

Construction Intelligence — Working Definition

RRI-W01 · Version 0.1

A Proposed Definition and Practice Boundary for an Emerging Professional Discipline

Rhogan Research Institute

Construction Intelligence Research & Standards

Classification: Definition White Paper

Status: Proposed Working Definition — Open for Review

Version: 0.1

Issue Date: 12 October 2026

Abstract

Construction projects generate vast quantities of drawings, specifications, schedules, contracts, product data, correspondence, field observations, and revisions. Their volume does not establish their reliability. Data may be accessible yet uncoordinated; documents may be issued yet unfit for a particular decision; and a technically fluent summary may still conceal an unsupported conclusion.

This white paper proposes a working definition of Construction Intelligence as a distinct evidence-to-decision practice. It identifies the necessary characteristics of the practice, separates it from adjacent disciplines and software categories, sets minimum requirements for traceability and professional validation, and establishes a vocabulary for discussing outputs without overstating their certainty.

Construction Intelligence is not presented as an adopted industry standard, a new licensure category, or a replacement for architecture, engineering, estimating, project controls, construction management, or legal judgment. The proposed discipline instead concerns the controlled interpretation of interdependent construction information for a stated decision, including the treatment of contradictions, omissions, uncertainty, authority, and change.

The central proposition: Construction Intelligence is demonstrated by a defensible decision-support result—not by the amount of data processed, the speed of an analysis, or the presence of artificial intelligence.

1. Purpose and Research Standing

The purpose of this paper is to offer a falsifiable and operational working definition for use in research, procurement, professional discussion, workflow design, and comparative evaluation. A term that can describe any use of construction data cannot reliably distinguish a specialized practice from routine document handling.

The proposal advances four claims. First, Construction Intelligence must be anchored to a defined construction decision. Second, it must operate on identifiable source evidence and respect document authority and revision status. Third, it must distinguish established conditions from inferences, assumptions, contradictions, and unknowns. Fourth, its findings must be reviewable by qualified people and capable of changing when the evidence changes.

These are proposed criteria for disciplinary coherence; they are not published requirements of ISO, NIST, AACE, buildingSMART, NIBS, or any licensing board. Existing authoritative material is used as research context and methodological alignment, not as an assertion of endorsement.

2. Why a Working Definition Is Needed

Construction information is fragmented by authorship, discipline, trade, format, revision, contract role, and project phase. A floor finish may appear in a room finish schedule, an architectural plan, a specification section, an addendum, a product substitution response, and a later field directive. These records may not agree, and none can be assumed to control merely because it appears newest or more detailed.

Common terms—"AI-powered intelligence," "smart document review," "BIM intelligence," and "construction analytics"—often describe tools or outputs without identifying their evidentiary conditions. Without an explicit definition, an attractive dashboard, a quantity count, or an automated summary can be sold as intelligence even when it fails to explain what is known, what is contested, whose authority governs, or whether the result supports the decision at hand.

Document availability is not document maturity. Document maturity is not project risk. Finding volume is not finding accuracy. A model-generated answer is not a professionally validated conclusion.

The proposed definition treats those distinctions as constitutive requirements rather than optional enhancements.

3. The Proposed Working Definition

3.1 Full Definition

Construction Intelligence is the disciplined, decision-specific practice of identifying, governing, correlating, and critically interpreting construction information across relevant sources, disciplines, and revisions; assessing source authority and

evidentiary sufficiency; identifying supported conditions, contradictions, omissions, dependencies, and material uncertainties; and producing traceable, explicitly qualified, professionally reviewable findings that inform a defined construction decision without displacing the responsible decision-maker.

3.2 Concise Definition

Construction Intelligence turns governed construction evidence into traceable, uncertainty-aware support for a specific construction decision.

3.3 Boundary Condition

A workflow should not be described as demonstrated Construction Intelligence solely because it extracts data, searches files, measures quantities, summarizes text, predicts a number, builds a model, flags anomalies, or generates a report. Any of those capabilities may contribute to Construction Intelligence. None, standing alone, verifies the complete practice.

