



*18th International Conference on
Non-Conventional Materials and Technologies
"Construction Materials & Technologies for
Sustainability"
(18th NOCMAT 2019)
24th – 26th July 2019
Nairobi Kenya*

GRAND CHALLENGE OR OXYMORON? CODES AND STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT FOR NONCONVENTIONAL MATERIALS

Kent A. Harries^{1*}, Lola Ben Alon² and Bhavna Sharma³

¹University of Pittsburgh, USA; kharries@pitt.edu

² Carnegie Mellon University, USA

³ University of Bath, UK

*corresponding author

ABSTRACT

Development of construction and materials standards serve technical, social and economic objectives. Most significantly, standards are required for the acceptance of materials by the engineering community. This paper contrasts the characteristics of codes and standards, and their development, for engineered materials and those for nonconventional and vernacular materials. Challenges associated with code and standard development for these materials are highlighted and discussed through case studies. Recommendations for approaches to codes and standards development for nonconventional and vernacular materials are presented.

KEYWORDS: codes and standards, bamboo, earthen construction

INTRODUCTION

In the context of civil infrastructure, conventional construction materials such as steel, timber, and reinforced concrete were once unconventional and unproven materials. Acceptance was achieved through decades of testing, analysis, and experience which evolved into standardised building code practices. Even today, the standardisation of these materials continues. More recently, standardisation of materials that are still considered to be unproven has been emerging. For instance, fibre reinforced polymer (FRP) composites, which were initially developed for aerospace applications, are being standardised for use in civil infrastructure and, as a result, their use is burgeoning. Natural building materials such as bamboo, earth, and straw bale construction are also receiving increased interest in terms of standardisation, leading to their acceptance internationally and their emergence as “new” products. Nevertheless, the

standardisation of nonconventional and vernacular materials is in its earliest stages; design, construction, testing protocols and technical terminology, even among experts, are fragmented and require further evolution.

The importance of nonconventional and vernacular materials and practices standardisation lies in both technical and social realms. The objective of a standard material test procedure, for instance, is to accurately determine a design value for the material (e.g., a strength or a stiffness) as well as to provide a common frame of reference for the user community – a *lingua franca* of sorts. Data from such comparable tests can be compiled to obtain a more reliable understanding of a material's properties based on statistical analysis which can lead to the refinement of, and confidence in, design values. This, in turn, leads to broader acceptance of the material in the design community. Such acceptance, coupled with advocacy, can lead to broader social acceptance of previously marginalised vernacular construction methods [1].

MATERIAL STANDARD VERSUS STANDARD MATERIAL

In many cases of conventional construction materials, engineered materials specifications (or standards) result in standard (or standardised) materials and building products. However, when it comes to nonconventional and vernacular construction materials, the emergence of standard materials from engineered building standards is often challenged by their high variability and their reliance on local or traditional construction methods. Most nonconventional and vernacular materials are natural, rather than man-made. Materials are locally sourced and often processed or mixed on site as they are required. The degree to which the end-use construction products are engineered from these materials varies although the natural material remains the 'feedstock' and is the focus of this discussion of materials standards and specifications. Unlike conventional engineered materials which are developed through the "formulation and synthesis of new compounds with structural control primarily at the micrometre scale" [2], natural materials are typically comprised of a few components having relatively poor intrinsic properties. The superior properties of natural materials result from the complex architecture of the material over a variety of length scales [2]. Natural materials have evolved (or have formed) to represent a "local optimum for a given set of requirements and restraints"; for biological materials, these include both mechanical and biological functions [2]. These requirements are usually different from the engineering uses to which we apply the materials.

Natural materials are highly variable affecting both the construction process and the building outcome in terms of structural performance. This makes it challenging to develop materials standards having the same objectives or formats as those used for engineered materials. Large variations in material properties leads to smaller characteristic strength values. This reduction means that the material is not efficiently utilised making it, potentially, unattractive to engineers who must consider both monetary and environmental cost of their structures. Furthermore, due to their variability, and in order to verify their code compliance, natural materials require field tests that are often easy to perform but limited in terms of their accuracy. Due to the high variability, in order to maintain a desired confidence, frequency of field testing is also higher than for engineered materials.

