

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENERGY RISK FRAMEWORK FOR
RETROFITTING PROJECT

MOHAMMAD SYABILEE BIN NIKMAN LEE

A thesis submitted in
fulfilment of the requirement for the award of the
Doctor of Philosophy



Faculty of Technology Management and Business
Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia

OCTOBER 2021

This work is dedicated to my family especially my parents for their support, patience, understanding, and prayers throughout this research journey.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All praise and adoration are for Allah, the Lord of the worlds, for the privilege of life and for guiding me through to this stage of my PhD programme. The completion of this phase of research was due to the effort and contributions of so many people too numerous to mention within the available space and time. First and foremost, I am genuinely indebted to my supervisor, Assoc Prof Ts Dr Sulzakimin Bin Haji Mohamed, and my Co-supervisor Assoc Prof Dr Md Asrul Nasid Bin Masrom, for providing me with an opportunity to work with them. I feel highly honoured and fortunate to have worked with them and sincerely appreciate their guidance, patience, support, and encouragement in supervising me. My deep gratitude goes to Assoc Prof Ir Ts Dr Riduan Yunus and Assoc Prof Ts Dr Roshartini Omar, for their contribution as panelist in Pre-viva which significantly improved this thesis content to meet the required standard.

My profound appreciation goes to the Research Management Centre (RMC), UTHM, for supporting this project through research grant: H042. I say a huge thanks to my faculty FPTP, and the Centre for Graduate Studies for providing enabling environment for research and providing training that enhances research. I am indeed very grateful to all that have assisted me up to this time in my research journey, including several lecturer from UiTM and colleagues from facebook doctorate support group (DSG).

I would also like to express my utmost gratitude and delightful compliments to my family, Mak, Abah, Adi and Jai for their love, patience, and understanding throughout the research period. And not forgetting from my friends, Aizat, Azuri, Bad, Emily, Farah, Hanip, Muiz, and Payad that always support through continuous motivation to finish all task since from beginning until the end. My sincere thanks also goes to my fellow research colleagues in UTHM, Ekin and Roy for being supportive and helpful friends during difficult time.

ABSTRACT

Energy demand in existing building grows every year compared with new building. The growth of energy consumption on existing building is significantly soaring throughout every year due to the degradation of energy efficiency and near-end life expectancy of building components. Energy retrofit is proven to improve energy efficiency at the expense of numerous risks as early in pre-construction project. Thus, the influences of risk facing by stakeholders to achieve optimum design strategies granting a huge effect in retrofit project. This research aims to address risks in retrofit project during pre-construction stage by determining the potential risk factors and the relationship with the retrofit elements. This research used convergent-parallel mixed-method within the context of qual-quant research design to administer semi-structured interviews and questionnaires to obtain information from internal stakeholders. With the aid of Computer-Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS), Atlas.Ti version 7, the qualitative data were coded, categorized, and analysed obtained from six respondents. The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) were used for analysing quantitative data collected from 66% of respondents out of 198 samples. The analysis revealed that two critical risk factors were found under planning and design phase. In planning phase, the most critical factor is related with the tenant cooperation in post-planning. The contribution of this risk is influenced by the policies, regulation, human factor, and uncertainty factor elements. Likewise, the risk in design phase that requires critical concern is related with inaccurate energy model. It shows that the risk is influenced by technologies, uncertainty factor and client expectation elements. The highlighted risks demonstrate the correlation with the retrofit elements to achieve optimum energy efficiency design through developed framework model. The developed framework model was validated across ten respondents and proven to assist construction industry to achieve optimum design strategy by assessing the highlighted risk factors and elements. The validation process in framework is conducted through expert panel in retrofit project and analysed using Krippendorff alpha reliability method.

ABSTRAK

Permintaan tenaga kepada bangunan sedia ada berkembang setiap tahun berbanding dengan bangunan baru. Pertumbuhan penggunaan tenaga di bangunan sedia ada dikaitkan dengan penurunan kecekapan tenaga dan jangka hayat. 'Retrofit' di bangunan sedia ada terbukti dapat meningkatkan kecekapan tenaga walaupun berdepan dengan pelbagai risiko seawal projek pembinaan. Pengaruh risiko yang dihadapi oleh pihak berkepentingan untuk mencapai strategi rekabentuk yang optimum memberikan impak pada projek 'retrofit'. Oleh itu, penyelidikan ini bertujuan untuk menyiasat risiko dalam projek 'retrofit' di peringkat pra-pembinaan dengan mengenalpasti faktor risiko dan hubungannya dengan elemen 'retrofit'. Penyelidikan ini menggunakan kaedah campuran-selari konvergen dalam konteks rekabentuk penyelidikan 'qual-quant' bagi menguruskan proses temubual dan soal selidik separa berstruktur daripada responden. Dengan bantuan perisian kualitatif (CAQDAS), Atlas.Ti versi 7, data kualitatif yang diperoleh dari enam responden dikodkan, dikategorikan, dan dianalisis. Pakej Statistik untuk Sains Sosial (SPSS) digunakan untuk menganalisis data kuantitatif yang dikumpulkan dari 66% responden daripada 198 sampel. Analisis menunjukkan bahawa dua faktor risiko kritikal ditemui dalam fasa perancangan dan rekabentuk. Dalam fasa perancangan, faktor yang paling kritikal adalah berkaitan dengan kerjasama penyewa dalam peringkat pengoperasian bangunan. Risiko ini dipengaruhi oleh polisi, peraturan, faktor manusia, dan elemen faktor ketidakpastian. Risiko di dalam fasa rekabentuk adalah berkaitan dengan model tenaga yang tidak tepat. Risiko tersebut dipengaruhi oleh teknologi, faktor ketidakpastian dan elemen jangkaan klien. Model rangka kerja yang dibangunkan telah dikesahan oleh sepuluh responden dan menunjukkan hubungan diantara risiko dan elemen 'retrofit' bagi mencapai rekabentuk kecekapan tenaga yang optimum. angka kerja yang dibangunkan terbukti dapat membantu industri pembinaan bagi mencapai strategi rekabentuk yang optimum melalui penilaian risiko dan elemen 'retrofit'. Proses kesahan model rangka kerja telah dikendalikan oleh panel pakar di dalam projek 'retrofit' dan dianalisis menggunakan kaedah 'Krippendorff alpha reliability'.

TABLE OF CONTENT

TITLE PAGE	i
DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ABSTRAK	vi
TABLE OF CONTENT	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES	xvi
LIST OF ABBREVIATION	xviii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xx
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background of study	2
1.3 Problem statement	6
1.4 Research question	7
1.5 Research objectives	8
1.6 Research methodology	8
1.7 Research scope	9
1.8 Research significant	10
1.9 The organization of the thesis	11
1.10 Conclusion	12
CHAPTER 2 ENERGY RISK IN PRE-CONSTRUCTION STAGE TOWARDS RETROFIT	14

2.1	Introduction	14
2.2	Sustainable construction	14
2.3	Fundamental of retrofit	16
2.4	Retrofit on Developed Countries	19
	2.4.1 Retrofit development in the United States	21
	2.4.2 Retrofit development in China	22
	2.4.3 Retrofit development in Australia	24
2.5	The development of retrofit in Malaysia	25
2.6	Building retrofit process	29
	2.6.1 An important phase in retrofitting	30
2.7	Main elements influencing the efficiency of retrofitting	38
	2.7.1 Policies and regulation	40
	2.7.2 Building specific information	42
	2.7.3 Human factors	46
	2.7.4 Type of retrofit technologies	48
	2.7.5 Uncertainty factors	49
	2.7.5.1 Physical uncertainty factors	50
	2.7.5.2 Design factors	51
	2.7.5.3 Scenario factors	51
	2.7.6 Building owner resources and expectations	52
2.8	Assessing risk management on a retrofit project	53
2.9	Addressing risks factors in pre-construction stage	55
	2.9.1 Risk in the planning stage: Social risks	57
	2.9.2 Risk factors in the planning stage: Economic risks	60
	2.9.3 Risk factors in the planning stage: Political risks	66
	2.9.4 Risk factors in the design stage: Technical / quality risks	70
	2.9.5 Risk factors in the design stage: Financial management risks	74
2.10	Applicable theories in energy efficiency risk	77
	2.10.1 Prospect theory	77
	2.10.2 Practice theory	79
2.11	Conceptual framework	81
2.12	Chapter summary	84



CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	85
3.1 Introduction	85
3.2 Research philosophy	85
3.3 Research paradigm	87
3.3.1 Post-positivism view approach	88
3.3.2 Constructivism view approach	88
3.3.3 Transformative view approach	89
3.3.4 Pragmatism view approach	89
3.3.5 Selection of research paradigm	90
3.3.6 Research design	91
3.3.7 Research approach	93
3.4 Research development process	97
3.4.1 Research development stage 1: Information gathering	99
3.4.1.1 Literature review	99
3.4.2 Research development stage 2: Interview	101
3.4.2.1 Interview method	101
3.4.2.2 Respondent selection for interview	101
3.4.2.3 Qualitative sample size	103
3.4.2.4 Interview development	105
3.4.3 Research development stage 3: Survey	106
3.4.3.1 Survey method	106
3.4.3.2 Respondent selection for survey	107
3.4.3.3 Quantitative sample size	108
3.4.3.4 Questionnaire development	109
3.4.3.5 Pre-test and pilot test	111
3.4.3.6 Pilot test result	116
3.4.3.7 Pilot test distribution	117
3.4.3.8 Data normality and reliability for pilot test	117
3.4.4 Research development stage 4: Data analysis and framework development	119
3.4.4.1 Quantitative data analysis	120
3.4.4.2 Qualitative data analysis	122



3.5	Model validation	124
3.5.1	Expert opinion validation	124
3.5.2	Validation of the proposed model improvement framework	125
3.6	Summary	125

CHAPTER 4 DATA ANALYSIS: RISK FACTORS IN

PRE-CONSTRUCTION STAGE 126

4.1	Introduction	126
4.2	Profile of interview respondents	126
4.3	The current risk towards energy retrofitting in pre-construction stage	127
4.3.1	Social measurement risk	129
4.3.1.1	Human participation in energy retrofit	129
4.3.2	Financing of retrofitting	130
4.3.2.1	The poor demand in retrofitting	131
4.3.2.2	Difficulties in determining return of investment over retrofit strategies	132
4.3.2.3	Uncertainty of energy saving	133
4.3.2.4	Investment assessment	135
4.3.3	Energy efficiency policy	138
4.3.3.1	Regulation limiting the retrofit intervention	138
4.3.3.2	Investment support from the government	140
4.3.4	Building efficiency evaluation	141
4.3.4.1	Design experience	142
4.3.4.2	Limited expertise	145
4.3.4.3	Material standard	147
4.3.4.4	Investment over energy improvement	148
4.3.4.5	Interference of law	149
4.3.4.6	Accuracy of energy model from the building	150
4.4	Discussion of findings from the qualitative data analysis	155
4.5	Summary	160