3.4 Necessary Conditions for a Defensible Claim

Condition	Minimum demonstration
Defined decision	Names the user, decision, project scope, stage, and consequence of being wrong.
Governed source set	Identifies reviewed evidence, authority, version, coverage, and material absences.
Cross-source reasoning	Tests relevant relationships and contradictory claims; does not only summarize each file.
Uncertainty discipline	Separates observations, interpretations, assumptions, unknowns, and escalation needs.
Traceable output	Links material claims to evidence and provides a reproducible rationale and limitation.
Accountable review	Provides competent review, correction, responsibility, and revision control appropriate to impact.

All six conditions are proposed as necessary for a high-confidence disciplinary claim. They do not guarantee correctness. Demonstration is contextual: a simple decision may require a small evidence set, while a complex contractual or life-safety decision may require extensive interdisciplinary review.

4. What the Practice Produces

Construction Intelligence should distinguish the evidence-to-decision chain rather than collapsing every stage into the word “insight.” Each stage has different truth conditions and potential failures.

Stage	Meaning	Illustrative failure if confused
Source record	A document, data object, observation, or communication with provenance.	An obsolete sheet is treated as active.

Stage	Meaning	Illustrative failure if confused
Extracted datum	A represented fact such as a note, dimension, date, or quantity.	A transcribed dimension is assumed correct.
Interpreted finding	A tested claim about a construction condition or relationship.	A contradiction is guessed away.
Decision implication	Why the finding matters to a named decision and stakeholder.	Material uncertainty is reported without consequence.
Decision and action	A judgment or direction made by the authorized party.	Analyst output silently substitutes for approval.
Observed outcome	What later happened or was independently verified.	A predicted benefit is declared achieved.

The discipline operates most directly between source records and decision implications. It can inform a decision, but the decision remains with the person or entity holding the relevant legal, design, contractual, operational, or commercial authority.

5. Decision Context and Lifecycle Application

A finding is meaningful only relative to the decision it is supposed to support. Identical documents can be sufficient for conceptual benchmarking and insufficient for a purchase order, fabrication release, or final installation.

Context	Illustrative CI question	Typical output
Feasibility	What has enough support to set conceptual parameters?	Known/unknown conditions and bounded assumptions.
Design / coordination	Where do cross-discipline requirements conflict?	Issue register and discipline-specific clarification.
Bid / GMP	What scope and commercial exposure can be defended?	Source-referenced inclusions, qualifications, and risk.
Contract / award	Which obligation is established and which remains disputed?	Authority-linked scope position for counsel/contract review.
Procurement / release	Are item, quantity, approval, lead time, and interface established?	Release-readiness finding and unresolved dependency.
Construction	Does the current direction support the proposed installation?	Current revision/field condition reconciliation.
Turnover / operations	Are accepted records and asset obligations preserved?	Verified closeout information with provenance.

These contexts align conceptually with the decision-context principle discussed in RRI-M01, Document Maturity Index. They do not represent externally standardized Construction Intelligence classes.

6. Relationship to Established Disciplines and Technologies

Construction Intelligence is an integrative practice; it does not claim ownership of the existing technical disciplines that supply its source evidence, methods, or professional judgment.

Adjacent practice	Primary purpose	Construction Intelligence distinction
Estimating / cost engineering	Measure, price, classify, and evaluate cost.	Interrogates evidence, exclusions, revision effects, dependencies, and defensibility behind cost decisions.
BIM / digital delivery	Structure, model, and exchange project/asset information.	May use BIM data but need not require a model; evaluates decision consequences and gaps across record types.
Document management	Control storage, permissions, distribution, and versions.	Interprets meaning and relationships after establishing source control.
Clash / model coordination	Identify geometric or rules-based conflicts.	Adds contract, specification, temporal, procurement, and decision context.
Project controls	Monitor cost, schedule, progress, and performance.	Tests whether the underlying evidence supports a specific prospective or retrospective inference.
Risk management	Identify, analyze, evaluate, and treat uncertainty.	Characterizes evidentiary conditions that feed risk analysis; does not substitute for it.
Generative AI / search	Retrieve, transform, classify, predict, or generate content.	Tools may assist but must be governed and validated; AI use is neither necessary nor sufficient.