The challenge of material variation could be addressed by various strategies. For instance, wood is a natural building material that exhibits large variability, yet we develop both prescriptive and performance standards for timber. This has led to agreement on standard lumber products, and to the use of wood as one of the main building materials in one of the heaviest regulated environments - North America. While the number of wood species is great,

the main strategy used in timber standardisation is to group species according to their structural properties and appearances, prescribing uniform grade-use data for each group.

The ‘Cart and Horse’

Construction design standards do not exist in a vacuum; at a minimum, they rely on materials specifications which, themselves require test standards. This leads to a number of issues when considering nonconventional and vernacular materials. Unlike for engineered materials, materials specifications do not exist for nonconventional and vernacular materials; there is no recipe. Thus the design standard must account for the variability in the material without having any quantification of this. Materials specifications are difficult to establish since there are no ‘standard’ materials and no design basis to which to aspire. Design standards and materials specifications coexist and both drive the other. In the absence of either, the engineer is left wondering where to begin.

CONSENSUS STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT

National and international codes and standards are conventionally ‘consensus documents’; that is, they are prepared by a committee of “affected and interested parties” (stakeholders), within which a consensus must be reached. Standards also usually receive public review and all comments received from both the committee and public must be responded to in good faith. An appeals process is also prescribed. Collectively, this is referred to as “due process” and is set out in guiding documents [3, 4]. Such due process is the key to ensuring that standards are developed in an environment that is equitable, accessible and responsive to the requirements of various stakeholders and that ultimately they serve and protect the public interest [3].

Construction standards committees are composed of volunteers. Motivation for serving on such committees varies, but most members – design professionals, producers, academics, government agencies – arrive with an agenda. Indeed, very often stakeholders represent competing interests [5]. The consensus process is intended to mitigate competing interests in order to arrive at a standard that best protects the public interest. As a result, consensus standards reflect the state-of-practice rather than the state-of-the-art. Indeed, newly developed consensus standards often reflect ‘lowest common denominator’ practice and not necessarily best practice. As standards are maintained, they evolve toward best practices. In the case of nonconventional and vernacular materials, mutual relationships between building codes communities and regional experts are necessary to ensure sound code development and enforcement processes. This could be facilitated through the engagement of the local building community in a “proactive, constructive partnership with their building code officials” [6]. Such an approach, however, may not convince all stakeholders and a degree of trust and confidence must be established within the standardisation process. Essentially, an “expert” is only an expert if accepted as one by their colleagues.

Standards are developed by standard-writing organisations which may take two forms. National (or international) standards organisations (e.g., ASTM, BSI, CEN, ISO, RILEM) whose typical primary objective is founded in supporting interests of national commerce regardless of sector. As a result, the standardisation process can become “a political or economical power game although the topics discussed are mostly of a purely technical nature” [7]. Volunteer standards committees require balance in their membership interest and a critical mass of members is required to take up a new area of standards development. Typically, development of a new standard must find an existing committee to work within which may generate conflicts of

interest or gaps in expertise. Entrenched interests and the tendency for “deep pockets [permitting time for review and regular travel to meetings] to dominate the code development process” also affect the progression of codes and standards for nonconventional materials.

The second type of standards-writing organisations are industry driven and sponsored (e.g., ACI, AISC, fib, etc.). These organisations usually promulgate higher level model codes and benefit from the concentration of expertise that focused professional organisations permit. However, development of standards for new or nonconventional materials will typically not be possible in such focused organisations which may lack the broader expertise and may be in competition with the new material. Nonconventional and vernacular materials are often non-commodified systems that have no ‘industry association’. Often, they cannot be developed into products and cannot be patented. This leads to a lack of financial support and advocacy of nonconventional and vernacular materials at code and standards organisations and committees.