CHAPTER 5 DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION: DEVELOPMENT OF		
RISK FRAMEWORK MODEL TO ENHANCE ENERGY		
EFFICIENCY DESIGN STRATEGIES		161
5.1	Introduction	161
5.2	Analysis of respondent's characteristics	162
5.3	Sample of respondent's profile data	162
5.3.1	Background information profiles	162
5.3.2	Project details	165
5.4	Preliminary data analysis	166
5.4.1	Screening for missing values and screening for outliers	167
5.4.2	Normality for constructs and factors	168
5.5	Reliability analysis	170
5.6	The overall response to risk factor constructs	171
5.6.1	The response of internal stakeholder on their risk towards pre-construction stage	172
5.6.1.1	Criteria in retrofit elements	172
5.6.1.2	Social risk	173
5.6.1.3	Economic risk	173
5.6.1.4	Political risk	175
5.6.1.5	Technical/quality risk	175
5.6.1.6	Financial management risk	176
5.7	Examination of relationship between variables	177
5.8	Examination of relationships between retrofit element dimensions and risk factors	179
5.9	Identification of energy efficiency on retrofit element predictors	183
5.10	Assessing the regression model through diagnostic test	191
5.11	Discussion of Results	200
5.12	Summary of the quantitative analysis	207
5.12.1	Research overview	208
5.12.2	The proposed framework for addressing risks in pre-construction stage	209

5.12.3	Expert validation result	215
5.13	Summary	217
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION		219
6.1	Introduction	219
6.2	The combination of qualitative and quantitative results	219
6.3	The summary of research objectives	220
6.3.1	Research objective one (R.O.1)	220
6.3.2	Research objective two (R.O.2)	221
6.3.3	Research objective three (R.O.3)	223
6.3.4	Research objective four (R.O.4)	226
6.4	Research contributions	226
6.4.1	Contributions to the body of knowledge	226
6.4.2	Contributions to the industry	229
6.5	Research limitation	230
6.6	Recommendation for further research	231
6.7	Conclusion	232
REFERENCES		234
APPENDICES		261



LIST OF TABLES

2.1	Differential between retrofit, refurbishment and renovation characteristic	18
2.2	Summary of the development of retrofit in Malaysia	28
2.3	Total of project register under Green Building Index	42
2.4	Summary of social risk in planning stage involved in retrofit project in pre-construction stage	59
2.5	Summary of economic risks in planning stage involved in retrofit toward pre-construction stage	64
2.6	Summary of politic risks in planning stage involved in retrofit toward pre-construction stage	69
2.7	Summary of technical / quality risks for design stage involved in retrofit toward pre-construction stage	73
2.8	Summary of financial management risks for design stage involved in retrofit toward pre-construction stage	76
3.1	Four main social sciences approaches	87
3.2	The rationale of using mix method strategy	91
3.3	Summary of research approach	96
3.4	Determination of sample size for qualitative	104
3.5	Registered retrofit architect and ESCO in Malaysia	108
3.6	Distribution of respondents	113
3.7	Detail profile of retrofit practitioner	113

3.8	Detail profile of pilot study	115
3.9	Rate of pilot test distribution	117
3.10	Pilot test result	117
4.1	Profile of interviewees	127
4.2	Emerging themes from the interview data analysis	128
4.3	Summary of major qualitative findings	153
5.1	Demographic profile	164
5.2	Project profile's	166
5.3	Result of normality test	169
5.4	Reliability of items measurement	170
5.5	Constructs' evaluation criteria	171
5.6	Response on retrofit elements	172
5.7	Response on social risk	173
5.8	Response on economic risk	173
5.9	Response on political risk	175
5.10	Response on technical/quality risk	175
5.11	Response on financial management risk	176
5.12	Variables codes	177
5.13	Correlation analysis between retrofit elements and risk factors	180
5.14	Forward selection result from multiple regression analysis	187
5.15	Comparison result between forward selection and backward elimination analysis	189
5.16	Summary of predictors on each model	190
5.17	Type of regression diagnostic	192
5.18	Residuals statistics	195

5.19	Models parameter	196
5.20	Details of analysis of variance (ANOVA)	197
5.21	Overview of diagnostic test for regression model	198
5.22	Frequency of predictors' occurrence in the model	205
5.23	Predictor's group	206
5.24	Respondents profiles of the proposed framework validation questionnaire	215



LIST OF FIGURES

2.1	Sustainability as a balance between economic, environmental and social aspects	15
2.2	Green technology focus by National Green Technology Policy (NGTP)	27
2.3	Net present value (NPV) of operation and maintenance costs with retrofitting and repairing interventions	34
2.4	Uncertainty in planning design stage will influence the energy saving in post-construction phase	35
2.5	Retrofit phases consist of pre-construction, construction and post-construction project delivery	38
2.6	Six important elements influencing overall retrofit project	40
2.7	The distribution of policies collection from 29 countries	41
2.8	Example of energy saving summary based on ComBAT tool	44
2.9	ROBESim tool for energy retrofit comparison through various scenarios	45
2.10	Factors that influencing occupant behaviour	47
2.11	Flowchart of implementation of retrofit technologies	49
2.12	Three categories for uncertainty factors	50
2.13	Risk management process	54

2.14	The risks factors involved in pre-construction stage for retrofit	57
2.15	The elements in prospect theory	79
2.16	The main elements in practice theory	81
2.17	The conceptual framework for addressing risk for retrofit project	82
3.1	Mixed methods research designs	94
3.2	Summary of research approach	95
3.3	Research process	98
3.4	Literature review categorization	100
3.5	Questionnaire development process	111
3.6	Procedure for the pilot test	116
3.7	Work process of Atlas.Ti 7	123
4.1	The evidence of critical clashing area in retrofitting HVAC system	146
4.2	The evidence of differences between poor material and good material on insulation that propose on passive strategy for thermal reduction	148
5.1	Normal P-P plot of regression standardized residual for risk factor on policies	194
5.2	Scatterplot result on regression analysis for risk factor in policies	194
5.3	Proposed framework to enhance energy efficiency for design strategies in pre-construction through risk assessment	214
5.4	Validation of the proposed framework for enhancing energy efficiency design strategies in pre-construction through risk assessment based on respondent judgment	216



LIST OF ABBREVIATION

BCR	-	Benefit to Cost Ratio
CIDB	-	Construction Development Industrial Board
CITP	-	Construction Industry Transformation Programme
CBD	-	Commercial Building Disclosure
ComBAT	-	Commercial Building Analysis Tool
DPP	-	Discounted Payback Period
EE	-	Energy Efficiency
ECM	-	Energy Conservation Measures
EPC	-	Energy Performance Contract
ESCO	-	Energy Services Company
GBI	-	Green Building Index
GHG	-	Greenhouse Gas
GTFS	-	Greentech Financing Scheme
HVAC	-	Heating Ventilation Air Conditioning
IR	-	Infra-Red
IRR	-	Internal Rate of Return
IEA	-	International Energy Agency
KeTTHA	-	Ministry of Energy, Green Technology and Water
KTOE	-	Kilotons
LEED	-	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
MAMPU	-	Malaysian Administrative Modernization and Management Planning Unit
MI	-	Modification Indices
MS	-	Malaysia Standards
M&V	-	Measurement & Validation
MT	-	Million Tonnes
NGTP	-	National Green Technology Policy

NEEAP	-	National Energy Efficiency Action Plan 2016-2025
NPCC	-	National Policy on Climate Change
NREB	-	Non-Residential Existing Building
NZEB	-	Net Zero Energy Building
ORR	-	Overall Rate of Return
QS		Quantity Surveyor
PV	-	Photovoltaic
RE	-	Renewable Energy
RE	-	Retrofit element
RF	-	Risk Factor
ROBESim	-	Retrofit-Oriented Building Energy Simulator
ROI	-	Return of Investment
SBS	-	Sick Building Syndrome
SEM	-	Structural Equation Modelling
SERDP	-	Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program
SL		Standardized Loading
SPSS	-	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
SPP	-	Simple Payback Period
T&C	-	Testing and Commissioning
CBECs	-	The Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey
NABERS	-	The National Australian Built Environment Rating System
USA	-	United States of America
UK	-	United Kingdom
USGBC	-	U.S Green Building Council
USDOE	-	U.S Department of Energy

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGES
A	Covering letter	261
B	Risk questionnaire	262
C	Interview questions	269
D	Validation questionnaire	272
E	K-alpha reliability	274
F	Publications	275
H	Vita	277



PTTA UTHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUNKU TUN AMINAH

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Green building has generally been approved as one of the more effective strategies towards sustainable development in many countries, vital to creating a sustainable environment (Yu, Tu, & Luo, 2011). Despite introducing the green concept in construction for many years, there are certain area need to be improved in sustainable concept to further support towards positive impact on the environment, specifically in existing building. Notably, this is largely due to heavily focusing on sustainable development for new construction projects compared to existing buildings (Adeyemi *et al.*, 2014). Fundamentally, it is proven that the lifecycle of the existing building performance is degrade over the times and retrofitting is required to sustain and revamp the energy efficiency level (Dong *et al.*, 2005). The sustainable development of existing buildings is evolving in recent years through energy retrofit. Retrofits project modifies existing buildings to improve energy and environmental performance, reduce water use, improve thermal comfort, and reduce the noise level by applying new technologies (Hwang *et al.*, 2015).

The application of the new technologies in the existing building provides more variation to enhance energy efficiency in the existing building. Therefore, the application of new technologies on the existing building is constantly filled with uncertainty and risk (Lam *et al.*, 2010). The process to achieve energy efficiency level in existing building involve a huge of risks due to unforeseen condition occur in the early phase of the project that will affect on post-construction (Xia & Chan, 2012; Deng, Low, & Zhao, 2014; Zhao, Hwang, & Phang, 2014; Zhao *et al.*, 2015). The existence of risk in the retrofit project provides challenges to each task as it allows for

a different outcome in energy efficiency level by the combination of the planning and design stage (Topouzi *et al.*, 2015). Risk can either be prevented or limit the probable effect on the energy retrofit design through addressing the risk (Zou *et al.*, 2016). In Malaysia, the retrofit concept is circuitously put into practice in existing buildings, focusing on energy-efficient building design and achieving GBI rating. According to National Energy Efficiency Action Plan 2014, the key initiatives to promote energy efficiency are building design that influences energy-efficient to the existing building (Ministry of Energy Green Technologies and Water (KeTTHA), 2014).

1.2 Background of Study

Buildings are one of the largest consumptions of energy, accounting for up to 32 percent of the overall total global final energy use, and 19 percent of the total is presently related to energy usage (Lucon *et al.*, 2014). It is widely recognized that in developing countries, the overall energy consumption of the building sector accounts for approximately 20 to 40 percent of the total energy consumption (Perez-Lombard *et al.*, 2008). The energy performance of buildings is calculated based on a methodology that covers the whole annual energy performance of a building, including the requirements in hot and dry conditions, which has greatly impacted energy consumption from the recent years (IE 2010). Central to the debate on the idea of “the important moderation of the environmental impacts resulting from the building sector” is the question of how sustainable development on the building may develop a positive impact on the environment.

