

EXPLORING INFLUENCING FACTORS IN THE INDIAN REAL ESTATE SECTOR FROM A PROCESS STANDARDISATION PERSPECTIVE

KAMAL KUMAR MUKHERJEE



DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI
APRIL 2019

EXPLORING INFLUENCING FACTORS IN THE INDIAN REAL ESTATE SECTOR FROM A PROCESS STANDARDISATION PERSPECTIVE

by

Kamal Kumar Mukherjee

Department of Civil Engineering

Submitted

in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

APRIL 2019

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis titled "EXPLORING INFLUENCING FACTORS IN THE INDIAN REAL ESTATE SECTOR FROM A PROCESS STANDARDISATION PERSPECTIVE" being submitted by Kamal K Mukherjee to the Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi for the award of a degree of Doctor of Philosophy is a bona fide record of the research work carried out by him under our supervision and guidance. The thesis work, in our opinion, has attained the requisite standard for fulfilling the requirements of the said degree. The results contained in this thesis have not been submitted in part or full to any other University or Institute for award of any degree or diploma.

K. Chandra 04/04/2019

Dr K. Chandrashekhar Iyer
Professor
Department of Civil Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology
New Delhi
India

Anil Sawhney

Dr Anil Sawhney
Director of the Infrastructure Sector,
RICS
60 East 42nd Street, Suite 542
New York, NY 10165
USA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There is a galaxy of people whose contribution into this piece of research must be acknowledged.

First, my supervisors, Prof K C Iyer and Prof Anil Sawhney, who never let their guidance, support and interest flag, in me or the research, despite my work commitment taking me out of the research for considerable periods of time. I owe an enormous lot to them. Without them, the work could not have been completed.

Next, the stakeholders who made themselves available for interaction during the course of this research. As most of them were new acquaintances, it was extremely helpful, even magnanimous on their part, to have made themselves available for extended periods of time for the research. To nearly 200 stakeholders who gave a complete response to the web-based questionnaire that is known to have taken at least 45 minutes, I owe an extra measure of gratitude.

Among stakeholders I had interacted with are those who served as nuclei, not just for ideas but also for leading me to more people in their network. I count Prof Sunil Agarwal of RICS in Amity University, NOIDA and my cousin Mr Rajiv Banerjee, a graduate in Civil Engineering from IIT-BHU (Varanasi) and currently a faculty in a prominent educational institution, as the foremost among them. At times when I struggled to find more people who could take the web-based survey and pestered them to find me more potential respondents, they were always forthcoming with fresh names of people I could interact with. Mr Mahesh Durgi from DLF also similarly rallied people from his own network.

Though not quite in the same age bracket, my fellow research scholars provided help far beyond what would normally be expected. When, for example, the stakeholder base for responses to the questionnaire threatened to have hit a ceiling, they connected me to many from their own networks who related to the Real Estate sector. Very much in the same age class were Dr Partha S Banerjee and Dr Dhruba Purukayastha, both of whom had completed their research efforts in recent times. Nuggets of wisdom they shared have been of immense value. I make a special note of thanks for Dr Banerjee for sharing insights into statistical analysis that helped me break ground.

To the institution of IIT Delhi I owe a special note of gratitude for providing me the opportunity to pursue this research. Having been through the system during my undergraduate days I now become doubly indebted to the IIT system.

Finally, I thank my parents, and my wife and daughter- the former for having taught me to struggle, and the latter for being fellow-participants in that struggle. With this research keeping me unavailable to them for extended periods of time, it is to them that I dedicate this work.

Kamal Kumar Mukherjee

New Delhi, India

4th April 2019

ABSTRACT

A perceived uniqueness of real estate (RE) projects has led to a view among RE practitioners that since no two RE projects are the same, they must all follow their own unique set of processes. Further, local exigencies often result in the very processes agreed at the beginning of every project being changed, thereby making projects unpredictable for delivery within time and budget, or to standards of quality expected. Maintaining the need to follow pre-defined standard processes in RE operations, this research establishes the efficacy of adopting process standardisation while executing RE operations.

in building the case for adopting process standardisation, the current research extends the paradigm shift from function to process unfolding in several industries and explores the potential of standardisation in this process-centric approach using generic process formulations and specific possibilities in the context of RE operations. The research integrally also considers how an operations regime in the RE sector based on processes and their standardisation could be helped by two impactful developments in information and communication technologies (ICTs): rising affordability of ICT devices, and ubiquity of high-bandwidth ICT networks. Further, the research provides justification for adopting a digitally-enabled approach based on process standardisation by relating it to key RE sector objectives, formulated from a sector competitiveness viewpoint.