Most nonconventional and vernacular materials have received little attention in terms of standards development. National standard-writing organisations with limited resources and volunteer committees have little incentive to address technology that is often considered marginal. Where nonconventional and vernacular materials are not marginal, there is little support and often no perceived need for standards. Similarly, there are few established professional organisations who would find nonconventional and vernacular materials in their purview. Ironically: “...to be able to write a consensus standard, the stakeholder community requires mature practice from which lessons can be learned. To reach this level of practice, standards are required in order to overcome inherent reluctance and cost barriers to adoption of the structural material” [8].

One way to overcome this ironic situation is to have existing experts organise in a way that can produce valuable exchange of experience and technical documents. For instance, in the case of the New Zealand earth building standards, the Earth Building Association of New Zealand (EBANZ), with the participation of local engineers and architects, first developed a set of guidelines in 1991. Thereafter, New Zealand Standards (NZS) took responsibility for the project and joined together with Standard Australia in 1993 to develop a mutual standard with an enlarged committee [9]. The collaboration was discontinued in 1997 mainly due differences in seismic requirements, yet the exchange of information and expertise was valuable. One year later, NZS published the New Zealand earth building standards [10-12]. Simultaneously, Standards Australia developed The Australian Earth Building Handbook [13] and the Earth Building Association of Australia (EBAA) developed the Building with Earth Bricks and Rammed Earth in Australia [14].

An occasional barrier to this approach is that some nonconventional and vernacular materials enthusiasts resist standards development as a threat to craft-based industry; taking work away from experienced practitioners [15]. This may – mistakenly in the view of the authors – lead to a perceptual coupling between sustainable materials and non-standardised materials that are implemented in a bottom-up manner. However, taking such an approach runs counter to establishing sufficient inertia to ensure the acceptance of these sustainable ‘alternative materials’ into mainstream construction practices.

“Shall”, “Should” and “May” – the Language of Standards

One result of early standards development is that often initial standards are prepared in non-mandatory language and cannot therefore be adopted by building codes or used for

enforcement. Verb form is crucial to standards development. Enacting documents or clauses – those that represent a legal obligation – are conventionally required to provide unequivocal and imperative requirements: “shall”. Recommendations (“should”) and permissive language (“may”) are relegated to non-mandatory appendices or documents because they are unenforceable. Imperative language can also have the effect of focusing the scope of a standard too narrowly, potentially stifling innovation and restricting entry to market of competing or similar technology. When addressing nonconventional and vernacular materials, their variability alone demands the use of more permissive language in many cases. This will favour the development of design guides (or similar) over standards. This dichotomy is seen in the Australia and New Zealand experience described above.

Types of Design Standards

Modern building codes are based on a ‘capacity must exceed demand’ approach in which the demand represents the loads applied to the structure and capacity is the ability of the structure to resist these loads. In a more general sense, “performance based design” considers that a structure’s performance (defined in a variety of ways) must exceed some minimum requirement – at the very least ensuring the safety of the occupants. While most modern building codes are primarily load versus resistance driven, all include some degree of performance requirement as well. Performance requirements are common for aspects of structural behaviour that are less quantitative and more qualitative, such as durability and aspects of occupant comfort. The demand and capacity ‘sides of the equation’ are determined separately – from different standard documents. Load demand on a structure is mostly independent of the material from which a structure is built. The resisting capacity of a structure is given by material-specific design standards. Safety of structural design results from ensuring capacity exceeds demand with a specified reliability. Factors are applied to both the demand (factors greater than 1) and capacity (factors less than 1) sides of the equation; these combine to result in a probability that the capacity will exceed the demand. In modern structural engineering, the probability of failure of a structure subject to its ultimate design loads is targeted to be on the order of 0.0001. The load and capacity resistance factors (alternately referred to as partial safety factors) reflect many aspects of design but primarily represent the uncertainty inherent in making both demand and capacity calculations.

Capacity resistance factors are dominated by the uncertainties associated with material performance. The development of reliability-based partial safety factors or material resistance factors requires significantly more statistical data on material capacity or strength than is usually readily available for nonconventional and vernacular materials. Additionally, the basis for loading and the target reliability index must be known. For this reason, modern load and resistance factor or partial safety design approaches are not generally appropriate for nonconventional and vernacular materials.