However, the introduction of much alternative initiative to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) does not drastically impact building energy consumption. It can be highlighted that the energy demand and economic growth are robustly interrelated and notably increase every year from new building to the existing building (Nikolaou *et al.*, 2011). Surprisingly, the recent study shows that the growth of energy consumption on an existing building is significantly soaring throughout every year due to the degradation of energy efficiency and near-end life expectancy of building components compared with new buildings (Aste & Pero, 2013). In a recent study, Alam *et al.*, (2016) described that the energy consumption for an existing commercial building grows every year. In Malaysia, the demand for energy for commercial buildings is up

to 38,645 Gigawatts (GWh), while residential buildings consume approximately about 24,709 Gwh (Hassan *et al.*, 2014). This, however, has led the construction industry to adopt the concept of green building for existing buildings (Khoukhi, Darsaleh & Ali, 2020).

Despite the fact that the trend of green building is growing every year, the interpretation of the project objectives is still behind the main list. The lack of crystal-clear definition leads to a schizophrenic divide among scholars, which generates potential challenges for deploying and promoting the green building concept per se (Zuo & Zhao, 2014). Green buildings and retrofitting of the existing green buildings is approved as the greatest plan to optimize the energy efficiency into another level. In general, the retrofit is an activity that upgrades the energy efficiency level through the component and feature that did not have when it first construct (Paradis, 2016). Finding an optimal solution to increase the energy efficiency level on an existing building is the main criterion to achieve part of sustainable development (Basarir & Diri, 2012). As a growing set of findings is being provided, the need for advanced project management, energy management, technological capabilities management, and construction management in energy efficiency are valuable to the stakeholder required than ever before (Mohd-Rahim *et al.*, 2017). Each of the requirements to fulfil the project objectives is facing various risks to meet the energy efficiency level. The risk associated with a project often reflects an adverse effect on the achievement and encounters unexpected problems despite all the precautions taken accordingly (Urbanski, Haque & Oino, 2019).

Risk in the construction projects is among the critical concerns for each stakeholder due to the potential rebound effect in the full project delivery (Hwang, 2015). Risk is diverse and unique as it presents as an early phase of the project, capable of manipulating the decision-making process (Iqbal *et al.*, 2015). Interestingly, the risk is part of the process in a construction project which directly or indirectly consequences the project objectives and cannot be avoided or ignored. Zou *et al.*, (2016) described the risk as any exposure to possible loss to the project and failure to meet the project objectives. The identification of uncertainty in the construction project is accomplished by addressing the risks. Risks can be presented in the whole progress of the construction project such as the planning stage, design stage, construction stage, and maintenance stage by granting direct or indirect effect to meet the project objectives (Ma *et al.*, 2012). A different combination of risk surrounds each step of the

project development, and it is almost certain that the identification of risk in the early stage of the project can break the chain-reaction effect until the end of the project. The impact of the risk in a construction project can provide a negative or positive outcome of the project. It is, however, the implication of the project that will determine the degree of risks (Alam *et al.*, 2017). Therefore, addressing risk in a construction project is fundamentally critical to meet the project objectives by controlling cost, time, and quality as early as possible.

The existence of risk in a construction project can be fundamentally described by the surrounding elements contributing to the unpredicted situation, such as policies, legislative practices, information, or tools (Ruparthna *et al.*, 2016 & Ma *et al.*, 2012). The uncontrollable condition is likely to provide difficulty to the stakeholder to recognize the potential risk that can be a main threat to the project objectives. The identification of risk will expose all possible sources from internal or external influence to the project. However, Barber (2005) highlighted that internal risks are a major challenge for the project team and may require special attention to manage the project effectively. Internal risks are often elusive and difficult to quantify for classifying the risks (Khodeir & Mohamed, 2015). The internal risks may exist broadly, but the clear definition of the continuation is correlated with human behaviour involvement. Tollin (2011) reported that even when the direct source of an internal risk seems to lie in the operation of a process, people are likely to be involved to some extent because it is people who design, own, and operate structures and processes. Performing the risk identification in the pre-construction stage without considering the project's natural elements could result in a huge loss and disadvantage to all stakeholders. The determination of the project characteristic and attributes would reveal the potential risks that can be categorized into threats (Kaur & Singh, 2018).

However, the probability of risk to evolve is significantly high and varies across the construction project, especially in retrofitting an existing building. It is commonly held that existing buildings are not energy efficient and should be dramatically redesigned to boost their efficiency by exploring energy efficiency measures full of risk and multipart (Liang *et al.*, 2015). Risk in an existing building is specifically unique and faces large numbers of uncertainties due to the project complexity compared with a new construction project. The risks imposed in an existing building are developed through a series of limitations, constraints, and circumstances that extend the difficulties of recognizing the potential threat (Ma *et al.*,

2012). The retrofit project requires a systematic and dynamic approach to adopt the energy-saving objectives starting from the progression of management in the pre-construction stage (Hwang *et al.*, 2015). Zou *et al.*, (2016) reported that risk in a retrofit project could be addressed in two different phases, such as the planning stage and design stage. In the planning process, the initiation of the project scope and objectives involve the collaboration of stakeholders between each party to achieve project targets (Zhao *et al.*, 2015). The important element in project targets, such as project budget, project quality, project scope, and project timeline, are set up during the project planning phase (STBA, 2015). Most significant decisions are made in the project planning phase, and the process is surrounded by risks that exerting a negative influence on project performance (Naeem *et al.*, 2018). Identifying and transferring the risk will assist stakeholders in settling on more rational choices on solutions towards achieving energy-efficient goals in the first place. The discussion among stakeholders should also occur when design changes of the previously selected retrofit options are proposed, and when new information becomes accessible during each step of identifying the risk process (Menassa, 2011).

Continuous identification of risk is capable of reducing further the chances of energy performance gap via the design process. Ali (2014) describes that most of the previous study agree on the significant impact of the design process for the success of construction projects. While design costs contribute just about 10 percent to overall project costs, the design phase greatly affects the performance of the retrofit projects. There is also data suggesting that design issues led to almost 80 percent of the quality issue in a project related to the risk. The design process is difficult to control due to the fact that the combination of intensive technological and social tasks is leading to various risks. In addition, due to the extensive use of complex construction technologies and innovative materials to the existing building without knowing the capabilities or limitations, the design process is compounded by numerous risks (Hwang *et al.*, 2017).

Such risks in a retrofit project can be minimized and secured through addressing the potential risks that cause an initial negative impact to meet the energy efficiency objectives (Alam *et al.*, 2016). Therefore, from the preceding, this research seeks to address risk factors specifically for an existing commercial building in Malaysia that incorporate the retrofit element by developing the proposed framework as a guideline to enhance energy efficiency through retrofitting.

REFERENCES

- 1200 Buildings: Melbourne Retrofit Survey. (2015). In City of Melbourne (Vol. 1, Issue). *Australian Publication*.
- Abdullahi, I. (2017). *Influence of facilities performance on students satisfaction in Northern Nigerian Universities*. Unpublished PhD Thesis: Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia.
- Abedifar, M., & Abdideh, M. (2017). A sensitivity study of geomechanical and reservoir parameters on safe mud window during drilling operations. *Petroleum and Coal*, 59(4), 489-496.
- Adeyemi, A., Martin, D., & Kasim, R. (2014). Improvement of existing buildings for sustainability as againts maintenance and rebuild. *International Real Estate Research Symposium, (IRERS)*.
- Adnan, H., Jusoff, K., & Salim, M. K. (2008). The Malaysian construction industry's risk management in design and build. *Modern Applied Science*, 2(5), 27-33.
- Akintoye, A. (2000). Analysis of factors influencing project cost estimating practice. *Construction Management and Economics*, 18(1), 77-89.
- Akintoye, A. S., & MacLeod, M. J. (1997). Risk analysis and management in construction. *International Journal of Project Management*, 15(1), 31-38.
- Aksamija, A. (2017). Impact of retrofitting energy-efficient design strategies on energy use of existing commercial buildings: Comparative study of low-impact and deep retrofit strategies. *Journal of Green Building*, 12(4), 70-88.
- Al-Kodmany, K. (2014). Green Retrofitting Skyscrapers: A Review. *Buildings*, 4(4), 683-710.
- Alajmi, A. (2012). Energy audit of an educational building in a hot summer climate. *Energy and Buildings*, 47, 122-130.
- Alam, M., Phung, V. M., Zou, P. X. W., & Sanjayan, J. (2017). Risk identification and assessment for construction and commissioning stages of building energy retrofit

projects. *International Conference of Advancement of Construction Management and Real Estate, November.*

- Alam, M. S., & Haque, M. Z. (2016). Fundamental Principles of Green Building and Sustainable Site Design. *International Journal of Management and Applied Science*, 2(11), 11-20.
- Alam, M., Zou, P. X. W., Sanjayan, J., Stewart, R., Sahin, O., Bertone, E., & Wilson, J. (2016). Guidelines for building energy efficiency retrofitting building retrofitting. *Sustainability in Public Works Conference (pp. 24-26).*
- Albatici, R., Gadotti, A., Baldessari, C., & Chiogna, M. (2016). A decision making tool for a comprehensive evaluation of building retrofitting actions at the regional scale. *Sustainability*, 8(10), 4-33.
- Albino, V., & Berardi, U. (2012). Green buildings and organizational changes in Italian case studies. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 21(6), 387-400.
- Ali, A. (2014). Complexity in managing refurbishment design process: Malaysian experience. *MATEC Web of Conferences*, 15.
- Ali, A. S., Rahmat, I., & Hassan, H. (2008). Involvement of key design participants in refurbishment design process. *Facilities*, 26(9/10), 389-400.
- Allcott, H., & Greenstone, M., (2012). Is there an energy efficiency gap? *Journal of Economy Perspectives*, 26(1). 3-28.
- Alshenqeeti, H. (2014). Interviewing as a data collection method: A critical review. *English Linguistics Research*, 3(1), 39-45.
- Alvi, M. H. (2016). A Manual for Selecting Sampling Techniques in Research. *Field Method*, 4(3), 2-30.
- Antonson, D., Gulfer, I., Pérez, S. E., Pando, A. R., Yönten, E., & Seda, Y. (2015). Affordable and adaptable public buildings through energy efficient retrofitting. *Energies*, 2(5), 50-73.
- Architects, T. A. I. of. (2013). Deep energy retrofits: An emerging opportunity. *An Architect's Guide to the Energy Retrofit Market*, (63).
- Asadi, E., Da Silva, M. G., Antunes, C. H., & Dias, L. (2012). Multi-objective optimization for building retrofit strategies: A model and an application. *Energy and Buildings*, 44, 81-87.
- Aste, N., & Del Pero, C. (2013). Energy retrofit of commercial buildings: Case study and applied methodology. *Energy Efficiency*, 6(2), 407-423.
- Avina, J. M. (2018). Successfully implementing energy efficiency projects. *Strategic*

Planning for Energy and the Environment, 37(4), 74-78.