The research methodology adopted initially focuses on two converging tracks with the first accessing relevant sector competitiveness literature to formulate RE sector objectives. Retaining the process standardisation perspective, the second track synthesises findings from existing literature on process standardisation with a qualitative interpretive analysis of semi-structured interviews with 30 Indian RE sector practitioners working at levels of consequence, to comprehensively identify a clutch of inhibiting (12) and enabling (14) variables that would matter from a standpoint of processes and their standardisation. With a nation-wide survey of adequate sample strength, the research then seeks stakeholder views on how the identified variables relate to each of the sector objectives formulated. A rigorous Principal Components Analysis is then deployed on survey responses to identify, for each of the RE sector objectives, possible combination of factors that would impact

each RE sector objective. In the next step, another round of stakeholder consultation is used to select the most suitable set of factors for every RE objective as understood by a third set of stakeholders with long-standing hands-on experience in the Indian RE sector.

In the final phase of this research, activities to be executed on ground are proposed to realise ideas emerging from this work. This is accomplished by building an equivalence between RE sector, where standardised process-based operations are sought to be implemented in a whole-of-sector approach, to similar efforts in the public sector where, worldwide, whole-of-government initiatives from an operations perspective has acquired momentum and is being pursued by many national governments across the globe. Relating RE sector operations from a process standardisation perspective with the public sector leads to nine intervention directions for the RE sector. Drawing a link between RE sector operations and WoG initiatives in the public sector also leads to associating a relative importance with each of the intervention directions separately for each of the four RE sector objectives formulated, as well as for all the objectives considered together.

Four objectives including growth and profitability, predictability and quality of operations, availability and deployment of skilled human resources, and governance, are identified for the RE sector. The findings clearly show standardisation of processes and associated attributes as an influencing factor for all the sector objectives formulated. They also show that standardisation of attributes associated with processes and availability of digital infrastructure and utilities are key enablers for process standardisation efforts in the RE sector.

This work extends the earlier research to shift from a function to process orientation in RE and bridges research gaps in the formulation of objectives for RE sector and establishing a connection between the synergistic adoption of processes, their standardisation, and technology with RE sector objectives. The research work also proposes broad intervention directions for activities that must be executed on ground to realise ideas emerging from this work.

रियल एस्टेट (RE) परियोजनाओं की कथित विशिष्टता ने RE व्यवसायियों के बीच एक दृष्टिकोण पैदा किया है कि चूंकि कोई दो RE परियोजनाएं समान नहीं हैं, इसलिए उनके सभी प्रक्रियाओं को अपने अद्वितीय सेट का पालन करना चाहिए। इसके अलावा, स्थानीय आवश्यकताओं के परिणामस्वरूप अक्सर हर परियोजना के शुरू होने पर सहमत हुई प्रक्रिया भी परिवर्तित की जाती है, जिससे परियोजनाएं समय और बजट के भीतर वितरण के लिए प्रतिकूल हो जाती हैं, या उनसे अपेक्षित गुणवत्ता नहीं मिल पाता है। RE संचालन में पूर्व-निर्धारित मानक प्रक्रियाओं का पालन करने की आवश्यकता को बनाए रखते हुए, यह शोध RE संचालन को निष्पादित करते समय प्रक्रिया मानकीकरण को अपनाने की प्रभावकारिता स्थापित करता है।