Allowable Stress Approach to Design

A simpler method of designing nonconventional and vernacular materials takes an allowable stress approach in which the capacity of a member is limited by its characteristic material strength divided by a ‘factor of safety’. For highly variable materials used in their natural form, such as bamboo, it may be more appropriate to take an allowable member strength approach in which case the load-bearing capacity of the member is the characteristic strength rather than a material strength. This approach, however, leads to more complicated test standard requirements. Whereas standards for establishing a value of stress need only consider

fundamental mechanics, component tests involve complex boundary conditions, kinematic and even dynamic considerations. Allowable strength approaches require greater engineering effort and knowledge of the intended final structural use. The latter issue, in particular is, itself, a limit to developing standards.

'Deemed to Comply' Alternatives to Prescriptive or Code-based Design

In order to overcome many of the obstacles to standards development for nonconventional and vernacular materials, alternative design methodologies can be promoted as being 'equivalent to' national standards. Similarly, where technological obstacles limit the ability to adopt formal standards, such alternative design methodologies may be 'deemed to comply' with national standards. Such equivalence may be based on experience from previous generations, documented engineering evaluation, or design-by-testing.

Experience from previous generations that is well preserved in local tradition and dutifully transmitted to people living today can be the basis of an informal, non-codified "standard" provided the content and scope are known. This requirement is met when a method of construction or use of material is an "old and pure tradition" or treated as "general wisdom" within a community characterised by a relatively undisturbed social structure having a recognised social pattern. The application of such experience from previous generations is limited to similar scenarios and may not be extrapolated in terms of dimensional scale. Experience from previous generations is not transferable following migration.

Documented engineering evaluation, such as those commonly made following natural disasters, documenting construction methods and structural designs that demonstrably satisfied design requirements may be equivalent to standards under similar scenarios. Such reports should be prepared by acknowledged design professionals and be accepted by the national or international technical community following appropriate peer review. The application of documented engineering evaluation is limited to only scenarios similar to those documented and should not be extrapolated in terms of dimensional scale. An example of such documentation is inclusion in the World Housing Encyclopaedia [16].

Many building codes permit variations on 'design-by-testing'. Typically used when the composition or configuration of structural members or systems are such that design by code provisions is not possible, testing prototype systems provides a means of assessing structural performance in terms of the intent of the Code. Tested prototypes must be structural assemblages including members and connections, isolated by definable and reproducible boundary conditions. Prototype tests should be conducted at full-scale, use the same materials as the intended structures, include replicate specimens and be overseen by a design professional. Such tests are not 'proof tests' and must be carried to failure with failure modes reported. Tests should be reported in a manner suitable for peer-review and the report should provide sufficient detail that the testing could be repeated.

APPROPRIATE CODES AND STANDARDS

Angelino et al. [17] propose a framework for defining and measuring the quality of codes and standards in the construction industry. A primary hypothesis is that reducing complexity improves quality of codes and standards. First, the "purpose" of the code or standard must be identified and this should guide the drafting of the document at all stages. The purpose of a design standard is different to different stakeholders resulting in varied interpretations of the

standard. Using the framework proposed by Angelino et al. [17] as an inspiration, the objectives of design standards for nonconventional and vernacular materials should a) be viewed as a system to codify existing or vernacular or traditional knowledge; and b) provide a concise system of provisions for nonconventional and vernacular building systems that were not previously inspected or regulated. Standards should include a system to: a) guarantee structural safety; b) design structures that are environmentally, socioculturally, and economically sustainable; c) aid common design situations while supporting innovative design; and d) build a common and shared design language.