For example, ISO 19650-1:2018 addresses information management across an asset lifecycle, and NBIMS-US V4 addresses structured digital information exchange. Those areas can supply essential controls and records, while this proposal focuses on evidence-supported decision interpretation. [1, 2]

7. The Evidence and Authority Principle

A source is not authoritative merely because it is present, signed, recent, visually persuasive, or extracted with high optical or language-model confidence. Construction records carry different functions: instructions, design intent, contractual obligations, communications, product claims, approvals, observations, or analysis. Their priority is often contractual and context-specific.

7.1 Minimum Source Record

Field	Required interpretation
Identity	Filename or record ID; sheet, section, detail, item, or communication reference.
Provenance	Issuing organization, origin, known custody, and access limitations.
Temporal status	Issue date, revision, addendum, supersession, and effective status where established.
Authority basis	Contract provision, formal direction, approval process, or authority explicitly unknown.
Coverage	Discipline, location, scope, decision period, and whether relevant documents were unavailable.
Evidence pinpoint	Page, sheet, detail, paragraph, location, object identifier, or field record.

7.2 No Universal Document Precedence Assumption

A workflow must not invent a universal order in which drawings always outrank specifications, the latest file always supersedes every prior instruction, or a submittal automatically changes the contract. Applicable contract terms and issuing authorities must be established. If precedence is unknown or contested, the issue remains open and its implication must be stated.

7.3 Absence Is Not a Negative Finding

“Not identified in the reviewed set” is different from “not required by the project.” Missing specification language does not prove that no requirement exists; an absent drawing detail does not prove that the construction condition is absent; and silence in an automated search does not justify an exclusion without review.

8. A Minimum Reproducible Workflow

The sequence below is proposed as a general method, not a requirement that every project use identical software, documents, or reviewers. Its purpose is to make reasoning and omissions auditable.

- 01. Define the decision, intended user, deliverable, trade or system boundary, and materiality criteria.
- 02. Register the evidence population and disclose any excluded, unavailable, corrupted, or unreadable records.
- 03. Identify issuing authorities, revision status, and contractual or procedural precedence where known.
- 04. Normalize terminology, locations, assemblies, dates, identifiers, and units without discarding provenance.
- 05. Extract and verify relevant claims against their original source records.
- 06. Join related evidence across documents, disciplines, locations, revisions, and decisions.

- 07. Identify supported conditions, omissions, conflicts, assumptions, dependencies, and required field checks.
- 08. Evaluate materiality and consequence without equating likelihood, exposure, confidence, and document maturity.
- 09. Prepare findings with exact evidence points, reasoning, qualifiers, and unanswered questions.
- 10. Perform qualified technical review of material conclusions and capture disagreements.
- 11. Issue a controlled, decision-specific result with revision and usage limitations.
- 12. Re-evaluate affected findings when new evidence arrives and record changes to the decision position.

For an automated workflow, record the software or model version, retrieval scope, configuration, human interventions, and applicable data handling rules when those details affect repeatability. For a manual workflow, record reviewers, methods, assumptions, and sampling limitations to an equivalent standard of accountability.

9. The Finding as the Fundamental Unit

The smallest auditable unit of Construction Intelligence is not the page, prompt, quantity, or dashboard widget; it is the decision-relevant finding. A finding is an assertion with supporting evidence, an interpretive path, a consequence, an uncertainty statement, and a controlled disposition.