प्रक्रिया मानकीकरण को अपनाने के मामले में, वर्तमान शोध कई उद्योगों में सामने आने वाली फ़ंक्शन (function) से प्रक्रिया (process) की ओर बदलाव को विस्तृत करता है और RE प्रक्रिया के संदर्भ में सामान्य प्रक्रिया योगों और विशिष्ट संभावनाओं का उपयोग करते हुए इस प्रक्रिया-केंद्रित दृष्टिकोण में मानकीकरण की क्षमता का पता लगाता है। यह अनुसंधान अभिन्न रूप से यह भी मानता है कि प्रक्रियाओं और उनके मानकीकरण के आधार पर RE क्षेत्र में एक संचालन शासन कैसे सूचना और संचार प्रौद्योगिकी (ICT) में दो प्रभावशाली घटनाक्रमों से मदद प्राप्त कर सकता है: ICT उपकरणों की घटती कीमतों, और उच्च बैंडविड्थ ICT नेटवर्क की सर्वव्यापकता। इसके अलावा, अनुसंधान एक प्रतिस्पर्धात्मक दृष्टिकोण से तैयार किए गए प्रमुख RE क्षेत्र के उद्देश्यों से संबंधित होकर, मानकीकरण-सक्षम दृष्टिकोण को अपनाने का औचित्य प्रदान करता है।

शुरू में अपनाई गई अनुसंधान पद्धति दो अभिसरण पटरियों पर केंद्रित है, जिसमें से पहला प्रासंगिक क्षेत्र प्रतिस्पर्धात्मक के दृष्टि से RE सेक्टर के उद्देश्यों को परिभाषित करता है। प्रक्रिया मानकीकरण के दृष्टिकोण को बनाए रखते हुए दूसरी पटरी प्रक्रिया मानकीकरण पर मौजूदा साहित्य से अर्द्ध-संरचित साक्षात्कार के गुणात्मक व्याख्यात्मक विश्लेषण के साथ निष्कर्षों का संश्लेषण करता है, जिसके अंतर्गत प्रभावशाली स्तरों पर काम करने वाले 30 भारतीय RE क्षेत्र के व्यवसायियों से अवरोध (12) और सक्षम (14) बनाने वाले चर की पहचान करता है जो प्रक्रियाओं और उनके मानकीकरण के दृष्टिकोण से मायने रखते हैं। पर्याप्त नमूना शक्ति के एक राष्ट्रव्यापी सर्वेक्षण के साथ, अनुसंधान तब stakeholders से विचार करता है कि कैसे पहचाने गए चर सेक्टर के प्रत्येक उद्देश्यों से संबंधित हैं। एक व्यापक प्रिंसिपल कंपोनेंट एनालिसिस के सहारे RE सेक्टर के उद्देश्यों के लिए, प्रत्येक RE सेक्टर के उद्देश्य को प्रभावित करने वाले

कारकों (factors) के संभावित समूहों की पहचान की जाती है। अगले चरण में, प्रत्येक RE सेक्टर उद्देश्य के लिए कारकों के सबसे उपयुक्त सेट का चयन करने के लिए stakeholder परामर्श का एक और दौर उपयोग किया जाता है, जिसके अंतर्गत भारतीय RE sector में लंबे समय से कार्यरत stakeholders द्वारा समझा जाता है।

इस शोध के अंतिम चरण में, इस कार्य से उभरने वाले विचारों को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए जमीन पर निष्पादित होने वाली गतिविधियों का प्रस्ताव है। यह RE क्षेत्र एवं सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के बीच एक समानता का निर्माण करके पूरा किया जाता है। जहाँ एक ओर RE क्षेत्र में मानकीकृत प्रक्रिया-आधारित संचालन को पूरे क्षेत्र के दृष्टिकोण में लागू करने की मांग की जा रही है, वहीं सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में समान प्रयासों के अंतर्गत दुनिया भर में सरकार की ओर से संपूर्ण पहल संचालन (Whole-of-Government अथवा WoG) के दृष्टिकोण ने गति प्राप्त कर ली है और कई राष्ट्रीय सरकारों द्वारा इसका अनुसरण किया जा रहा है। सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के साथ तुलना के परिणामस्वरूप प्रक्रिया मानकीकरण के दृष्टिकोण से RE क्षेत्र के संचालन से संबंधित RE क्षेत्र के लिए नौ(9) हस्तक्षेप निर्देश सुझाए गए हैं। RE में पूरे क्षेत्र के दृष्टिकोण और सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में WoG के बीच एक कड़ी आकर्षित करने से प्रत्येक RE सेक्टर उद्देश्य के लिए, और संपूर्ण सेक्टर के लिए, अलग-अलग हस्तक्षेप दिशाओं के बीच तुलनात्मक महत्व का भी अनुमान लगाया गया है।