While all valid, depending on context, some objectives might be more relevant than others. Ultimately, a general statement of purpose for a design standard for nonconventional and vernacular materials may combine two or more of the above features. A very specific mission statement is included in the New Zealand Earth Building Standards [10]: “The objective of this Standard is to provide for the structural and durability design of earth buildings. The Standard is intended to be approved as a means of compliance with clauses B1 and B2 of the New Zealand Building Code”. A more general example may be to codify existing knowledge in order to ensure structural safety, as well as to address common design situations while providing means of compliance with building codes and supporting innovative design.

“Usability” of a standard, as the word implies, must be based on the needs and expectations of the user. De Weck et al. [18] describes usability as being founded on how users perceive the quality of the standard in addition to the impact of unanticipated difficulties (in terms of time and effort) arising from its use. Angelino et al. [17] identify the following attributes that inform the “ease-of-use” of a design standard:

- accessibility – the extent to which provisions are easily and quickly identified;
- clarity – the extent to which provisions are clear in scope, including limitations;
- coherence – the extent to which provisions are presented in a logical manner;
- completeness – the extent to which provisions are sufficient for the design required;
- conciseness – the extent to which provisions are written in a succinct manner;
- ease of navigation – the extent to which provisions are connected and the links followed;
- simplicity – the extent to which provisions may be applied by users without understanding all of the underlying principles;
- understandability – the extent to which provisions are easily comprehended by the target users, minimising the risk of misinterpretation.

Demonstration of ease-of-use may be through development of representative examples. These are typically published as a non-mandatory companion to a standard document. Examples, however, are a double-edged sword: while improving simplicity and understandability, their blind application by those with inappropriate expertise may be dangerous. Benchmarking by example may also unintentionally stifle innovation when a new concept does not “fit the example”. An alternative to presenting examples is to develop navigation flow charts for design standard provisions or typical design cases. These serve to improve ease of navigation but are also a tool the standard authors can use to ensure clarity and completeness. Development of a design work flow chart can identify provisions which are incomplete, lead to ‘dead ends’, or result in complex iterative procedures.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Codes and standards development has been described as “a long and onerous” process [8]. Particularly for materials having no existing precedent, the task is daunting and meets resistance

at many steps. The following enumerates many of the challenges and possible strategies to overcome these issues.

Finding the Motivation for Standards Development - First and foremost, a need or motivation is required in order to promote the development of standards for nonconventional and vernacular materials. The primary driving motivation of building codes today is public safety and general welfare. In addition to life safety, there is a growing awareness to the importance of environmental sustainability that catalyses the standardisation of these materials [19]. Nonconventional and vernacular materials often offer an ecologically-based solution, ensuring that long term public safety, health and welfare are retained. In addition, factors such as changing environment (e.g., climate change and sea-level rise), changing demographics (e.g., urban migration), and changing industry needs are also important.

Establishing a Collaborative Standardisation Framework - Standards development must take place within an existing framework. This framework may not have the technical expertise or commercial motivation necessary to commit to a standard-development process. Therefore, in order to initiate the process for nonconventional and vernacular materials, collaboration is often required between associations representing technical expertise and governmental organisations to provide an adequate financial and motivational framework.

Including a Broad Stakeholder Community - Standards development should involve all stakeholders, but engagement in the process is usually voluntary. This results in a degree of self-selection in terms of the stakeholders' involvement and requires that stakeholders have the necessary resources available to voluntarily engage in the process. This resource availability is particularly difficult to ensure when considering nonconventional materials having an international scope. Such development often takes place at the hands of a few "champions" rather than the broader stakeholder community.

Developing a Sound 'Engineering Judgement' - Assimilating the engineering data, expertise, and knowledge often takes years to achieve and is critical to the standards-development process. For this reason, standard development for nonconventional and vernacular materials must begin with synthesis of the existing engineering data, as well as documentation and enhancement of local practices. As mentioned previously – codes and standards reflect state-of-practice rather than the state-of-the-art. This is an iterative process of continuous improvement (so-called "maintenance") of standards worldwide.