Field	Description
Finding ID and scope	Unique identifier; project, location, system, affected decision.
Condition class	Supported condition; contradiction; omission; ambiguity; dependency; change; or field verification.
Evidence	Exact references and reviewed source status; counterevidence included.
Inference	Reasoned explanation distinguishing direct document content from interpretation.
Effect	Potential effect on scope, cost, schedule, procurement, quality, safety, or administration.
Uncertainty	What is not established, why, and which consequence depends on it.
Resolution authority	Role/entity able to clarify or decide; not assumed to be the analyst.
Disposition	Open, qualified, confirmed, resolved, superseded, or rejected with date and basis.

9.1 Illustrative Finding Language

The current room finish schedule assigns Material A to Room 210; the latest reviewed floor plan labels the same location Material B. Both references are recorded. The

governing requirement is not established in the reviewed information. The affected bid quantity and installation basis remain qualified pending authorized clarification.

This form is preferable to a flat declaration that Material A or B is correct. It demonstrates evidence, discrepancy, decision consequence, and disciplined non-resolution without manufacturing authority.

10. Uncertainty, Confidence, Maturity, and Risk

A mature Construction Intelligence practice must refuse false precision. Four different questions must remain separate even when they are represented within the same report or dashboard.

Construct	Question being answered	What it does not establish
Evidence coverage	Did the review include the pertinent population?	That included evidence is accurate or current.
Document maturity	Is information sufficiently complete and coordinated for this decision?	That the project is safe or low risk.
Finding confidence	How well is this finding supported and validated?	An objective probability without calibration.
Commercial / technical risk	What exposure might remain and what is its consequence?	That a low-confidence claim is definitely wrong.
Workflow performance	How well does this review method detect and qualify conditions?	That a single result guarantees future performance.

Confidence should normally be expressed in explicit categories with criteria (for example: supported by controlling sources and checked; provisionally interpreted; unverified; disputed). Do not publish numerical confidence scores as calibrated probabilities without a validation set, calibration method, and documented applicability limits.

Risk may be high when evidence is strong (for example, a clearly stated expensive obligation) and may be unknowable when evidence is weak. Document maturity and exposure therefore require separate measurement. RRI-M01 treats decision readiness as a further distinct construct.

11. Validation and Benchmarking Requirements

Construction Intelligence cannot establish a credible professional discipline solely by self-description. Claims of completeness, accuracy, or improvement require testing against relevant comparison conditions. RRI-M02, Construction Intelligence Benchmark Protocol, proposes controlled baselines, adjudicated findings, human review, and revision-sensitive tests for this purpose.

11.1 Proposed Evaluation Dimensions

Measure	Operational question
Material-condition recall	Of independently established important conditions, how many were detected?
Finding precision	Of issued findings, how many survive independent adjudication?
Evidence traceability	Can a reviewer locate the correct source and reproduce the interpretation?
Uncertainty fidelity	Were unresolved or low-evidence conditions qualified rather than invented away?
Coverage disclosure	Were missing documents, disciplines, locations, and review limits explicitly disclosed?
Revision responsiveness	Were changed/obsolete conditions accurately updated after addenda or new evidence?
Repeatability	Does the method reach consistent results on repeated equivalent inputs?
Professional effort	What review/correction time was required to reach a usable decision position?
Decision usefulness	Did the output materially improve the selected decision under declared criteria?

Evaluation must account for materiality: missing one consequential contractual scope conflict may matter more than identifying fifty harmless notation discrepancies. Results should state their denominator, adjudication criteria, sampled conditions, and observed limitations. Faster generation is useful only if the resulting claims withstand independent review.

11.2 Falsifiability Condition

A Construction Intelligence method is credible only if an independent test can show when it fails.

A test designed so the favored tool, researcher, or reviewer cannot lose is a demonstration, not evidence of disciplinary superiority. [7, 8]

12. Governance, Confidentiality, and Professional Accountability

Construction information commonly includes nonpublic drawings, commercial terms, pricing, security details, staff information, and client-controlled intellectual property. A valid Construction Intelligence practice begins with rights to access and process the information. It does not assume that a user has authority to transmit confidential project data to an external analytics or AI provider.

- Purpose limitation: use project records only for authorized decisions and intended processing purposes.