RE सेक्टर के लिए (a) विकास और लाभप्रदता, (b) पूर्वानुमान एवं उपलब्धता, (c) कुशल मानव संसाधनों की उपलब्धता और तैनाती, और (d) प्रभावी शासन पद्धति सहित चार उद्देश्यों की पहचान की जाती है। निष्कर्ष स्पष्ट रूप से तैयार किए गए सभी क्षेत्रों के उद्देश्यों के लिए एक कारक के रूप में प्रक्रियाओं और संबंधित विशेषताओं के मानकीकरण को दिखाते हैं। वे यह भी बताते हैं कि RE क्षेत्र में प्रक्रिया मानकीकरण प्रयासों के लिए डिजिटल बुनियादी ढांचे और डिजिटल उपयोगिताओं की उपलब्धता प्रमुख प्रवर्तक हैं।

यह शोध RE क्षेत्र में फ़ंक्शन-उन्मुख से प्रक्रिया-आधारित कार्य प्रणाली हेतु पहले के शोध का विस्तार करता है एवं RE क्षेत्र के उद्देश्यों के साथ प्रक्रियाओं, उनके मानकीकरण, और प्रौद्योगिकी के तालमेल को अपनाने के बीच संबंध हेतु शोध में त्रुटियों को भी आंशिक रूप से भरता है। यह शोध भविष्य की गतिविधियों के लिए व्यापक हस्तक्षेप दिशाओं का प्रस्ताव रखता है जिन्हें इस कार्य से उभरने वाले विचारों को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए जमीन पर निष्पादित किया जाना चाहिए।

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1	1
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 THE INDIAN REAL ESTATE (RE) SECTOR	1
1.2 RESEARCH CONTEXT	4
1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH	5
1.4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY IN BRIEF	6
1.5 ORGANISATION OF THE THESIS	7
CHAPTER 2	11
2. BACKGROUND OF THE REAL ESTATE SECTOR	11
2.1 INTRODUCTION	11
2.2 DEFINITIONS EMPLOYED FOR REAL ESTATE	11
2.3 STAGES IN THE RE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS	14
2.4 DISCIPLINES OF ACTIVITIES IN A REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT	17
2.5 STAKEHOLDERS IN THE RE SECTOR	19
2.6 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONSTRUCTION AND RE SECTORS	21
2.7 SPECIFICITIES ASSOCIATED WITH RE SECTOR	22
2.8 CASE FOR A STANDARDISED PROCESS-BASED APPROACH AND ICT IN THE RE SECTOR	35
2.9 DETAILS OF A STANDARDISED PROCESS-BASED APPROACH AIDED BY ICT	45
2.10 CONCLUDING REMARKS	53
CHAPTER 3	55
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	55
3.1 INTRODUCTION	55
3.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE COMPOSITE METHODOLOGY	55
3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN	62
3.4 ALTERNATIVE METHODOLOGIES CONSIDERED	73
3.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS	75
CHAPTER 4	77
4. COMPETITIVENESS CONCEPTS AND THE FORMULATION OF RE SECTOR OBJECTIVES	77