Proper Documentation and Analysis of Test Studies - Although most nonconventional and vernacular materials have a long history, it is typically *ad hoc*, anecdotal and not suited to developing standards. For instance, there is often a lack of fundamental statistical data on material properties; this is a significant barrier to integration of these materials into the framework of most modern design standards. Thus, in order to contribute to the body of literature and to future standardisation, nonconventional and vernacular materials test studies should include proper documentation and analysis of their results including the reporting of metadata (means and methods, etc.). Reported test results should include properties of constituent materials (when applicable), and should clearly present statistical evaluation. Source data must also be readily available – this is well supported by a variety of digital archives including universities, thesis repositories and peer-reviewed journals.

Even where data exists in the technical literature, it is often inconsistent in what data is actually reported and typically does not include important metadata. Common weaknesses with

published research relevant to informing the preparation of design rules [8] must be overcome as follows; study authors should:

- provide clear definition of the domain of applicability of the work and provide critical review of previous research relevant to that domain.
- ensure that all crucial data on properties of specimens is reported.
- adopt test methods that describe capacities or properties relevant to design and/or describe the engineering significance of the data reported.
- consider practical aspects, such as the construction methods applied on site, as well as the effects of imperfections that occur in practice.

Homogenisation to Mitigate Material Variability - Nonconventional and vernacular materials are not uniform from environment to environment, further complicating the process of ‘assigning numeric values’ that typify the standard-development process. Therefore, similar to what is done in timber codes and standards, a homogenisation approach grouping different species or ‘classes’ of materials is appropriate for nonconventional and vernacular materials.

Conducting Missing Research - There are currently large gaps in the knowledge of nonconventional and vernacular materials that should be addressed in order to allow regulatory justification and standards development for these materials. In particular – there is limited formalised scientific data on long-term durability and thermal performance in different climatic contexts. In terms of structural data, the ability of connections to transmit loads, as well as the seismic performance of building elements should be further studied. These research areas require significant resources and time for study.

Avoiding Unnecessary Complexity in Standards - Modern engineering design standards have reached a level of complexity that impacts negatively upon both their quality and ease of use which increases the risk of misinterpretation of the code or standard [17]. When considering nonconventional and vernacular materials, the user community may be further removed from the standards development process increasing the risk of misinterpretation. Indeed, unnecessarily complex standards in the field of nonconventional and vernacular materials may lead to the standards simply not being applied at all. On one hand, the opportunity afforded by nonconventional and vernacular materials for starting with a “blank page” when developing standards should be used to mitigate unnecessary complexity. On the other hand, existing codes and standards as well as committee constitutions that prove successful should be used as exemplars to avoid excessive complexity that results from “re-inventing the wheel”. The reality will lie somewhere in the middle: leveraging existing codes and standards while reducing the complexity in accordance with the reduced degree of certainty we anticipate in terms of fundamental material properties.

CONCLUSIONS, OBSERVATIONS AND NEEDS FOR THE FUTURE

Building codes, design standards and materials test standards and specifications for nonconventional and vernacular materials will, necessarily, take a different form than those for engineered materials. Standards written in mandatory language (“shall”, rather than “should” or “may”) are a stage in the evolution of acceptance of a material or technology demonstrating maturity. Prior to this, non-mandatory guide documents help to acclimatise the engineering and stakeholder communities to the materials and provide a basis for early-adopters – helping to establish a critical mass and motivation for standards development. This process is multi-generational; thus the guidance documents also help to provide the necessary continuity. Importantly, champions and early-adopters of nonconventional and vernacular materials should

not be discouraged by the lack of mandatory standards – it is an indication that they are ahead of the curve.