- Bao, L., Zhao, J., & Zhu, N. (2012). Analysis and proposal of implementation effects of heat metering and energy efficiency retrofit of existing residential buildings in northern heating areas of China in “the 11th Five-Year Plan” period. *Energy policy*, 45, 521-528.
- Barber R.B. (2005). Understanding internally generated risks in projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 23(8), 584-590.
- Barberis, N.C., (2013). Thirty years of prospect theory in economics: A review and assessment. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27, 173-196.
- Basarir, B., Dirir, B. S., & Dirir, C. (2012a). Energy efficient retrofit methods at the building envelopes of the school buildings Energy Efficient Retrofit of School Buildings. *Retrofit 2012*, 1, 1-13.
- Beecham, S., Hall, T., Britton, C., Cottee, M., & Rainer, A. (2005). Using an expert panel to validate a requirements process improvement model. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 76(3), 251-275.
- Ben, H., & Steemers, K. (2014). Energy retrofit and occupant behaviour in protected housing: A case study of the Brunswick Centre in London. *Energy and Buildings*, 80(9), 120-130.
- Benzar, B. E., Park, M., Lee, H. S., Yoon, I., & Cho, J. (2020). Determining retrofit technologies for building energy performance. *Journal of Asian Architecture and Building Engineering*, 19(4), 367-383.
- Berardi, U. (2013). Stakeholders’ influence on the adoption of energy-saving technologies in Italian homes. *Energy policy*, 60, 520-530.
- Bertone, E., Stewart, R. A., Sahin, O., Alam, M., Zou, P. X. W., Buntine, C., & Marshall, C. (2018). Guidelines, barriers and strategies for energy and water retrofits of public buildings. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 174(11), 1064-1078.
- Better Building Partnership Report, (2010). Low carbon retrofit toolkit: A roadmap to success. *Better Buildings Partnership*.
- Blair, J., Czaja, R. F., & Blair, E. A. (2014). *Designing Surveys: a guide to decisions and procedures: Third edition*. United States of America: *SAGE Publications*.
- Boynton, P. & Greenhalgh, T. (2004). Hands-on guide to questionnaire research: Selecting, designing, and developing your questionnaire. *Clinical Research*, 2 328-332.
- Bozorgi, A., & Jones, J. R. (2013). Improving energy retrofit decisions by including

- uncertainty in the energy modeling process. *The 2013 ARCC Architectural Research Conference*, 415-423.
- Brannen, J. (2005). Mixing methods: The entry of qualitative and quantitative approaches into the research process. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(3), 173-184.
- Brown, P., Swan, W., & Chahal, S. (2014). Retrofitting social housing: Reflections by tenants on adopting and living with retrofit technology. *Energy Efficiency*, 7(4), 641-653.
- Bruce, T., Zuo, J., Rameezdeen, R., & Pullen, S. (2015). Factors influencing the retrofitting of existing office buildings using Adelaide, South Australia as a case study. *Structural Survey*, 33(2), 150-166.
- Bryman, A. and Bell, E., 2015. *Business Research Methods*. Oxford: *Oxford Univ. Press*.
- Bu, S., Shen, G., Anumba, C., Wong, A., & Liang, X. (2015). Literature review of green retrofit design for commercial buildings with BIM implication. *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment*, 4(2), 188-214.
- Buys, L., & Miller, E. (2011). Retrofitting commercial office buildings for sustainability: tenants' expectations and experiences. *Management and Innovation for a Sustainable Built Environment*, June.
- Callon, M. (1987). Society in the making: the study of technology as a tool for sociological analysis. The social construction of technological systems: new directions in the sociology and history of technology. 83-103.
- Carreón, J. R. (2015). Review on techniques, tools and best practices for energy efficient retrofitting of heritage buildings.
- Castro, K.M., Alev, Üllar & Aparicio, (2017). Cost-effective energy-efficient building retrofitting - materials, technologies, optimization and case studies. *Woodhead Publishing*.
- Cha, H., & Lee, D. (2018). Determining value at risk for estimating renovation building projects by application of probability-based fuzzy set theory. *Journal of Asian Architecture and Building Engineering*, 17(1), 63-70.
- Chan, A. P. C., Darko, A., Olanipekun, A. O., & Ameyaw, E. E. (2018). Critical barriers to green building technologies adoption in developing countries: The case of Ghana. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 172, 1067-1079.
- Check, J., & Schutt, R. K. (2012). Survey research. *Research methods in education*.

Thousand Oaks, CA: *Sage Publications*.

- Chen, S., Zhang, G., & Setunge, S. (2014). Analysis of factors influencing the performance of HVAC retrofits. *Proceedings of the 18th International Symposium on Advancement of Construction Management and Real Estate, November*.
- Chong, C., Ni, W., Ma, L., Liu, P., & Li, Z. (2015). The use of energy in Malaysia: Tracing energy flows from primary source to end use. *Energies*, 8(4), 2828–2866.
- Chuah, J. W., Raghunathan, A., & Jha, N. K. (2013). ROBESim: A retrofit-oriented building energy simulator based on EnergyPlus. *Energy and Buildings*, 66, 88–103.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge.
- Copiello, S. (2016). Buildings energy retrofit: Dealing with uncertainty. *Sustainable Built Environment Conference 2016 in Hamburg, October*.
- Cozza, S., Chambers, J., Deb, C., Scartezzini, J-L., Schlueter, A., & Patel, M. (2020). Do energy performance certificates allow reliable predictions of actual energy consumption and savings? Learning from the Swiss national database. *Energy and Buildings*, 1(2), 2-10.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, *Sage Publications*.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston, MA: *Pearson Education, Inc*.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). Steps in conducting a scholarly mixed methods study. DBER Speaker Series 48, University of Nebraska - Lincoln. Available at http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/dberspeakers/48?utm_source=digitalcommons.unl.edu%2Fdberspeakers%2F48&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* 4th edition. *SAGE Publications*.
- Cunningham, T. (2015). Cost control during the pre-contract stage of a building project: An introduction. In *Dublin Institute of Technology*.
- Czaja, R., & Blair, J. (2005). *Designing surveys: A guide to decisions and procedures*. *Pine Forge Press*.
- Dainty, A. (2008). *Methodological pluralism in construction management research*.

Advanced Research Methods in the Built Environment, 1, 1-13.

- Daly, D. (2015). Improving energy efficiency in lower quality commercial buildings: Simulation , retrofit optimisation and uncertainty. University of Wollongong.
- Daniel, B. S. (2014, July 30). Educating consumers to be more energy efficient. *The Star*, 1–8. <https://www.thestar.com.my/news/community/2014/07/30/working-towards-a-brighter-future-sustainable-energy-development-authority-sheds-some-light-on-the/>
- Darko, A., & Chan, A. P. C. (2016). Critical analysis of green building research trend in construction journals. *Habitat International*, 57, 53-63.
- Dawes, J. (2008). Do data characteristics change according to the number of scale points used? An experiment using 5-point, 7-point and 10-point scales. *International Journal of Market Research*, 50(1), 61-104.
- De-Lisle, J. (2011). The benefits and challenges of mixing methods and methodologies: Lessons learnt from implementing qualitatively led mixed methods research designs in Trinidad and Tobago. *Caribbean Curriculum*, 18, (2011), 87-120.
- Department of Energy (2015). As assessment of Energy Technologies and Research Opportunities. *Quadrennial Technology Review*.
- De-Selincourt, K. (2015). The risks of retrofit. 28-37. *Green Building Press*.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: *Sage Publications*.
- Depersio G., (2018). What are the advantages of using a simple random sample to study a larger population? Retrieved from: <https://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/042915/what-are-advantages-using-simple-random-sample-study-larger-population.asp>
- Dieronitou, I. (2014). The ontological and epistemological foundations of qualitative and quantitative approaches to research. *International Journal of Economics*, 2(10), 1-17.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). Internet, phone, mail, and mixed mode surveys: The tailored design method (4th ed.). *John Wiley & Sons Inc.*
- Dixon, T. (2014). Practice briefing: Commercial property retrofitting: What does “retrofit” mean, and how can we scale up action in the UK sector? *Journal of Property Investment and Finance*, 32(4), 443-452.

- Dong, B., Kennedy, C., & Pressnail, K. (2005). Comparing life cycle implications of building retrofit and replacement options. *Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering*, 32(6), 1051-1063.
- Dowling, R., Mcguirk, P. M., & Bulkeley, H. (2016). Demonstrating retrofitting : perspectives from Australian local government. *Retrofitting Cities: Priorities, Governance and Experimentation*, 212–31.
- Durmus-pedini, A., & Ashuri, B. (2010). An overview of the benefits and risk factors of going green in existing buildings. *International Journal of Facility Management*, 1(1), 1-15.
- Dyba, T., (2000). An instrument for measuring the key factors of success in software process improvement. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 5(4), 357-390.
- Eichholtz, P., Kok, N., & Quigley, J. M. (2010). Doing well by doing good? Green office buildings. *American Economic Review*, 100(5), 2492-2509.
- Ekanayake, B. J., Sandanayke, Y. G., & Ramachandra, T. (2018). Challenges in hotel building refurbishment projects in Sri Lanka. *The 7th World Construction Symposium 2018: Built Asset Sustainability: Rethinking Design, Construction and Operations* (Issue July, pp. 145–151). Ceylon Institute of Builders.
- El-Darwish, I., & Gomaa, M. (2017). Retrofitting strategy for building envelopes to achieve energy efficiency. *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, 56(4), 579-589.
- Energy Commission, S. T. (2019). List of Registered Energy Service Company (ESCO). Retrieved from <https://www.st.gov.my/web/consumer/esco>
- Easterby-Smith, M. P. V, Thorpe, R., & Jackson, P. (2008). Management research: theory and research. *Sage Publication*.
- Faeiza, N. M., Juliana, J., & Chua, P. (2016). Indoor air quality and sick building syndrome (sbs) among staff in two different private higher learning institution settings in Kuala Lumpur and Selangor. *Energies*, 12(1), 57-61.
- Fan, Y., & Xia, X. (2018). Energy-efficiency building retrofit planning for green building compliance. *Building and Environment*, 136, 312-321.
- Fasna, M. F. F., & Gunatilake, S. (2019). Outsourcing energy retrofitting of hotel buildings: The decision-making process. *MATEC Web of Conferences*, 266, 1-16.
- Fellows, R. F., & Liu, A. M. M. (2008). Research methods for construction. *Wiley-Blackwell Publishing*.
- Fink, A. (2014). Conducting research literature reviews. In Vicki Knight (Ed.), *Statewide Agricultural Land Use Baseline 2015*. SAGE Publications.