4.1	INTRODUCTION.....	77
4.2	THE CONCEPT OF COMPETITIVENESS	77
4.3	COMPETITIVENESS IN THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY	78
4.4	ANALYSING AVAILABLE COMPETITIVENESS FRAMEWORKS APPROPRIATE FOR RE SECTOR IN THE RESEARCH CONTEXT	81
4.5	RE SECTOR OBJECTIVES FROM A COMPETITIVENESS PERSPECTIVE .	83
4.6	CONCLUDING REMARKS	83
CHAPTER 5.....		85
5.	IDENTIFICATION OF CONCOMITANT INHIBITING AND ENABLING VARIABLES	85
5.1	INTRODUCTION.....	85
5.2	CONCOMITANT INHIBITING AND ENABLING VARIABLES FOR RE SECTOR COMPETITIVENESS.....	85
5.3	CONCLUDING REMARKS	88
CHAPTER 6.....		91
6.	ASSOCIATION OF INHIBITING AND ENABLING VARIABLES WITH RE SECTOR OBJECTIVES.....	91
6.1	RE SECTOR OBJECTIVE 1: SECTOR GROWTH and PROFITABILITY.....	93
6.2	RE SECTOR OBJECTIVE 2: PREDICTABILITY OF OPERATIONS AND QUALITY OF SERVICE DELIVERY	102
6.3	RE SECTOR OBJECTIVE 3: SUSTAINED GENERATION AND DEPLOYMENT OF SKILLED HUMAN RESOURCES	109
6.4	RE SECTOR OBJECTIVE 4: SECTOR GOVERNANCE FOR COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS AND NORMS	117
6.5	CONCLUDING REMARKS	125
CHAPTER 7		127
7	INTERVENTION DIRECTIONS FOR RE SECTOR COMPETITIVENESS	127
7.1	SECTOR-LEVEL PROCESS STANDARDISATION IN OTHER DOMAINS .	127
7.2	EQUIVALENCE BETWEEN RE AND GOVERNMENT SECTOR FROM A PROCESS STANDARDISATION PERSPECTIVE	129
7.3	BROAD INTERVENTION DIRECTIONS DERIVED FROM AN EQUIVALENCE BETWEEN RE AND GOVERNMENT SECTORS	133
7.4	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE AMONG THE INTERVENTION DIRECTIONS..	134
7.5	SUMMARISING RELATIVE IMPORTANCE AMONG THE INTERVENTION DIRECTIONS.....	140
7.6	CONCLUDING REMARKS	141
CHAPTER 8.....		145

8	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	145
8.1	SUMMARY OF THE CURRENT RESEARCH.....	145
8.2	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	146
8.3	SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE CURRENT RESEARCH.....	148
8.4	LIMITATIONS OF THE CURRENT RESEARCH.....	149
8.5	DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	150
8.6	PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR THE CURRENT RESEARCH	153
	REFERENCES.....	155

Appendices

A1	FACTORS FOR RE SECTOR OBJECTIVE RE-OB₁: SECTOR GROWTH AND PROFITABILITY	1
A1.1	Factors for Scenario I: 55% Variance Representation.....	1
A1.2	Factors for Scenario II: 65% Variance Representation	3
A1.3	Factors for Scenario III: 75% Variance Representation	6
A2	FACTORS FOR RE SECTOR OBJECTIVE RE-OB₂: PREDICTABILITY OF OPERATIONS AND QUALITY OF SERVICE DELIVERY	8
A2.1	Factors for Scenario I: 55% Variance Representation.....	8
A2.2	Factors for Scenario II: 65% Variance Representation	10
A2.3	Factors for Scenario III: 75% Variance Representation	12
A3	FACTORS FOR RE SECTOR OBJECTIVE RE-OB₃: SUSTAINED GENERATION AND DEPLOYMENT OF SKILLED HUMAN RESOURCES	14
A3.1	Factors for Scenario I: 55% Variance Representation.....	14
A3.2	Factors for Scenario II: 65% Variance Representation	16
A3.3	Factors for Scenario III: 75% Variance Representation	19
A4	FACTORS FOR RE SECTOR OBJECTIVE RE-OB₄: GOVERNANCE FOR BETTER COMPLIANCE WITH NORMS AND GUIDELINES	21
A4.1	Factors for Scenario I: 55% Variance Representation.....	21
A4.2	Factors for Scenario II: 65% Variance Representation	23
A4.3	Factors for Scenario III: 75% Variance Representation	25
A5	WEB-BASED QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO SURVEY RESPONDENTS ..	28
A6	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RELATED TO THIS RESEARCH	33
A7	PROFILE OF THE RESEARCHER	34