Development must not occur in a vacuum. Many of the likely benefits of nonconventional and vernacular materials reside, not in their structural performance, but in (for example) their thermal, sustainability, social, and aesthetic performance. It is these benefits that will provide the motivation for the standards development process and may well introduce non-traditional stakeholders into the process. While nonconventional and vernacular materials are mainly developed in a bottom-up approach by advocates with little funding, it is crucial that collaborations take place between entities (e.g., governmental and regulatory organizations), and practitioners (e.g., researchers and field experts). Potential barriers that must be overcome include the lack of aggregated and properly documented engineering data, especially in the fields of durability and fire resistance, as well as a lack of experience in the standards development processes among experts in these materials. In this context, existing guides and examples that are proven successful should be used to mitigate excessive complexity as well as to provide useful design parameters. Ultimately, resources should be made available for research and education, as these are a key to increasing awareness of the advantages of non-conventional and vernacular materials and consequently to their formalisation in codes and standards. In this context, the environmental and societal needs for nonconventional and vernacular materials can be evaluated and should be addressed by policy makers through their endeavours to catalyse the development of nonconventional and vernacular codes and standards.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The content of this paper was developed by the lead author when he was Leverhulme Visiting Professor at the University of Bath in academic year 2018. The support of the Leverhulme Foundation is gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

- [1] Harries, K.A., Sharma, B. and Richard, M.J. (2012). Structural Use of Full Culm Bamboo: The Path to Standardisation, *International Journal of Architecture, Engineering and Construction*. **1**(2), 66-75.
- [2] Wegst, U.G.K., Bai, H., Saiz, E., Tomsia, A.P. and Ritchie, R.O. (2015) Bioinspired Structural Materials, *Nature Materials* **14**, 23-36.
- [3] American National Standards Institute (ANSI) (2018) *ANSI Essential Requirements: Due process requirements for American National Standards*, January 2018 edition, www.ansi.org/essentialrequirements [retrieved 5 February 2018]
- [4] *ISO/IEC Guide 59:1994 Code of good practice for standardisation*, International Organisation for Standardisation (ISO)
- [5] Allen D.E. (1992) The role of regulations and codes, *Engineering Safety*, Editor: D. Blockley, Mc Graw-Hill.
- [6] Eisenberg, D. (2017). *2005 ASTM Standard E2392 for Earthen Wall Systems*. <http://www.ecobuilding.org/code-innovations/policy-profiles/2005-astm-standard-e2392-for-earthen-wall-systems> [retrieved 5 February 2018]
- [7] Takahashi S. and Tojo A. (1993) The SSI Story: What it is and how it was stalled and eliminated in the International Standards Arena, *Computer Standards and Interfaces*, **15**(3), 523-538.
- [8] Mottram, J.T. (2017) Fibre Reinforced Polymer Structures: Design Guidance or Guidance for Designers. *Advanced Composites in Construction 2017*, Sheffield, 5-7 September 2017.

- [9] Walker, R., and Morris, H. (1998). Development of new performance based standards for earth building. *Proceedings of the Australasian Structural Engineering Conference 1*.
- [10] *NZS 4297:1998 Engineering design of earth buildings*, Standards New Zealand.
- [11] *NZS 4298:1998 Materials and workmanship for earth buildings*, Standards New Zealand.
- [12] *NZS 4299:1998 Earth buildings not requiring specific design*, Standards New Zealand.
- [13] *HB 195-2002 The Australian Earth Building Handbook*, Standards Australia
- [14] Earth Building Association of Australia (EBAA) (2004) *Building with Earth Bricks and Rammed Earth in Australia*
- [15] Augarde, Charles E. (2018) personal correspondence
- [16] *World Housing Encyclopaedia* (WHE), <http://www.world-housing.net> [retrieved 14 April 2018]
- [17] Angelino, M, Denton, S, Agarwal, J and Shave, J, (2014) The development of successful design standards: Understanding the challenges, *Proceedings of 37th International Association for Bridge and Structural Engineering (IABSE): Symposium on Engineering for Progress, Nature and People*. Madrid, September 2014, 527-534.
- [18] De Weck, O.L., Roos, D., Magee, C.L. (2011) *Engineering Systems: meeting human needs in a complex technological world*, MIT Press, 232 pp.
- [19] Eisenberg, D., and Persram, S. (2009) *Code, Regulatory and Systemic Barriers Affecting Living Building Projects. Cascadia Region Green Building Council* <https://living-future.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Code-Regulatory-Systemic-Barriers-Affecting-LB-Projects.pdf> [retrieved 5 February 2018]