale, erodes FM team confidence, and kills adoption. Between 60% and 70% of AI-first CRE implementations fail to reach production versus 15–20% when AI is layered onto a mature operational foundation [27], [28].

7.3. Treat the A5→B1 Handover as a Governed Data Transfer, Not a Document Bundle

The construction-to-operations transition must deliver a verified digital dataset, persistent GUIDs, point-to-asset mapping, commissioning evidence, FM-ready metadata, formally accepted by both construction and facility teams before operational responsibility transfers [14], [2].

Why this matters: most DT value destruction in CRE occurs not during construction and not during operations, but in the six-to-twelve week handover window. Asset identity, telemetry mapping, and commissioning evidence are either consolidated during this window or lost permanently. Re-tagging post-handover costs 3–5 times more than doing it right at handover (deployment evidence, 2022–2025).

7.4. Mandate a Vendor-Neutral Reference Architecture

Implement a Tier 4 Reference Architecture requiring open standards (IFC 4.3, Brick Schema, COBie, DTDL) and contractual portability rights before any platform is procured [6], [30].

Why this matters: the integration cost of a proprietary twin is invisible at Year 1. It becomes very visible at Year 3–5 when the organisation wants to change vendors, add use cases, or benchmark across sites and discovers that the data is locked in a format nothing else can read.

7.5. Shift FM Workforce Strategy from Manual Intervention to System Orchestration

Invest in training “twin operators”, facility professionals who interpret predictive alerts, manage exceptions, and execute closed-loop workflows, rather than expecting existing FM teams to adopt the twin without role redesign [3], [52].

Why this matters: the binding constraint on DT value in FM is not technology availability. It is operational acceptance. If FM teams distrust or ignore twin outputs, those outputs generate zero value regardless of how sophisticated the underlying model is.

7.6. Automate Compliance as a Value Driver, Not a Reporting Obligation

Use Tier 4–5 data pipelines to produce assurance-ready ESG outputs, traceable lineage, reproducible calculations, versioned KPI logic, evidence bundles, from the first operational deployment. Do not wait until an audit or GRESB submission deadline forces the issue [1], [38].

Why this matters: ESG reporting retrofitted onto a twin that was not designed for assurance requires reconstructing source data, calculation boundaries, and version history. This is often impossible to do accurately, exposing the organisation to audit qualification and investor confidence risk.

7.7. Govern Decision Rights Before Scaling Automation

Define the decision authority model, which recommendations require human approval, which actions can be automated, who owns accountability for outcomes and embed this in the governance framework before extending automation beyond a single building [39], [44], [3].

Why this matters: automation without decision rights governance creates accountability voids. These voids surface at the worst possible moment, a comfort failure, a safety incident, a regulatory inquiry, when nobody can produce an auditable record of who authorized what.

8. Conclusion

Commercial real estate organisations face a structural challenge that technology alone cannot solve. Lifecycle information remains fragmented across delivery phases. Operational workflows stay disconnected from analytical outputs. Value claims routinely outpace what governance and adoption practices can actually sustain.

This paper introduced CREST, a seven-tier practitioner-oriented framework comprising Strategic Canvas, Value Streams, Adoption Model, Reference Architecture, Deployment Playbook, Maturity Model, and ROI & Benefits Matrix. It is designed to close the gap between technology potential and delivery reality by linking strategic intent to repeatable deployment discipline and measurable operational outcomes across EN 15978 A and B lifecycle modules [22], [6], [3].

The central finding is not that Digital Twin technology is immature. It is that most CRE Digital Twin programmes fail for non-technical reasons. Skipped strategic alignment. Ungoverned data handovers at A5→B1. Proprietary architectures that trap data. Operational workflows that are never redesigned around twin outputs. CREST addresses each of these failure modes through stage-gated maturity progression, minimum data contracts per lifecycle phase, vendor-neutral reference architecture, and benefits measurement built into deployment from day one [2], [7], [23].