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Brief schematic of the Research Methodology followed for the work	9
Figure 2.1	Conceptualisation of the Built Environment Sector including Real Estate by Eriksson et al. (2011)	13
Figure 2.2	Hierarchy in theatres of activity in RE suggested by Ahuja et al. (2009)	14
Figure 2.3	Seven Stages of RE Development conceptualised by Kohlhepp (2012)	15
Figure 2.4	Six Stages of RE Development by Bullock and Sullivan (2009)	16
Figure 2.5	Illustrative Cyclical RE Development Stages	16
Figure 2.6	Juxtaposition of Stakeholder Groups adopted for this research with those of Graaskamp (1992) and Roulac (1995)	20
Figure 2.7	RE Stakeholder Groups' Conceptualisation for the Research	23
Figure 2.8	Principal Recommendations made by the Construction Taskforce led by Sir John Egan (1998)	38
Figure 2.9	Impact of Process Standardisation on Process Performance by Münstermann et al (2010)	43
Figure 2.10	The three levels of transformation through adoption of process, standards and ICT	46
Figure 2.11	Categories of pre-assemblies (Source Gibb and Frank (2003))	52
Figure 3.1	Composite Research Methodology	56
Figure 3.2	Model for Principal Component Analysis (DeCoster, 1998)	59
Figure 3.3	Schematic View of Scenarios, Components and Most Relevant Scenario during Statistical Analysis of Responses	61
Figure 3.4	Frequency Chart and Word Cloud of recurring words in semi-structured interviews	64
Figure 3.5	Experience Profile of Respondents	67
Figure 3.6	Location Profile of Respondents	67
Figure 3.7	Vocation Profile of Respondents	68
Figure 4.1	Industry as a Value-adding Unit by Momaya (1998)	79
Figure 4.2	Attributes of APP Framework by Momaya and Selby (1998)	79
Figure 4.3	Construction Industry Competitiveness Hexagon by Ericsson et al. (2004)	80
Figure 4.4	Performance Indicators for Construction Industry Competitiveness (conceived by Ericsson et al. (2004))	82
Figure 4.5	Depiction of the “Connect” between Inhibiting/Enabling Variables and RE Sector Objectives from a competitiveness standpoint	82
Figure 6.1	Methodology for Statistical Analysis of Data	94
Figure 7.1	Drawing an Equivalence between RE and the Government Sector	130
Figure 7.2	Equivalence between Baseline Conditions of WoG delivery model and whole-of-sector approach in RE	135
Figure 7.3	Summary of Research Output- Representing the Connection between the defined problem with the solution space	143
Figure 8.1	Possible Implementation Scenarios of Process and Standards-driven Roadmap	152

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	RE Development Stages and their Constituent Activities	17
Table 2.2	Disciplines of Activities in the RE Development Process.....	18
Table 2.3	Benefits from BPS (adapted and enhanced from Münstermann and Weitzel (2008),Münstermann et al. (2010) and Romero et al. (2015))	42
Table 2.4	Sub-dimensions of process and manifestation (adapted from (Münstermann and Weitzel, 2008))	47
Table 3.1	Profile of participants in semi-structured interviews.....	62
Table 3.2	Suggested sample size using the STV criterion.....	68
Table 3.3	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin values and Sample Adequacy	69
Table 4.1	Elements of Ericsson’s Competitiveness Hexagon Framework for the Construction Industry (as extracted from Ericsson et al. (2004))	81
Table 5.1	Variables deduced from observations by interviewees and perusal of secondary literature.....	86
Table 5.2	Research Outputs (Sector Objectives and Inhibiting/Enabling Variables)	88
Table 6.1	Preliminary Investigation Criteria and corresponding benchmarks/ rules to ensure efficacy of Principal Component Analysis on Stakeholder Responses	91
Table 6.2	p-values for n=3 and m=5 for concordance analysis for different values of S as provided by Kendall and Smith (1939)	93
Table 6.3	Brief Profiles of Judges Consulted for Concordance Analysis for RE-OB ₁	93
Table 6.4	Inhibiting Factors representing 55% Variance for RE-OB ₁	95
Table 6.5	Inhibiting Factors representing 65% Variance for RE-OB ₁	95
Table 6.6	Inhibiting Factors representing 75% Variance for RE-OB ₁	96
Table 6.7	Scores, with derived “Ranks”, given by Judges evaluating the 3 Inhibiting Scenarios for RE-OB ₁	97
Table 6.8	Enabling Factors representing 55% Variance for RE-OB ₁	97
Table 6.9	Enabling Factors representing 65% Variance for RE-OB ₁	98
Table 6.10	Enabling Factors representing 75% Variance for RE-OB ₁	98
Table 6.11	Scores, with derived “Ranks”, given by Judges evaluating the 3 Enabling Scenarios for RE-OB ₁	99
Table 6.12	Most Suitable Inhibiting Factors and constituent variables for RE-OB ₁	100
Table 6.13	Most Suitable Enabling Factors and constituent variables for RE-OB ₁	100
Table 6.14	Brief Profiles of Judges Consulted for Concordance Analysis for RE-OB ₂	102
Table 6.15	Inhibiting Factors representing 55% Variance for RE-OB ₂	103
Table 6.16	Inhibiting Factors representing 65% Variance for RE-OB ₂	103
Table 6.17	Inhibiting Factors representing 75% Variance for RE-OB ₂	104
Table 6.18	Scores, with derived “Ranks”, given by Judges evaluating the 3 Inhibiting Scenarios for RE-OB ₂	104
Table 6.19	Enabling Factors representing 55% Variance for RE-OB ₂	105
Table 6.20	Enabling Factors representing 65% Variance for RE-OB ₂	105
Table 6.21	Enabling Factors representing 75% Variance for RE-OB ₂	106