- Flourentzou, F., & Roulet, C. A. (2002). Elaboration of retrofit scenarios. *Energy and Buildings*, 34(2), 185-192.
- Francis, J. J., Johnston, M., Robertson, C., Glidewell, L., Entwistle, V., Eccles, M. P., & Grimshaw, J. M. (2010). What is an adequate sample size? Operationalising data saturation for theory-based interview studies. *Psychology and Health*, 25(10), 1229-1245.
- Frederiks, E. R., Stenner, K., & Hobman, E. V. (2015). Household energy use: Applying behavioural economics to understand consumer decision-making and behaviour. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 41, 1385-1394.
- Friese, S. (2013) Atlas.Ti 7 user manual. Berlin: Atlas.Ti scientific software development gmbh.
- Gao, W., & Zhang, P. (2011). Sustainable renovation projects of residential buildings Chalmers University of Technology.
- Geldenhuys, H. J. (2017). The Development of an Implementation Framework for Green Retrofitting of Existing Buildings in South Africa (Issue March) Stellenbosch University.
- Geltner, D., Moser, L., & Minne, A. Van De. (201 C.E.). The effect of green retrofitting on us office properties: An investment perspective. *SSRN*.
- Gieryn, T.F. (2002). What buildings do. *Journal of Theory Social*, 31(1), 35-74.
- Gillingham, K., & Palmer, K., (2014). Bridging the energy efficiency gap: Policy insights from economic theory and empirical evidence. *Journal of Environment Economy Policy*, 8(1), 18-38.
- Green Building Index, G. (2019). GBI Executive Summary. Retrived from <http://new.greenbuildingindex.org/organisation/summary>
- Greene, D. L., (2011). Uncertainty, loss aversion, and markets for energy efficiency. *Energy Economics*, 33(4), 608-616.
- Grete Hestnes, A., & Ulrik Kofoed, N. (2002). Effective retrofitting scenarios for energy efficiency and comfort: Results of the design and evaluation activities within the office project. *Building and Environment*, 37, 569-574.
- Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough?: An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 59-82.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 2(105), 163-194.

- Guy, S. & Shove, E. (2000). A sociology of energy, buildings, and the environment: Constructing knowledge, designing practice. *Routledge Research Global Environmental Change Series, Routledge, London.*
- Haase, M., Skeie, K. S., & Woods, R. (2015). The key drivers for energy retrofitting of European shopping centres. *Energy Procedia, 78(1876), 2298-2303.*
- Hagaman, A. K., & Wutich, A. (2016). How many interviews are enough to identify metathemes in multisited and cross-cultural research? Another perspective on Guest, Bunce, and Johnson's (2006) landmark study. *Field Methods, 29(1), 23-41.*
- Hagentoft, C. E. (2017). Reliability of energy efficient building retrofitting-probability assessment of performance and cost. *Energy and Buildings, 155, 166-171.*
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis (7th ed.)*. Eaglewood Cliff, NJ: *Prentice-Hall.*
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2009). *Multivariate data analysis seventh edition. Pearson Publication.*
- Hakim, C., (1987). Research design: Strategies and choices in the design of social research. *Contemporary Social Research, 2(3), 13-21.*
- Harris, J., Anderson, J., & Shafron, W. (2000). Investment in energy efficiency: A survey of Australian firms. *Energy Policy, 28(12), 867-876.*
- Hassan, Jalees & Mohamad zin, Rosli & Abd Majid, Muhd.Zaimi & Balubaid, Saeed & Hainin, Mohd Rosli. (2014). Building energy consumption in Malaysia: An overview. *Jurnal Teknologi, 707, 2180-3722..*
- Hayes, A. F., & Krippendorff, K. (2007). Answering the call for a standard reliability measure for coding data. *Communication methods and measures, 1(1), 77-89.*
- Healy, M., Perry, C., & Healy, M. (2004). Qualitative Market Research: An international journal of qualitative research within the realism paradigm comprehensive criteria to judge validity and reliability of qualitative research within the realism paradigm. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal, 3(3), 118-126.*
- Heimonen, I., Immonen, I., Kauppinen, T., Nyman, M., & Junnonen, J.-M. (2007). Risk management for planning and use of building service systems. *CLIMA 2007 Well Being Indoors, 9th REHVA World Congress, 1-9.*
- Henderson, S. G., Biller, B., Hsieh, M. H., Shortle, J., Tew, J. D., & Barton, R. R. (2007). Verification and validation of simulation models. In *IEEE Proceedings*

of the Winter Simulation Conference, 1-9.

- Heo, Y., Augenbroe, G., & Choudhary, R. (2013). Quantitative risk management for energy retrofit projects. *Journal of Building Performance Simulation*, 6(4), 257-268.
- Holden, M. T., & Lynch, P. (2004). Choosing the appropriate methodology: Understanding research philosophy. *The Marketing Review*, 4(4), 397-409.
- Holz, M. J. L., & Sigler, T. J. (2016). An evaluation of green building rating schemes. *State of Australian cities conference 2016 green urbanism in Australia*, 1-12.
- Hong, T., Piette, M. A., Chen, Y., Lee, S. H., Taylor-Lange, S. C., Zhang, R., Sun, K., & Price, P. (2015). Commercial Building Energy Saver: An energy retrofit analysis toolkit. *Applied Energy*, 159, 298-309.
- Hopfe, C. J., & Hensen, J. L. M. (2011). Uncertainty and sensitivity analysis in building performance simulation for decision support and design optimization. *Energy and Buildings*, 43(10), 2798-2805.
- Hosseini, S., Choi, K., & Bae, J. (2017). IRIER: A decision-support model for optimal energy retrofit investments. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 143(9), 0501-7016.
- Hox, J. J. (1999). An introduction to structural equation modeling. *Family Science Review*, 11, 354-373.
- Hussin, J., Rahman, I. A., & Memon, A. H. (2013). The way forward in sustainable construction: issues and challenges. *International Journal of Advances in Applied Sciences*, 2(1), 15-24.
- Huang, Z., Ge, J., Zhao, K., & Shen, J. (2019). Post-evaluation of energy consumption of the green retrofit building. *Energy Procedia*, 158, 3608-3613.
- Hwang, B.-G., Shan, M., Phua, H., & Chi, S. (2017). An exploratory analysis of risks in green residential building construction projects: The case of Singapore. *Sustainability*, 9(7), 11-16.
- Hwang, B.-G., & Tan, J. S. (2010). Green building project management: obstacles and solutions for sustainable development. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 10, 21-26.
- Hwang, B.-G., Zhao, X., See, Y. L., & Zhong, Y. (2015). Addressing risks in green retrofit projects: The case of Singapore. *Project Management Journal*, 46(4), 76-89.
- Hwang, B. G., Shan, M., & Tan, E. K. (2016). Investigating reworks in green building

- construction projects: Magnitude, influential factors, and solutions. *International Journal of Environmental Research*, 10(4), 499-510.
- Hwang, B., Zhao, X., & Tan, L. L. G. (2015). Green building projects: Schedule performance, influential factors and solutions. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 2(3), 327-346.
- IE (2010). Industry experts, central air conditioning systems - A European market overview.
- Ihuah, P. W., & Eaton, D. (2013). The pragmatic research approach: A framework for sustainable management of public housing estates in Nigeria. *Journal of US-China Public Administration*, 10(10), 933-944.
- Ilieva, J., Baron, S., & Healey, N. M. (2002). Online surveys in marketing research: Pros and cons. *International Journal of Market Research*, 44(3), 361-376.
- Iqbal, S., Choudhry, R.M., Holschemacher, K., Ali, A., Tamosaitene, J.(2015). Risk management in construction project. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, 21(1), 65-78.
- Ishak, N. I., Mustafa Kamal, E., & Yusof, N. (2017). The green manufacturer's compliance with green criteria throughout the life cycle of building material. *SAGE Open*, 7(3), 1-12.
- Islam, M. R., Rahim, N. A., Solangi, K. H., & Tower, E. (2009). Renewable energy research in Malaysia. *Engineering E-Transaction*, 4(2), 69-72.
- Jackson, D. L. (2003). Revisiting sample size and number of parameter estimates: some support for the N:q hypothesis. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 10(1), 1-34.
- Janda, K.B., & Parag, Y. (2013). A middle-out approach for improving energy performance in buildings. *Journal of Building Resources Information*, 41(1), 39-50.
- Jafari, A. & Valentin, V. (2017). An optimization framework for building energy retrofits decision-making. *Building and Environment*, 115, 118-129.
- Jagarajan, R., Naim, M., Mohd, A., Hakim, A., Nadzri, M., Lee, J., Mei, Y., Baba, M., Geoinformation, F., Estate, R., & Bahru, U. T. M. J. (2017). Green retrofitting- A review of current status, implementations and challenges. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 67, 1360-1368.
- Jayasudha, K., & Vidivelli, B. (2016). Analysis of major risks in construction projects. *Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences*, 11(11), 6943-6950.

- Jensen, Maslesa, E., Gohardani, N., Bjork, F., Kanarachos, S., & Fokaides, P. A. (2013). Sustainability evaluation of retrofitting and renovation of buildings in early stages. *7th Nordic Conference on Construction Economics and Organisation 2013, June*.
- Jha, B., & Bhattacharjee, B. (2018). Tool for energy efficient building envelope retrofitting. *Building Performance Analysis Conference And Simbuild*, 1–8.
- Jia, L., Qian, Q. K., Meijer, F., & Visscher, H. (2020). Stakeholders' risk perception: A perspective for proactive risk management in residential building energy retrofits in China. *Sustainability*, *12*(7), 6-20.
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, *33*(7), 14-26.
- Jones, B., & Bogus, S. M. (2010). Decision process for energy efficient building retrofits: The owner's perspective. *Journal of Green Building*, *5*(3), 131-146.
- Kahneman, D., Tversky, A., (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Economics*, *47*, 263-291.
- Kaklauskas, A., Zavadskas, E. K., & Raslanas, S. (2005). Multivariant design and multiple criteria analysis of building refurbishments. *Energy and Buildings*, *37*(4), 361-372.
- Karim, S. B. A. K., Kamal, K. S., Wahab, L. A., & Hanid, M. (2007). Risk assessment and refurbishment: The case of Ipoh Railway Station Perak, Malaysia. *Management in Construction and Researchers Association (MICRA)*, 28-29.
- Karvonen, A. (2013). Towards systemic domestic retrofit: A social practices approach. *Building Research and Information*, *41*(5), 563-574.
- Kasim, R., Ishiyaku, B., Harir, A. I. & Usman, H. (2013). Performance evaluation of tangible and intangible environmental factors for sustainable public housing development in developing countries. *Proceedings of international conference: "Sustainable Development Conference 2013"*. Serbia: Tomorrow People Organization. 185-196.
- Kaklauskas, A., Zavadskas, E. K., Raslanas, S., Ginevicius, R., Komka, A., & Malinauskas, P. (2006). Selection of low-e windows in retrofit of public buildings by applying multiple criteria method COPRAS: A Lithuanian case. *Energy and buildings*, *38*(5), 454-462.
- Kaklauskas, A., Zavadskas, E. K., & Gulbinas, A. (2004). Multiple criteria decision support web-based system for building refurbishment. *Journal of civil*

engineering and management, 10(1), 77-85.