8.1. Limitations

This research carries four boundary conditions that limit generalizability.

First, the evidence base draws from a global CRE organisation, predominantly commercial office assets, industrial and retail project implementations. Independent replication across owner-operators, fund managers, and other asset classes, retail, industrial, healthcare, logistics, is needed before these results can be treated as sectorwide evidence.

Second, CREST explicitly covers EN 15978 Modules A and B. End-of-life phases (C1–C4), deconstruction, material recovery, circular economy applications, fall outside the validated scope.

Third, Cognitive Twin capabilities (Stage 4) are positioned as future-state. Validated evidence in this study concentrates at Digital Shadow and early Digital Twin maturity. Portfolio-scale autonomous optimisation and AI-driven capital allocation remain emerging practice.

Fourth, the regulatory landscape is moving fast. CSRD, the EU AI Act, and equivalent frameworks in APAC and North America are still being finalized. Compliance guidance will need periodic reassessment [1], [44].

8.2. Future Research Agenda

Five directions would most productively extend this work:

1. Cross-organisation and cross-asset validation of CREST tiers across owneroperators, institutional fund managers, and diverse asset types to test generalizability.
2. Quantitative benchmarking of stage-gate transition costs and timelines, establishing empirically grounded investment models for each CREST adoption stage.
3. Federated twin governance models for precinct and district-scale deployments, addressing data sovereignty, semantic mediation, and benefit-sharing across multiple owner-operators.
4. Longitudinal studies of ESG assurance outcomes in CSRD-regulated contexts, testing whether CREST-aligned data lineage withstands third-party auditor scrutiny over multi-year reporting cycles.

5. Human factors and FM workforce transition research examining how role redesign, training, and incentive alignment affect adoption rates and operational outcomes, an under-studied dimension of what is fundamentally a sociotechnical challenge.

The built environment's transition to data-driven operations is not a question of whether the technology is ready. It is a question of whether organisations choose to govern the transition with the same rigor they apply to capital investment, treating the Digital Twin not as a product to be procured, but as an operating capability to be earned.

References

- [1] M. B. R. METSOLA, DIRECTIVE (EU) 2022/2464 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2022/2464/oj> (2022).
- [2] C. Boje, A. Guerriero, S. Kubicki, Y. Rezgui, Towards a semantic construction digital twin: Directions for future research, *Automation in construction* 114 (2020) 103179.
- [3] A. Bolton, M. Enzer, J. Schooling, et al., The gemini principles: Guiding values for the national digital twin and information management framework. cambridge: Centre for digital built britain and digital framework task group (2018).
- [4] M. W. Grieves, Digital twins: past, present, and future, in: *The digital twin*, Springer, 2023, pp. 97–121.
- [5] H. Boyes, T. Watson, Digital twins: An analysis framework and open issues, *Computers in Industry* 143 (2022) 103763. doi:10.1016/j.compind.2022.103763.
- [6] digitaltwinconsortium.org, <https://shorturl.at/amYQf> (2026).
- [7] Q. Lu, X. Xie, A. K. Parlikad, J. M. Schooling, Digital twin-enabled anomaly detection for built asset monitoring in operation and maintenance, *Automation in Construction* 118 (2020) 103277.
- [8] iiconsortium.org, <https://www.iiconsortium.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2022/11/{I}{I}{R}{A}-v1.10.pdf>, [Accessed 15-04-2026].
- [9] R. Joshi, P. Didier, C. Holmberg, J. Jimenez, T. Carey, The industrial internet of things connectivity framework, *An Industry IoT Consortium, Foundational Document* (2022) 06–08.
- [10] S.-W. Lin, K. Watson, G. Shao, L. Stojanovic, B. Zarkout, *Digital twin core conceptual models and services*, Industrial IoT Consortium Framework Publication: Boston, MA, USA (2023).
- [11] BS EN 15978:2011 — 30 Nov 2011 — BSI Knowledge — knowledge.bsigroup.com, <https://shorturl.at/PEN6j>, [Accessed 15-04-2026].
- [12] ISO 14040:2006 — iso.org, <https://www.iso.org/standard/37456.html>, [Accessed 15-04-2026].
- [13] A. ASTM, *Standard practice for measuring life-cycle costs of buildings and building systems* (2005).
- [14] ISO 19650-1:2018 — iso.org, <https://www.iso.org/standard/68078.html>, [Accessed 15-04-2026].