Table 6.22	Scores, with derived “Ranks”, given by Judges evaluating the 3 Enabling Scenarios for RE-OB ₂	107
Table 6.23	Most Suitable Inhibiting Factors and constituent variables for RE-OB ₂	107
Table 6.24	Most Suitable Enabling Factors and constituent variables for RE-OB ₂	108
Table 6.25	Brief Profiles of Judges Consulted for Concordance Analysis for RE-OB ₃	109
Table 6.26	Inhibiting Factors representing 55% Variance for RE-OB ₃	110
Table 6.27	Inhibiting Factors representing 65% Variance for RE-OB ₃	111
Table 6.28	Inhibiting Factors representing 75% Variance for RE-OB ₃	112
Table 6.29	Scores, with derived “Ranks”, given by Judges evaluating the 3 Inhibiting Scenarios for RE-OB ₃	112
Table 6.30	Enabling Factors representing 55% Variance for RE-OB ₃	113
Table 6.31	Enabling Factors representing 65% Variance for RE-OB ₃	113
Table 6.32	Enabling Factors representing 75% Variance for RE-OB ₃	114
Table 6.33	Scores, with derived “Ranks”, given by Judges evaluating the 3 Enabling Scenarios for RE-OB ₃	115
Table 6.34	Most Suitable Inhibiting Factors and constituent variables for RE-OB ₃	115
Table 6.35	Most Suitable Enabling Factors and constituent variables for RE-OB ₃	116
Table 6.36	Brief Profiles of Judges Consulted for Concordance Analysis for RE-OB ₄	117
Table 6.37	Inhibiting Factors representing 55% Variance for RE-OB ₄	118
Table 6.38	Inhibiting Factors representing 65% Variance for RE-OB ₄	119
Table 6.39	Inhibiting Factors representing 75% Variance for RE-OB ₄	119
Table 6.40	Scores, with derived “Ranks”, given by Judges evaluating the 3 Inhibiting Scenarios for RE-OB ₄	120
Table 6.41	Enabling Factors representing 55% Variance for RE-OB ₄	121
Table 6.42	Enabling Factors representing 65% Variance for RE-OB ₄	121
Table 6.43	Enabling Factors representing 75% Variance for RE-OB ₄	122
Table 6.44	Scores, with derived “Ranks”, given by Judges evaluating the 3 Enabling Scenarios for RE-OB ₄	122
Table 6.45	Most Suitable Inhibiting Factors and constituent variables for RE-OB ₄	123
Table 6.46	Most Suitable Enabling Factors and constituent variables for RE-OB ₄	123
Table 6.47	Most Suitable set of Inhibiting and Enabling Factors for the different RE Sector Objectives formulated	126
Table 7.1	Baseline conditions for WoG approach as realised in Australia	131
Table 7.2	Relating Intervention Directions to most suitable Inhibiting and Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₁	136
Table 7.3	Relative Importance of Intervention Directions for Sector Objective 1 (RE-OB ₁).....	136
Table 7.4	Relating Intervention Directions to most suitable Inhibiting and Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₂	137
Table 7.5	Relative Importance of Intervention Directions for Sector Objective 2 (RE-OB ₂).....	137