- Kelley, K., Clark, B., Brown, V., & Sitzia, J. (2003). Good practice in the conduct and reporting of survey research. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 15(3), 261-266.
- Kaur, M., & Singh, R. (2018). Risk and risk-handling strategies in construction projects. *International Journal of Management Studies*, 5(4).1-7.
- Kh. M., S. L., & Omran, A. (2009). Sustainable development and construction industry in Malaysia. In *Economic, Social, Political and Cultural Problems of the Society*, 10, 76-85.
- Khairi, M., Jaapar, A., & Yahya, Z. (2017). The application, benefits and challenges of retrofitting the existing buildings. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 271(1).
- Khalaila, R. (2013). Translation of questionnaires into arabic in cross-cultural research: techniques and equivalence issues. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 24(4), 363-370.
- Khalil, A., Hammouda, N., & El-Deeb, K. (2018). Implementing sustainability in retrofitting heritage buildings. Case study: Villa Antoniadis, Alexandria, Egypt. *Heritage*, 1(1), 57-87.
- Khoury, J., Alameddine, Z., & Hollmuller, P. (2017). Understanding and bridging the energy performance gap in building retrofit. *Energy Procedia*, 122, 217-222.
- Khodeir, L.M., Mohamed, A. H. M. (2015). Identifying the latest risk probabilities affecting construction projects in Egypt according to political and economic variables. *HBRC Journal*, 11(1), 129-135.
- Kibert C.J. (2013). Sustainable construction: Green building design and delivery, 4th edition. *Wiley Publisher*.
- Klotz, L., & Horman, M. (2010). Counterfactual analysis of sustainable project delivery processes. *Journal of Construction engineering and management*, 136(5), 595-605.
- Konopásek, Z. (2008). Making thinking visible with Atlas.Ti: Computer assisted qualitative analysis as textual practices. *Qualitative Social Research*, 9(2), 12.
- Kontokosta, C. E. (2016). Modeling the energy retrofit decision in commercial office buildings. *Energy and Buildings*, 131, 1-20.
- Krarti, M. (2011). Energy audit of building systems an engineering approach. In *CRC Press*.

- Krieske, M., Hu, H., & Egnor, T. (2014). The scalability of the building retrofit market: A review study. *2014 IEEE Conference on Technologies for Sustainability, SusTech 2014*, 184-191.
- Krysiński, D., Nowakowski, P., & Dana, P. (2017). Social acceptance for energy efficient solutions in renovation processes. *Energies*, *1*(7), 689.
- Kumar, A., Chani, P. S., & Deoliya, R. (2014). Green retrofit potential in existing research laboratories and demonstration of energy efficient and sustainable technologies: Case study. *International Journal of Science, Engineering and Technology Research (IJSETR)*, *3*(3), 400–405.
- Kuntz, K., & Hu, X. (2017). Building green—and the risks for commercial properties. <https://www.verisk.com/insurance/visualize/building-green-and-the-risks-for-commercial-properties/>
- Kuusk, K., & Kalamees, T. (2016). Retrofit cost-effectiveness: Estonian apartment buildings. *Building Research and Information*, *44*(8), 920-934.
- Kuzel, A. J. (1992). *Sampling in Qualitative Inquiry*. Newbury, CA: Sage Publication.
- Lam, P. T., Chan, E. H., Poon, C. S., Chau, C. K., & Chun, K. P. (2010). Factors affecting the implementation of green specifications in construction. *Journal of Environmental management*, *91*(3), 654-661.
- Lapinski, A. R., Horman, M. J., & Riley, D. R. (2006). Lean processes for sustainable project delivery. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, *132*(10), 1083-1091.
- Lauesen, S., Vinter, O., 2001. Preventing requirement defects: an experiment in process improvement. *Requirements Engineering Journal*, *6* (1), 37-50.
- Lee, C. S., & Ali, A. S. (2012). Implementation of risk management in the Malaysian construction industry. *Journal of Surveying, Construction & Property*, *3*(1), 1-15.
- Lee, H. W., Choi, K., & Gambatese, J. A. (2014). Real options valuation of phased investments in commercial energy retrofits under building performance risks. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, *140*(6), 0501-4004.
- Lesjak, M. (2014). Analysis and review of the best practices and lessons learned on EE financing from Malaysia and other countries (Issue August).
- Less, B., & Walker, I. (2015). Deep Energy Retrofit Guidance for the Building America Solutions Center. *Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory*.
- Lewis, B. (2004). NVivo 2.0 and ATLAS.ti 5.0: A comparative review of two popular

- qualitative data-analysis programs. *Field Methods*, 16(4), 439-469.
- Li, Y., Ren, J., Jing, Z., Jianping, L., Ye, Q., & Lv, Z. (2017). The existing building sustainable retrofit in China: A review and case study. *Procedia Engineering*, 205, 3638-3645.
- Liang, X., Shen, G. Q., & Guo, L. (2015). Improving management of green retrofits from a stakeholder perspective: A case study in China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 12, 13823-13842.
- Liang, X., Yu, T., & Guo, L. (2017). Understanding stakeholders' influence on project success with a new sna method: A case study of the green retrofit in China. *Sustainability*, 9(11), 1927.
- Liberda, M., Ruwanpura, J., & Jergeas, G. (2012). Construction productivity improvement: A study of human, management and external issues markus. *Construction Research Congress*, 1-8.
- Liu, Y., Liu, T., Ye, S., & Liu, Y. (2018). Cost-benefit analysis for energy efficiency retrofit of existing buildings: A case study in China. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 177, 493-506.
- Lockwood, C. (2009). Building Retro. *Building retro publication*.
- Longnecker, M., & Ott, L. (2006). An introduction to statistical methods and data analysis. *Technometrics* (5th ed., Vol. 31, Issue 3). Duxbury.
- Louloudi, A., & Klügl, F. (2012). A new framework for coupling agent-based simulation and immersive visualisation. 51-57.
- Low, S. P., Gao, S., & Tay, W. L. (2014). Comparative study of project management and critical success factors of greening new and existing buildings in Singapore. *Structural Survey*, 32(5), 413-433.
- Lu, C.-J., & Shulman, S. W. (2008). Rigour and flexibility in computer-based qualitative research: Introducing the coding analysis toolkit. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 2(1), 105-117.
- Lu, X. (2010). Retrofitting design of building structures. *Building and Environment*, 1(1), 167.
- Lucon, O., Üрге-Vorsatz, D., Zain Ahmed, A., Akbari, H., Bertoldi, P., Cabeza, L.F., Eyre, N., Gadgil, A., Harvey, L.D.D., Jiang, Y., Liphoto, E., Mirasgedis, S., Murakami, S., Parikh, J., Pyke, C., Vilariño, M.V. (2014). Climate change 2014: Mitigation of climate change. *Buildings*, 5(2), 4-11.
- Lund, O. B., Haddadi, A., Lohne, J., & Bjørberg, S. (2016). Sustainable planning in

- refurbishment projects: An early phase evaluation. *Energy Procedia*, 96(1876), 425-434.
- Ma, Z., Cooper, P., Daly, D., & Ledo, L. (2012). Existing building retrofits: Methodology and state-of-the-art. *Energy and Buildings*, 55(12), 889-902.
- Mackenzie, N., & Knipe, S. (2006). Research dilemmas: Paradigms, methods and methodology. *Issues in Educational Research*, 16(2), 193-205.
- Marshall, B., Cardon, P., Poddar, A., & Fontenot, R. (2013). Does sample size matter in qualitative research? A review of qualitative interviews in research. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 54(1), 11-22.
- Mateo-Garcia, M., Ahmed, A., & McGough, D. (2017). Non-invasive approaches for low-energy retrofit of buildings: Implementation, monitoring and simulation in a living lab case study. *WIT Transactions on the Built Environment*, 171(5), 183-193.
- Mathew, P. A., Dunn, L. N., Sohn, M. D., Mercado, A., Custudio, C., & Walter, T. (2015). Big-data for building energy performance: Lessons from assembling a very large national database of building energy use. *Applied Energy*, 140, 85-93.
- McGuirk, P., Dowling, R., & Bulkeley, H. (2014). Repositioning urban governments? Energy efficiency and Australia's changing climate and energy governance regimes. *Urban Studies*, 51(13), 2717-2734.
- McIntosh, M. J., & Morse, J. M. (2015). Situating and constructing diversity in semi-structured interviews. *Global Qualitative Nursing Research*, 2(2), 1-5.
- McLafferty, S. L. (2010). Key methods in geography second edition volume 91. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Menassa, C. C., & Baer, B. (2014). A framework to assess the role of stakeholders in sustainable building retrofit decisions. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 10, 207-221.
- Menassa, C. C. (2011). Evaluating sustainable retrofits in existing buildings under uncertainty. *Energy and Buildings*, 43(12), 3576-3583.
- Mendes, J. C. (2015). Post occupancy evaluation of a retrofit for the future project : 55 wolvercote road, Thamesmead. *Brunel University London*.
- Mensah, S., Ayarkwa, J., & Nani, G. (2014). Framework for modelling sustainable construction practices towards low carbon construction. In *Postgraduate Conference*.
- Mertens, D. M. (2007). Transformative paradigm mixed methods and social justice.

Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1(3), 212-225.

- Mertens, D. M. (2010). Philosophy in mixed methods teaching: The transformative paradigm as illustration. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 4(1), 9-18.
- Mertens, D. M. (2012). Transformative mixed methods: Addressing inequities. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 56(6), 802-813.
- Mertens, D. M. (2014). Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods. *Sage publications*.
- Miller, E., & Buys, L. (2008). Retrofitting commercial office buildings for sustainability: tenants' perspectives. *Journal of Property Investment & Finance*, 26(6), 552-561.
- Miller, S., & Strand, J. (2010). Climate cost uncertainty, retrofit cost uncertainty, and infrastructure closedown: A framework for analysis. *The World Bank*.
- Ministry of Energy Green Technologies and Water. (2014). National energy efficiency action plan.
- Ministry of Energy Green Technology and Water Malaysia (KeTTHA). (2017). Green technology master plan malaysia 2017-2030. Ministry of Energy, Green Technology and Water (KeTTHA).
- Mlecnik, E., Visscher, H., & van Hal, A. (2010). Barriers and opportunities for labels for highly energy-efficient houses. *Energy Policy*, 38(8), 4592-4603.
- Moezzi, M., & Janda, N. K.B. (2014). From if only to social potential in schemes to reduce building energy use. *Journal of Energy Resource Social Sciences*, 1, 30-40.
- Mohamad, N. L., Shari, Z., & Dahlan, N. D. (2018). Building envelope retrofit : Enhancing energy performance in existing government office buildings in Malaysia. Retrived from www.mgbc.org.my
- Mohammadpour, A., Anumba, C. J., & Messner, J. I. (2017). Retrofitting of healthcare facilities: Case study approach. *Journal of Architectural Engineering*, 23(3), 5-8.
- Mohammed, I. M. (2018). *Framework for developing reverse mortgage market in Malaysia*. Unpublished PhD Thesis: Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia.
- Mohareb, E., Hashemi, A., Shahrestani, M., & Sunikka-Blank, M. (2017). Retrofit planning for the performance gap: Results of a workshop on addressing energy, health and comfort needs in a protected building. *Energies*, 10(8), 4-20.