- Access and custody: document approved repositories, roles, sharing, retention, deletion, and incident paths.
- External services: evaluate contracts, data use, subprocessors, residency, retention, and security obligations before transmission.
- AI transparency: identify when AI materially contributed to a conclusion and preserve human oversight appropriate to impact.
- Competency limits: escalate design, code, legal, safety, and engineering determinations to authorized professionals.
- Corrections and accountability: maintain a log of challenged findings, changes, issuers, reviewers, and effective dates.

Where AI is used, the NIST AI RMF 1.0 offers relevant voluntary risk-management concepts, including govern, map, measure, and manage, as well as validity, transparency, accountability, privacy, security, and reliability. These principles inform this proposal; the AI RMF does not itself define the professional field of Construction Intelligence. [6]

13. Professional Competence and Division of Responsibility

The proposed discipline requires construction-domain knowledge as well as information skills. A practitioner must be able to distinguish an architectural finish symbol from a contractual product requirement, a change directive from an informal comment, a priced allowance from a quantified scope obligation, and an unanswered request for information from an authorized revision.

Competence should be assessed in terms of documented decisions and reviewed findings, not merely software training, prompt writing, or model access. Proposed competencies include document interpretation, specification and drawing coordination, commercial and contractual literacy, scope boundary definition, trade systems, evidence provenance, uncertainty communication, verification methods, information governance, and revision management.

Competence is also domain-limited. A skilled estimator may identify a structural conflict but is not thereby authorized to certify structural adequacy. An AI reviewer may surface a code issue but is not a licensed code official. The construction intelligence result should identify the competent resolver and stop where authorized professional judgment must begin.

14. Illustrative Application: Commercial Flooring Bid Review

Hypothetical example only—not a finding from an actual project. An estimator reviews a renovation package with an architectural finish schedule, finish plans, Division 09 resilient flooring specifications, floor-preparation notes, general requirements, and two addenda.

14.1 Ordinary Data Processing

A basic workflow extracts rooms and finish codes, measures square footage, totals resilient base, and exports a quantity report. That can be excellent estimating support, but it does not alone

establish which of the competing scope requirements control or whether the bid includes all defined interfaces.

14.2 Construction Intelligence Review

A decision-specific review verifies which sheets and addenda govern; maps finish codes to product requirements; checks whether floor preparation is specified, excluded, conditional, or unquantifiable; reconciles transitions and wall base across drawing and specification sources; identifies product/installation conflicts; distinguishes a contractor assumption from an issued design instruction; and states the bid consequence of each unresolved condition.

It does not automatically price an undefined substrate repair quantity, substitute a product without approval, or declare a scope omission to be an exclusion simply because a drawing lacks a keynote. Where the evidence is insufficient, it produces a traceable qualification or clarification request for the authorized decision maker.

14.3 Result

The resulting intelligence is not the quantity alone; it is an inspectable commercial scope position supported by current documents, explicit assumptions, and a record of what can and cannot yet be defended.

15. Illustrative Application: Storefront and Glass Coordination

Hypothetical example only. A storefront elevation identifies one glazing composition while a performance specification requires a different safety or thermal characteristic. A product brochure addresses one characteristic but not the other. A conventional model or material list may not expose the contradiction.

A Construction Intelligence finding identifies the element, extracts the competing references, verifies the current issuance, states the unresolved performance requirement, links it to the procurement and submittal decision, and identifies the appropriate design or contract authority. It does not select a glass assembly or certify code compliance without the required professional approval.

16. A Proposed Practice Maturity Model

To prevent premature certification claims, the following stages are offered as a research model, not a consensus assessment scheme or accreditation path.

Stage	Demonstrated capability	Limitation
0 — Data retrieval	Finds or extracts construction data.	No verified reasoning requirement.
1 — Structured review	Records cross-references and source status.	Decision consequence may be weak.
2 — Controlled findings	Creates traceable, qualified, decision-specific findings.	Independent validation may be limited.