Table 7.6	Relating Intervention Directions to most suitable Inhibiting and Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₃	138
Table 7.7	Relative Importance of Intervention Directions for Sector Objective 3 (RE-OB ₃).....	138
Table 7.8	Relating Intervention Directions to most suitable Inhibiting and Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₄	139
Table 7.9	Relative Importance of Intervention Directions for Sector Objective 4 (RE-OB ₄).....	139
Table 7.10	Consolidating Relative Importance of Intervention Directions for all sector objectives taken together	140
Table 8.1	Explanation of the Nodes in Figure 8.1.....	152

List of Tables in Appendices

Table A1-1	Inhibiting Factors for RE-OB ₁ (Scenario I-55% Variance Representation)	1
Table A1-2	Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₁ (Scenario I-55% Variance Representation)	2
Table A1-3	Inhibiting Factors for RE-OB ₁ (Scenario II-65% Variance Representation)	3
Table A1-4	Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₁ (Scenario II-65% Variance Representation)	4
Table A1-5	Inhibiting Factors for RE-OB ₁ (Scenario III-75% Variance Representation)	6
Table A1-6	Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₁ (Scenario III-75% Variance Representation)	7
Table A2-1	Inhibiting Factors for RE-OB ₂ (Scenario I-55% Variance Representation)	8
Table A2-2	Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₂ (Scenario I-55% Variance Representation)	9
Table A2-3	Inhibiting Factors for RE-OB ₂ (Scenario II-65% Variance Representation)	10
Table A2-4	Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₂ (Scenario II-65% Variance Representation)	11
Table A2-5	Inhibiting Factors for RE-OB ₂ (Scenario III-75% Variance Representation)	12
Table A2-6	Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₂ (Scenario III-75% Variance Representation)	13
Table A3-1	Inhibiting Factors for RE-OB ₃ (Scenario I-55% Variance Representation)	14
Table A3-2	Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₃ (Scenario I-55% Variance Representation)	15
Table A3-3	Inhibiting Factors for RE-OB ₃ (Scenario II-65% Variance Representation)	16
Table A3-4	Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₃ (Scenario II-65% Variance Representation)	17
Table A3-5	Inhibiting Factors for RE-OB ₃ (Scenario III-75% Variance Representation)	19
Table A3-6	Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₃ (Scenario III-75% Variance Representation)	20
Table A4-1	Inhibiting Factors for RE-OB ₄ (Scenario I-55% Variance Representation)	21
Table A4-2	Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₄ (Scenario I-55% Variance Representation)	22
Table A4-3	Inhibiting Factors for RE-OB ₄ (Scenario II-65% Variance Representation)	23
Table A4-4	Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₄ (Scenario II-65% Variance Representation)	24
Table A4-5	Inhibiting Factors for RE-OB ₄ (Scenario III-75% Variance Representation)	25
Table A4-6	Enabling Factors for RE-OB ₄ (Scenario III-75% Variance Representation)	26
Table A7-1	Brief Profile of the Researcher	34

ABBREVIATIONS

AGIMO	Australian Government Information Management Office
ASSOCHAM	Associated Chambers of Commerce of India
BIM	Building Information Modelling
BPR	Business Process Re-engineering
BPS	Business Process Standardisation
CIO	Chief Information Officer
CMM	Capability Maturity Model
CRC	Cooperative Research Centre for Construction Innovation
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GoAU	Government of Australia
IBEF	India Brand Equity Foundation
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IMSC	Information Management Strategy Committee
ISO	International Standards Organisation
JIT	Just-in-Time
KMO	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin
NatBACC	National Building and Construction Committee
OECD	Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development
PCA	Principal Component Analysis
RE	Real Estate
RE-OB	Real Estate Sector Objective
RERA	Real Estate Regulation Act 2016
RICS	Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
SAAS	Software-as-a-Service
SEI-CMM	Software Engineering Institute's Capability Maturity Model
SIC	Standard Industry Classification
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
SPICE	Structured Process Improvement in Construction Enterprises
TQM	Total Quality Management
UN	United Nations
UNPAN	United Nations Public Administration Network
WoG	Whole-of-Government