- [15] mckinsey.com, <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/operations/ourinsights/reinventing-construction-through-a-productivity-revolution>, [Accessed 15-04-2026].
- [16] J. B. J. S. N. S. Eric Thomas, Peter Schott, Construction Disconnected: Rethinking the management of project data and mobile collaboration to reduce costs and improve schedules, https://www.autodesk.com/blogs/construction/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Construction_Disconnected.pdf, [Accessed 16-04-2026] (2018).
- [17] Digital twins can pump up industrial outcomes — action.deloitte.com, <https://action.deloitte.com/insight/3503/digital-twins-can-pump-up-industrial-outcomes>, [Accessed 15-04-2026].
- [18] GRESB Documents — documents.gresb.com, https://documents.gresb.com/generated_files/real_estate/2024/real_estate/reference_guide/complete.html, [Accessed 16-04-2026] (2024).
- [19] 2026 Asia Pacific Real Estate Market Outlook — cbre.com, <https://lnk.ua/NRBWmgQPO>.
- [20] cdbb.cam.ac.uk, <https://www.cdbb.cam.ac.uk/system/files/documents/{T}he{G}emini{P}rinciples.pdf>, [Accessed 17-04-2026].
- [21] M. Abdelrahman, E. Macatulad, B. Lei, M. Quintana, C. Miller, F. Biljecki, What is a digital twin anyway? deriving the definition for the built environment from over 15,000 scientific publications, *Building and Environment* 274 (2025) 112748.
- [22] M. Grieves, J. Vickers, Digital twin: Mitigating unpredictable, undesirable emergent behavior in complex systems, in: *Transdisciplinary perspectives on complex systems: New findings and approaches*, Springer, 2016, pp. 85–113.
- [23] F. Richter, K. Campbell, J. Riedl, Lost in translation: why digital twins thrive in research but falter in politics and public administration, *Data & Policy* 7 (2025) e71.
- [24] LL97 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction - Buildings — nyc.gov, <https://www.nyc.gov/site/buildings/codes/1197-greenhouse-gas-emissions-reductions.page>, [Accessed 15-04-2026].
- [25] J. P. Womack, D. T. Jones, Lean thinking—banish waste and create wealth in your corporation, *Journal of the operational research society* 48 (11) (1997) 1148–1148.
- [26] M. Rother, J. Shook, Value-stream mapping to create value and eliminate muda, *The Lean Enterprise Institute*, Brookline 16 (1999).
- [27] Lack of AI-Ready Data Puts AI Projects at Risk — gartner.com, <https://www.gartner.com/en/newsroom/press-releases/2025-02-26-lack-of-ai-ready-data-puts-ai-projects-at-risk>, [Accessed 16-04-2026].
- [28] Gartner Predicts 30% of Generative AI Projects Will Be Abandoned After Proof of Concept By End of 2025 — gartner.com, <https://www.gartner.com/en/newsroom/press-releases>.
- [29] Industry Foundation Classes (IFC) - buildingSMART International — buildingsmart.org, <https://www.buildingsmart.org/standards/bsi-standards/industry-foundation-classes/>, [Accessed 15-04-2026].

[30] B. Balaji, A. Bhattacharya, G. Fierro, J. Gao, J. Gluck, D. Hong, A. Johansen, J. Koh, J. Ploennigs, Y. Agarwal, et al., Brick: Towards a unified metadata schema for buildings, in: Proceedings of the 3rd ACM International Conference on Systems for Energy-Efficient Built Environments, 2016, pp. 41–50.