- Mohd-Rahim, F., Pirotti, A., Keshavarzsaleh, A., Zainon, N., & Zakaria, N. (2017). Green construction project: a critical review of retrofitting awarded green buildings in Malaysia. *Journal Of Design And Built Environment*, 1(5), 11-26.
- Moncef, K. (2018). Optimal design and retrofit of energy efficient buildings, communities, and urban centers. In *Butterworth-Heinemann*.
- Monetti, E., Silva, S. A. R., & Rocha, R. M. (2006). The practice of project risk management in government projects: A case study in São Paulo city. *Construction in Developing Countries: New Issues and Challenges*, January, 1-9.
- Morgan, D. L. (2014). Pragmatism as a paradigm for social research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(8), 1045-1053.
- Morse, J. M. (2000). Determining sample size. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10(1), 3-5.
- Muhr, T. (1991) Atlas.Ti - A prototype for the support of text interpretation. in tesch, renata (hg.), qualitative sociology, 14, 349-371. *Human Science Press*.
- Muhr, T. (1994). Atlas.Ti computer-aided text interpretation and theory building. user's manual. *Scientific Software Development*.
- Muhr, T. (1997). Visual qualitative data analysis management model building in education research and business. User's manual and reference. New version 4.1 designed for windows 95 and windows nt. *Scientific Software Development*.
- Muhr, T. (1997). Atlas.Ti - The knowledge workbench. visual qualitative data analysis management model building. *Scientific Software Development*.
- Naeem, S., Khanzada, B., Mubashir, T., & Sohail, H. (2018). Impact of project planning on project success with mediating role of risk management and moderating role of organizational culture. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 9(1), 88-98.
- Namey, E., Guest, G., McKenna, K., & Chen, M. (2016). Evaluating bang for the buck: A cost-effectiveness comparison between individual interviews and focus groups based on thematic saturation levels. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 37(3), 425-440.
- National Institute for Building Sciences. (2014). Financing small commercial building energy performance upgrades: challenges and opportunities. http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nibs.org/resource/resmgr/CC/CFIRE_CommBldgFinance-Final.pdf

- Nazri, A. Q., Izran, S. M., Baba, M., Zainol, N. N., Lokman, M. A. A., Woon, N. B., & Ramli, N. A. (2015). The Need for Retrofitting To Achieve Sustainability of Malaysian Buildings. *Jurnal Teknologi*, *10*, 171-176.
- Ng, S. T., Gong, W., & Loveday, D. L. (2014). Sustainable refurbishment methods for uplifting the energy performance of high-rise residential buildings in Hong Kong. *Procedia Engineering*, *85*, 385-392.
- Nielsen, A. N., Jensen, R. L., Larsen, T. S., & Nissen, S. B. (2016). Early stage decision support for sustainable building renovation - A review. *Building and Environment*, *103*, 165-181.
- Nikolaou, T., Kolokotsa, D., & Stavrakakis, G. (2011). Review on methodologies for energy benchmarking, rating and classification of buildings. *Advances in Building Energy Research*, *5*(1), 53-70.
- Nimlyat, P. S., Kandar, M. Z., & Zango, M. S. (2016). Green building and environment sustainability: A retrofit of chemical engineering pilot plant building Universiti Teknologi Malaysi (UTM). *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, *9*(46) 1-11.
- Oh, T. H., Chua, S. C., & Pang, Y. S. (2010). Energy policy and alternative energy in Malaysia: Issues and challenges for sustainable growth - An update. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *14*(4), 1241-1252.
- Ojo, G. K., & Odediran, S. J. (2015). Significance of construction cost estimating risks in Nigeria. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Construction Science*, *2*(1), 1-8.
- Olsen, W. (2004). Triangulation in social research: qualitative and quantitative methods can really be mixed. In *Developments in sociology*, 1-30. Causeway Press.
- Pallant, J. (2011). SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS. *4th Ed. Crows Nest*.
- Palm, J. (2013). The building process of single-family houses and the embeddedness of energy. *Journal of Energy Policy*, *62*, 762-767.
- Pan, S., Wang, X., Wei, S., Xu, C., Zhang, X., Xie, J., Tindall, J., & De Wilde, P. (2017). Energy waste in buildings due to occupant behaviour. *Energy Procedia*, *105*, 2233-2238.
- Pan, Y., Xu, Z., Li, Y., Levine, M., Feng, W., & Zhou, N. (2012). Evaluating commercial building retrofit energy saving by using a building retrofit tool: Case

- studies in Shanghai. *Energies*, 9(21), 4-18.
- Paone, A., & Bacher, J. P. (2018). The impact of building occupant behaviour on energy efficiency and methods to influence it: A review of the state of the art. *Energies*, 11(4), 20-28.
- Paradis, R. (2016). Retrofitting existing buildings to improve sustainability and energy performance. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Passive and Low Energy Architecture: Cities, Buildings, People: Towards Regenerative Environments, Los Angeles, CA, USA*, 11-13.
- Parrish, K., & Regnier, C. (2013). Proposed design process for deep energy savings in commercial building retrofit projects. *Journal of Architectural Engineering*, 19(2), 71-80.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. SAGE Publications inc.
- Paulus, T. M., & Lester, J. N. (2016). Atlas.Ti for conversation and discourse analysis studies. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 19(4), 405-428
- Perez-Lombard, L., Ortiz, J., & Pout, C. (2008). Review on buildings energy consumption information. *Energy and Buildings*, 40, 394-398.
- Pinch, T.J., & Bijker, W.E. (1987). The social construction of facts and artifacts or how the sociology of the social construction of technological systems: New directions in the sociology and history of technology.
- Ponto, J. (2012). Understanding and evaluating survey research. *Journal of the Advance Practitioner in Oncology*, 6(2), 168-171.
- Pradhan, P. M., Adhikari, R., Dahal, A., Shrestha, A., Subedi, D. L., Thapa, S., & Kharel, P. (2016). Retrofitting design of Kathmandu University library building after Gorkha earthquake 2015. *Lowland Technology International*, 18(2), 65-74.
- Project Management Institute, P. (2008). A guide to the project management body of knowledge (pmbok guide): 4th edition. *Project Management Institute*.
- Qin, X., Mo, Y., & Jing, L. (2016). Risk perceptions of the life-cycle of green buildings in China. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 126, 148-158.
- Raju V., Narayanaswamy & N.S., Harinarayana, (2016). Online survey tools: A case study of Google Forms.
- Rambaree, K. and Faxelid, E. (2013). Considering abductive thematic network

- analysis with Atlas.Ti 6.2. *Advancing Research Methods with New Media Technologies*, 170-186. Hershey PA
- Rambaree, K. (2013). Three methods of qualitative data analysis using Atlas.Ti: 'A posse ad esse'. In *Atlas.Ti User Conference 2013, 12-14 September 2013, Technische Universität Berlin, Germany*, 1, 1-15.
- Rambaree, K. (2016). Computer-Aided deductive critical discourse analysis of a case study from Mauritius with Atlas-Ti 6.2. In *Business Intelligence: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (669-691).
- Ranawaka, I., & Mallawaarachchi, H. (2018). A risk-responsive framework for green retrofit projects in Sri Lanka. *Built Environment Project and Asset Management*, 4(2), 50-58.
- Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (2012). Designing and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide. *John Wiley & Sons*.
- Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a theory of social practices a development in culturalist theorizing. *Journal of Social Theory*, 5(2).243-263.
- Reja, U., Manfreda, K. L., Hlebec, V., & Vehovar, V. (2003). Open-ended vs. close-ended Questions in web questionnaires. *Advanced Methodology Statistic*, 19(6), 512-517.
- Reyers, J., & Mansfield, J. (2001). The assessment of risk in conservation refurbishment projects. *Structural Survey*, 19(5), 238-244.
- Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (2003). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. London: *Sage Publications*.
- Rosanna, X. (2016, 13 January). L.A. landlords and tenants will share earthquake retrofit costs under deal approved by City Council. *Los Angeles Times*.
- Rovers, R. (2014). New energy retrofit concept: "Renovation trains" for mass housing. *Building Research and Information*, 42(6), 757-767.
- Rowley, J. (2014). Designing and using research questionnaires. *Management Research Review*, 37(3), 308-330.
- Rughooputh, R., Cheeneebash, J., & Mungroo, M. I. (2014). The impacts, benefits and cost of sustainable renovation to existing buildings in Mauritius and setting up of possible strategies: Two case studies. *Environmental Management and Sustainable Development*, 3(2), 109.
- Ruparathna, R., Hewage, K., & Rehan, S. (2016). Improving the energy efficiency of the existing building stock: A critical review of commercial and institutional

- buildings. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 9(30), 1032-1045.
- Sağlam, N. G., Yılmaz, A. Z., Becchio, C., & Corgnati, S. P. (2017). A comprehensive cost-optimal approach for energy retrofit of existing multi-family buildings: Application to apartment blocks in Turkey. *Energy and Buildings*, 150, 224-238.
- Sakina, M. A., Fassman, E., & Wilkinson, S. (2011). Risks associated in implementation of green buildings. *4th International Conference on Sustainability Engineering and Science*.
- Sanders, M. D., Parrish, K., & Mathew, P. (2012). Ready to retrofit : The process of project team selection, building benchmarking , and financing commercial building energy retrofit projects.
- Sandi, D., & Daniel, G. (2018, 15 February). 'This is an urgent issues': Seattle makes little progress on buildings that can kill in earthquakes. *The Seattle Times*.
- Sargent, R. G. (2008). Verification and validation of simulation models. In *2008 Winter Simulation Conference*, 157-169.
- Sarpin, N. (2015). *Developing people capabilities for the promotion of sustainability in facility management practices*. PhD Thesis, Queensland University of Technology.
- Saunders, B., Sim, J., Kingstone, T., Baker, S., Waterfield, J., Bartlam, B., Burroughs, H., & Jinks, C. (2018). Saturation in qualitative research: Exploring its conceptualization and operationalization. *Quality and Quantity*, 52(4), 1893-1907.
- Saunders, M. N. K., Thornhill, A., & Lewis, P. (2016). Research methods for business students. *Pearson*.
- Scotland, J. (2012). Exploring the philosophical underpinnings of research: Relating ontology and epistemology to the methodology and methods of the scientific, interpretive, and critical research paradigms. *English Language Teaching*, 5(9), 9.
- Setunge, S., Zhang, G., & Ziem, A. (2014). Payback period based prioritization of building retrofit technologies: An innovative use of critical path method. Proceedings of the 21st International Symposium on Advancement of Construction Management and Real Estate. *Advancement of Construction Management and Real Estate, November*.
- Seyler, N. J. (2019). Sustainability and the occupant: the effect of mindfulness and environmental attitudes on real estate user behaviours. *Springer Netherlands*.