Stage	Demonstrated capability	Limitation
3 — Validated practice	Uses peer review, adjudication, and revision controls.	Performance may remain domain-specific.
4 — Benchmarked practice	Shows repeatable results against independent baselines.	Does not imply universal competence.
5 — Governed institutional practice	Maintains competency, audit, lifecycle, and continuous-improvement controls.	Still requires defined scope and review.

A framework may use only a subset of these stages during research. Assignment to a maturity stage requires externally inspectable evidence, defined evaluation procedures, and disclosure of the sample and decision contexts. No stage grants a professional license or third-party standard certification.

17. Operational Tests and Disqualifying Practices

17.1 Practical Acceptance Questions

- What exact decision is this analysis intended to improve?
- Which issued source records were reviewed, which were not, and what does the contract make authoritative?
- Can a second qualified reviewer locate the evidence behind each material finding?
- What alternative interpretations or contradictory sources were considered?
- Are assumptions, unresolved conditions, and required approvals visible?
- When an addendum changes a governing condition, is the impact propagated through findings and conclusions?
- Can the workflow be independently tested against a comparison method and known reference conditions?

17.2 Claims That Should Fail Scrutiny

The following do not justify an unqualified Construction Intelligence label: unsupported confidence percentages; conclusions without pinpoint references; a claimed “complete review” with unknown document coverage; silent substitution of older sources; conflation of design intent with legal obligation; unverified claims that no requirement exists; exclusive reliance on a generative model’s narrative coherence; or results marketed as professional approval without a qualified reviewer.

18. Research Agenda and Limitations

The present document proposes language and methods. It does not establish that the industry has adopted the term as a discipline, that a statistically representative group of practitioners agrees with these boundaries, or that the suggested thresholds improve outcomes across project types. These matters require empirical examination.

- Construct validity: test whether the six necessary conditions separate higher-quality practice from generic processing.
- Inter-rater agreement: test whether different qualified reviewers classify the same conditions consistently.
- Cross-domain transfer: compare performance across civil, structural, architectural, MEP, finish, and facade scopes.
- Outcome linkage: study whether validated findings change bid, procurement, or construction decisions and with what results.
- Change resilience: test how methods handle addenda, superseded records, and conflicting authorities.
- Governance effectiveness: assess privacy and confidentiality controls in manual and AI-assisted settings.
- Qualification thresholds: test whether graded performance criteria can be published without encouraging score gaming.

Any subsequent standard should emerge only after review by practitioners, owners, design professionals, contractors, research organizations, and information/AI governance experts with documented disagreement and revision processes.

19. Research Position

Construction Intelligence deserves a working definition because construction decisions are frequently made from incomplete, heterogeneous, and revision-sensitive information. The need is not for another label placed on document automation. The need is for an inspectable, testable method of moving from recorded evidence to qualified decision support.

If a finding cannot show its source, distinguish what is known from what is assumed, survive qualified review, and explain why it matters to a defined decision, it has not demonstrated Construction Intelligence under this proposal.

The proposal intentionally leaves room for manual, hybrid, and automated methods. It does not elevate a vendor or platform to the status of a discipline. Its central claim is methodological: competence is earned through evidence, controls, and demonstrated decision utility—not asserted through branding.

20. Standards and Research Alignment

The sources below inform selected components of the proposed framework. They neither prescribe nor endorse this white paper's definition. Standard status and publication titles are identified explicitly; research materials and internal draft protocols are separate from published standards.

Reference	Relevance to proposed definition
[1] ISO 19650-1:2018	Information management: exchange, recording, versioning, organization, whole lifecycle.
[2] NBIMS-US V4	Structured building information, digital exchanges, project BIM requirements, and lifecycle information.
[3] buildingSMART IDS 1.0	Computer-interpretable information requirements and checking for model exchanges.
[4] GAO-20-195G (2020)	Documented, comprehensive, credible, and repeatable cost estimating and validation.
[5] AACE RP 56R-08 (2020)	Building/general construction estimate classification by maturity of project definition; guidance, not a standard.
[6] NIST AI RMF 1.0 (2023)	Voluntary AI risk governance, measurement, management, accountability, and trustworthiness.
[7] RRI-M01 (2026), v0.1	Developing methodology: document maturity distinct from risk and decision readiness.
[8] RRI-M02 (2026), v0.1	Developing methodology: independent baselines and measurable review performance.
[9] ISO 31000:2018	Risk management vocabulary and processes; distinct from evidence-confidence analysis.