[31] CONSTRUCTION TO OPERATIONS BUILDING INFORMATION EXCHANGE (COBie) V3 – National Institute of Building Sciences — nibs.org, <https://nibs.org/nbims/v3/cobie/>, [Accessed 15-04-2026].

[32] ASHRAE BACnet Committee Works with Other Organizations on New Standard — ashrae.org — ashrae.org, <https://www.ashrae.org/news/esociety/ashrae-bacnet-committee-works-with-other-organizations-on-new-standard>, [Accessed 15-04-2026].

[33] CMSBlueTheme, Resources — marketing.project-haystack.org, <https://marketing.project-haystack.org/project-haystack-resources/guide-specifications>, [Accessed 15-04-2026].

[34] baanders, DTDL models - Azure Digital Twins — learn.microsoft.com, <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/digital-twins/concepts-models>, [Accessed 15-04-2026] (2026).

[35] K. Scarfone, The NIST Cybersecurity Framework (CSF) 2.0 — nist.gov, <https://www.nist.gov/publications/nist-cybersecurity-framework-csf-20>, [Accessed 15-04-2026].

[36] ISO/IEC 27001:2022 — iso.org, <https://www.iso.org/standard/27001>, [Accessed 15-04-2026].

[37] C. Zhang, D. Arditi, Automated progress control using laser scanning technology, Automation in construction 36 (2013) 108–116.

[38] GRESB Documents — documents.gresb.com, https://documents.gresb.com/generated_files/real_estate/2025/real_estate/reference_guide/complete.html, [Accessed 16-04-2026] (2025).

[39] B. Zarkout, Digital Twin Core Conceptual Models and Services — nist.gov, <https://www.nist.gov/publications/digital-twin-core-conceptual-models-and-services>, [Accessed 15-04-2026].

[40] C. M. Eastman, BIM handbook: A guide to building information modeling for owners, managers, designers, engineers and contractors, John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

[41] Powering Best Practice — ITIL®, PRINCE2® and MSP® — Axelos — axelos.com, <https://www.axelos.com/store/book/management-of-value-mov>, [Accessed 16-04-2026].

[42] J. Ward, E. Daniel, Benefits Management: How to increase the business value of your IT projects (2nd Edition), 2012.

[43] Regulation - 2016/679 - EN - gdpr - EUR-Lex — eur-lex.europa.eu, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj>, [Accessed 16-04-2026].

[44] M. M. R. METSOLA, REGULATION (EU) 2024/1689 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj>, [Accessed 16-04-2026] (2024).

[45] Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.2 — w3.org, <https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG22/>, [Accessed 15-04-2026].

[46] J. Gil, D. Petrova-Antonova, G. J. Kemp, Redefining urban digital twins for the federated data spaces ecosystem: A perspective, Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science (2024) 23998083241302578.

[47] L. Todorean, T. Cioara, I. Anghel, E. Sarmas, V. Michalakopoulos, V. Marinakis, Demand response optimization for smart grid integrated buildings: Review of technology enablers landscape and innovation challenges, Energy and Buildings 326 (2025) 115067.

[48] IEA, Efficient Grid-Interactive Buildings, <https://www.iea.org/reports/efficient-grid-interactive-buildings>, [Accessed 16-04-2026] (2023).

[49] A. Khan, S. Chang, H. Chang, Generative ai approaches for architectural design automation, Automation in Construction 180 (2025) 106506.

[50] U. Aftab, R. Agliata, Material passports for digital and circular construction: a bibliometric and thematic analysis, Journal of Cleaner Production 543 (2026) 147651.

[51] S. Bao, H. Bu, Defining and generating operation and maintenance management requirements in digital twin applications using the dt-gpt framework, Journal of Building Engineering 104 (2025) 112356.

[52] M. Signorini, A. P. Pomè, Shaping the future of facility management. market and literature insights on digital twin adoption, Facilities 43 (11-12) (2025) 818– 834.