- Shaikh, P. H., Shaikh, F., Sahito, A. A., Uqaili, M. A., & Umrani, Z. (2017). An overview of the challenges for cost-effective and energy-efficient retrofits of the existing building stock. *Cost-Effective Energy Efficient Building Retrofitting: Materials, Technologies, Optimization and Case Studies, October*, 257-278.
- Shannon-Baker, P. (2016). Making paradigms meaningful in mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 10(4), 319-334.
- Shanshan, B., Geogrey, S., Anumba, C., Wong, A., & Xin, L. (2014). Literature review of green retrofit design for commercial buildings with BIM implication. *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment*, 4(2), 188-214.
- Shnapp, S., Sitja, R., & Laustsen, J. (2013). What is a deep retrofit (Issue February). http://www.gbpn.org/sites/default/files/08.DR_TechRep.low.pdf
- Shove, E., & Pantzar, M. (2005). Consumers, producers and practices: Understanding the invention and reinvention of Nordic walking. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 5(1), 43-64.
- Sigmund, Z. (2016). Risk management tool for improving project flows for construction projects on existing buildings. *Electronic Journal of the Faculty of Civil Engineering Osijek-e-GFOS*, 7(12), 76-85.
- Sigmund, Z., & Radujković, M. (2014). Risk breakdown structure for construction projects on existing buildings. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 119, 894-901.
- Stagrum, A. E., Andenæs, E., Kvande, T., & Lohne, J. (2020). Climate change adaptation measures for buildings: A scoping review. *Sustainability*, 12(5), 1721.
- STBA (2015). Planning responsible retrofit of traditional buildings. Retrieved from www.stbauk.org
- Stevens, D. G., Brounen, D., Adan, H., & Fuerst, F. (2017). Risks and uncertainties associated with residential energy efficiency investments. *Finance, Risk and Accounting Perspectives*, September, 1-21.
- Sun, X., Gou, Z., Lu, Y., & Tao, Y. (2018). Strengths and weaknesses of existing building green retrofits : Case study of a LEED EBOM gold project. *Energies*, 11(1936), 1-18.
- Suruhanjaya Tenaga, E. C. (2019). Malaysia energy information hub - statistic for electricity consumption. <https://meih.st.gov.my/statistics>
- Swan, W., & Brown, P. (2013). Part 2 Policy and regulation 5. A roadmap to significant reductions in energy use for existing buildings : The long view.

- Taal, M., Bulatov, I., Klemeš, J., & Stehlík, P. (2003). Cost estimation and energy price forecasts for economic evaluation of retrofit projects. *Applied Thermal Engineering*, 23(14), 1819-1835.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). Using multivariate statistics. Boston, *Pearson Education*.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using multivariate statistics. Boston, *Pearson inc*.
- Tadeu, S. F., Alexandre, R. F., Tadeu, A. J. B., Antunes, C. H., Simões, N. A. V., & Silva, P. P. Da. (2016). A comparison between cost optimality and return on investment for energy retrofit in buildings-A real options perspective. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 21, 12-25.
- Talen, E. (2011). Sprawl retrofit: sustainable urban form in unsustainable places. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 38(6), 952-978.
- Talib, O. (2019). Analisis data kualitatif dengan Atlas.Ti 8: Penerangan lengkap langkah-demi-langkah. UPM Press.
- Tam, V. W. Y., Almeida, L., & Le, K. (2018). Energy-related occupant behaviour and its implications in energy use: A chronological review. *Sustainability*, 10(8), 1-20.
- Tan, B., Yavuz, Y., Otay, E. N., & Çamlıbel, E. (2016). Optimal selection of energy efficiency measures for energy sustainability of existing buildings. *Computers and Operations Research*, 66, 258-271.
- Tan, Y., Liu, G., Zhang, Y., Shuai, C., & Shen, G. Q. (2018). Green retrofit of aged residential buildings in Hong Kong: A preliminary study. *Building and Environment*, 143(6), 89-98.
- Taherdoost, Hamed. (2016). Validity and reliability of the research instrument: How to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in a research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 5, 28-36.
- Martin C. (2018, November 1). Malaysia can save at least RM47bil over 15 years by being more energy efficient. *The Star*.
- Thomsen, K. E., Morck, O., Rolland, J., & Buvik, K. (2009). Innovative retrofit to improve energy efficiency in public buildings. *ECEEE 2009 Summer Study Proceedings. Act! Innovate! Deliver! Reducing Energy Demand Sustainably*, 2(2009), 907-918.
- Thuvander, L., Femenías, P., Mjörnell, K., & Meiling, P. (2012). Unveiling the process

- of sustainable renovation. *Sustainability*, 4(6), 1188-1213.
- Tollin, H. M. (2011). Green building risks: It's not easy being green. *Environmental Claims Journal*, 23(304), 199-213.
- Townend, S. (2003). The knowledge workbench. Berlin: scientific software development for pc and mac. *The Institute of Archaeology*, 14, 161-169.
- Topouzi, Janda, Kathryn &, Marina. (2015). Telling tales: Using stories to remake energy policy. *Building Research and Information*, 43, 516-533.
- Trotta, G. (2018). The determinants of energy efficient retrofit investments in the English residential sector. *Energy Policy*, 120, 175-182.
- Tryson, L. (2016). Commercial Buildings & the Retrofit Opportunity. *Contracting Business*. <https://www.contractingbusiness.com/commercial-hvac/commercial-buildings-retrofit-opportunity>
- Tserng, H. P., Yin, S. Y., Dzeng, R. J., Wou, B., Tsai, M. D., & Chen, W. Y. (2009). A study of ontology-based risk management framework of construction projects through project life cycle. *Automation in Construction*, 18(7), 994-1008.
- Ultanir, E. (2012). An epistemological glance at the constructivist approach: Constructivist learning in Dewey, Piaget, and Montessori. *Online Submission*, 5(2), 195-212.
- Urbanski, M., Haque, A.U., & Oino, I. (2019). The moderating role of risk management in project planning and project success: Evidence from construction businesses of Pakistan and the UK. *Engineering Management in Production and Services*, 11(1), 80-86.
- Wang, B., & Xia, X. (2015). Optimal maintenance planning for building energy efficiency retrofitting from optimization and control system perspectives. *Energy and Buildings*, 96, 299-308.
- Wei, E., Bagheri, S. R., Rangavajhala, S., & Shen, E. (2014). A comprehensive risk management system on building energy retrofit. *Annual SRII Global Conference, SRII*, 281–289.
- Wei, S., Hassan, T. M., Firth, S. K., & Fouchal, F. (2016). Impact of occupant behaviour on the energy-saving potential of retrofit measures for a public building in the UK. *Intelligent Buildings International*, 9(2), 97-106.
- Wengraf, Tom. (2018). Qualitative Research Interviews: biographic narrative and semi-structured method.
- Wilkinson, S. J., James, K., & Reed, R. (2009). Using building adaptation to deliver

- sustainability in Australia. *Structural Survey*, 27(1), 46-61.
- Wilson, C., Crane, L., & Chrysochoidis, G. (2015). Why do homeowners renovate energy efficiently? Contrasting perspectives and implications for policy. *Energy Research and Social Science*, 7, 12-22.
- Woolgar, S. (1991). The turn to technology in social studies of science. *Journal of Science Technology Human Valuation*, 16(1). 20-50.
- Xia, B., Zuo, J., Wu, P., & Ke, Y. (2015). Sustainable construction trends in journal papers. *Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on Advancement of Construction Management and Real Estate*, 169-179.
- Xia, B and Chan, A P (2011) Investigation of barriers to entry into the design-build market in the People's Republic of China. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 138(1), 120-127.
- Yan, Z. & Barbara, M. (2005). Qualitative Analysis of Content by. *Human Brain Mapping*, 30(7), 2197-2206.
- Yang, R. J., & Zou, P. X. W. (2014). Stakeholder-associated risks and their interactions in complex green building projects : A social network model. *Energies*, 73(2), 208-210.
- Yang, J.-B., & Peng, S.-C. (2008). Development of a customer satisfaction evaluation model for construction project management. *Building and Environment*, 43(4), 458-468.
- Yu, S., Tu, Y., & Luo, C. (2011). Green retrofitting costs and benefits : A new research agenda. *Real Estate Studies*, August.
- Zakaria, R. B., Foo, K. S., Zin, R. M., Yang, J., & Zolfagharian, S. (2012). Potential retrofitting of existing campus buildings to green buildings. *Applied Mechanics and Materials*, 2(4), 178-181.
- Zavadskas, E., Raslanas, S., & Kaklauskas, A. (2008). The selection of effective retrofit scenarios for panel houses in urban neighborhoods based on expected energy savings and increase in market value: The Vilnius case. *Energy and Buildings*, 40(4), 573-587.
- Zolkafli, U. K., Zakaria, N., Yahya, Z., Ali, A. S., Wajdi, F., Othman, M., & Hock, Y. K. (2012). Risks in conservation projects. *Journal of Design and Built Environment*, 5(1), 1-10.
- Zolkepli, F. (2018). *The star, 2018- KWSP on fire*. The Star Online. <https://www.thestar.com.my/news/nation/2018/02/14/it-just-did-not-meet->

safety-standards-flammable-cladding-panels-fuelled-the-epf-building-blaze-says/

- Zou, P. X. W., Alam, M., Sanjayan, J., Wilson, J., Stewart, R., Sahin, O., Bertone, E., Buntine, C., Blair, E., & Ellis-Jones, D. (2016). Managing risks in complex building retrofit projects for energy and water efficiency. *International Conference on Innovative Production and Construction (IPC 2016)*, 29-30th Sep 2016, Perth, Australia, September, 1-16.
- Zou, P. X. W., Zhang, G., & Wang, J. (2014). Identifying key risks in construction projects: Life cycle and stakeholder perspectives. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 8(2), 1-14.
- Zuo, J., & Zhao, Z.-Y. (2014). Green building research- Current status and future agenda: A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 30(3), 271-281.



PTTA UTHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUNKU TUN AMINAH

VITA

Mohammad Syabilee Bin Nikman Lee is a student in the Department of Construction Management, Faculty of Technology Management and Business, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia. He received his Certificate in Politeknik Sultan Azlan Shah in 2007 and continue with Diploma in Politeknik Sultan Abdul Halim Muadzam Shah in 2010 with majoring in Building Services Engineering. He pursuits his Bachelor Degree in Technology Management (Construction) and strive a fast-track PhD in Technology Management at the Faculty of Technology Management and Business, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia in the area of building retrofit. His general research interest is in building retrofit for existing building risk management towards the commercial building.



PTTA UTHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUNKU TUN AMINAH