20.1 Selected Bibliography

[1] International Organization for Standardization (ISO). ISO 19650-1:2018, Information management using building information modelling — Concepts and principles. <https://www.iso.org/standard/68078.html>

[2] National Institute of Building Sciences. National BIM Standard–United States (NBIMS-US), Version 4. <https://nbims.nibs-wbdg.org/nbims/v4/>

[3] buildingSMART International. Information Delivery Specification (IDS) 1.0, final standard (June 2024). <https://www.buildingsmart.org/information-delivery-specification-ids-v1-0-is-approved-as-a-final-standard/>

[4] U.S. Government Accountability Office. Cost Estimating and Assessment Guide: Best Practices for Developing and Managing Program Costs, GAO-20-195G (March 2020). <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-20-195g>

[5] AACE International. Recommended Practice 56R-08, Cost Estimate Classification System — As Applied in Engineering, Procurement, and Construction for the Building and General Construction Industries (August 2020). https://web.aacei.org/docs/default-source/toc/toc_56r-08.pdf

[6] National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0), NIST AI 100-1 (January 2023).
<https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/ai/NIST.AI.100-1.pdf>

[7] Rhogan Research Institute. RRI-M01: Document Maturity Index — Framework, Version 0.1 (October 2026). Internal developing methodology.

[8] Rhogan Research Institute. RRI-M02: Construction Intelligence Benchmark Protocol, Version 0.1 (October 2026). Internal developing research methodology.

[9] International Organization for Standardization (ISO). ISO 31000:2018, Risk Management — Guidelines. <https://www.iso.org/standard/65694.html>

21. Publication Status and Revision Control

Designation: RRI-W01. Current version: 0.1. Classification: Definition White Paper. Status: Proposed Working Definition — Open for Review. Issuing research body: Rhogan Research Institute, Construction Intelligence Research & Standards. Intended audience: construction practitioners, researchers, technology developers, project owners, procurement teams, and those evaluating evidence-to-decision methods.

This publication is offered for methodological discussion. It is not a specification for contractual incorporation, proof of standard conformance, license qualification, professional certification, or legal opinion. A later edition should incorporate documented stakeholder review, terminology testing, illustrative counterexamples, and validation data.

Appendix A. Publication-Ready Definition

Construction Intelligence is the disciplined, decision-specific practice of identifying, governing, correlating, and critically interpreting construction information across relevant sources, disciplines, and revisions; assessing source authority and evidentiary sufficiency; identifying supported conditions, contradictions, omissions, dependencies, and material uncertainties; and producing traceable, explicitly qualified, professionally reviewable findings that inform a defined construction decision without displacing the responsible decision-maker.

Short form: Construction Intelligence turns governed construction evidence into traceable, uncertainty-aware support for a specific construction decision.

Appendix B. Minimum Finding Record for Field Testing

Required field	Example entry (hypothetical)
Context / decision	Bid scope — resilient flooring / Level 2
Evidence population	Finish schedule Rev 3; plan Rev 2; specification issue dated ____; addenda list
Observed conflict	Finish schedule calls FL-A; plan calls FL-B at Room 210
Evidence references	Finish schedule FS-1 / R210; plan A-501 / Room 210
Authority check	Precedence / approved change status not established
Consequence	Potential change to product, cost, lead time, and transition
Uncertainty	Controlling material not established in reviewed source set
Disposition	Open — authorized clarification requested
Reviewer / date	Qualified discipline reviewer and dated disposition

All identifiers above are illustrative placeholders, not references to an actual project. A production record must retain exact and current citations, permission-controlled source access, and the disposition history.