

**TOPSIS analysis for sustainable redevelopment potential of
abandoned infrastructure in Nigeria**

Journal:	<i>Built Environment Project and Asset Management</i>
Manuscript ID	BEPAM-11-2021-0140.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Abandoned, Infrastructure, Redevelopment, Refurbishment, Sustainable Development, TOPSIS

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

TOPSIS analysis for sustainable redevelopment potential of abandoned infrastructure in Nigeria

Abstract

Purpose: Abandonment poses a range of effects detrimental to the development of a country such as Nigeria. Restoring such infrastructure in a sustainable manner is a challenge identified in the literature. The aim of this study is to evaluate a novel approach - TOPSIS to identify the sustainability criteria for the redevelopment of abandoned infrastructure in Nigeria. The literature evidences use of TOPSIS in various development contexts, but not in the context of redevelopment of abandoned infrastructure.

Design / Methodology: This study explores the potential of TOPSIS in the sustainable redevelopment of abandoned infrastructure in Nigeria through a combination of a quantitative method of data collection – questionnaire – and a case study. The case study focuses on the abandoned Federal Government Secretariat in Lagos. One hundred and sixty-one (161) participants responded to the questionnaire. Data collected were analysed using TOPSIS Analytical Technique.

Findings: Refurbishment is considered as the most sustainable alternative for the redevelopment of abandoned infrastructure. For criteria consideration, Structural Integrity and Foundation categorised under the technological attributes ranked highest for Refurbishment and Conversion alternatives. Waste Generation and Prevention, and Profitability top the list for Demolition and Procurement respectively.

Social implications: The social benefit of this study is to bring building considered to be an eyesore back into use.

Originality/value: The findings from the analysis orchestrates the importance of the built environment research concentrating on innovative frameworks for sustainable redevelopment of abandoned structures in the construction industry.

Keywords: Abandoned, Infrastructure, Redevelopment, Refurbishment, Sustainable Development, TOPSIS.

Paper Type: Research Paper

1.0 Background

The prosperity of a country depends on functional and readily available infrastructure (Nwannekanma and Gbonegun 2019). Developing nations are attempting to develop their infrastructure to advance their economic development (Hamma-adama et al., 2021). Some infrastructure that would have enhanced the economy of Nigeria became redundant. The landscape of the country is encumbered with abandoned and uncompleted infrastructure at all level of governance from the federal to the states and local governments (Ubani and Ononuju, 2013; Olalusi and Otunola, 2012; Oyewobi et al, 2017; Amadi, 2019; Elijah Olusegun and Olumuyiwa 2011). The abandonment of infrastructure therefore becomes a threat, slowing down the rate of development and causing nuisance to the environment (Abdul et. al. 2018).

Abandoned infrastructure as depicted by Olalusi & Otunola, (2012); Ubani & Ononuju, (2013); Hanachor (2012) are construction projects that commenced at an earlier date and were either halted before completion for one reason or the other, or were completed, initially occupied and vacated with no intention of resuming utilisation. These abandoned infrastructures have adverse effect on many stakeholders of the project, the society, economy, and environment. Okafor et al., (2018) stated that Nigeria has turn out to be the world's junkyard of abandoned and failed projects. This causes severe problems as these buildings tend to become a hideout for criminals as well as other undesirable activities thereby calling for mitigation plans to prevent further problem from re-occurring (Muzenda, 2018; Ariffin et al., 2018; Doraisamy et al., 2015). The sustainability of these infrastructure is questionable. Pavlovskis et al., (2017) states that sustainable development is not only about constructing new infrastructures but also about developing abandoned structures. Bearing this in mind, there is a need for a paradigm shift, reverting inwards to the use of abandoned infrastructure to alleviate poverty, improve the economy and sustain the environment.

Consequently, using a case study, the aim is to identify the sustainability alternatives and criteria for the redevelopment of abandoned infrastructure in Nigeria. Despite the array of literature on abandonment, sustainability, sustainable development and infrastructure in Nigeria, none has applied *the technique for order preference by similarity to an ideal solution* (TOPSIS) technique in proffering possible solution to the problem.

2.0 Redevelopment in other countries

Abandoned buildings are critical and pressing issue that necessitate urgent interventions, and re-adaptation for new use helping with waste reduction while maximizing the value of limited resources (Buitelaar 2021). Therefore, one of the purposes of this study is to make a case for the Nigerian government to consider the redevelopment of these abandoned structures to align with sustainable development. As practiced in some of the developed countries such as United Kingdom and United States of America, governments are innovatively repurposing abandoned infrastructure to meet the current need and the needs of the future generation. For

1
2
3 instance, 10 Abandoned cinemas in Italy were recovered, refurbished and converted to student
4 accommodations (Cascone & Sciuto, 2018).

5 Araszkievicz (2016) highlighted the transformation of a big cotton mill belonging to the Federal
6 Government in Poland into Puuvilla Shopping mall to accommodate office spaces and other
7 government functions. The remodeling of the big cotton mill was made possible with the use of
8 green BIM.
9
10

11 **2.1 The socio -economic implications of infrastructure abandonment on Nigeria’s drive for** 12 **sustainable environment.**

13 Atamewan (2020) studied the environmental and socio-economic implications of abandonment
14 in Nigeria and concluded the outcome as insecure, unhealthy economy which would be a threat
15 to the sustainability of the built environment. Most of these projects that were once celebrated
16 are now considered ‘white elephant’ projects in recent years. For instance, given foreign
17 exchange devaluation between 2013 and 2017, a project abandoned can accrue multiple fold
18 increase in cost at completion (Odotola and Adeniran, 2017). Impact of abandonment as
19 identified by Olumide Odeyinka (2018); Scales (2013); Hoe (2013); Tijan and Ajagbe (2016);
20 Amade, et al.(2015) were increase in unemployment and other social vices, delay in free flow of
21 traffic, creation of abode for pests, marred environmental aesthetics, threat to public health,
22 economic value deficit, and waste of material and financial resources. Garba (2019) identified
23 the effect of abandoned building projects on the economy stating the negative impact on
24 government taxes causing reduction of budget for services such as the provision for police and
25 fire services, reduction in the measure of economic activities, reduction in accrued revenue to
26 the government and lowered standard of living. These pose adverse effects on the socio-
27 economic activities resulting in lower property values within neighborhoods.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 The problem of abandoned and incomplete projects is yet to be resolved and it has a ripple
35 effect on the whole economy of the nation and the construction industry specifically. The next
36 section will discuss the criteria and alternatives for sustainable redevelopment.
37
38
39
40

41 **2.2 The Criteria and the Alternatives**

42 The selection of the criteria and alternatives are based on a literature review as shown in Table
43 1 and Figure 2. The ratings were identified into four levels. They will be evaluated against the
44 case study in section 3.
45

46 >>>Insert Table 1<<<

47
48
49 The following alternatives were defined for consideration in the redevelopment of
50 abandoned infrastructures:
51
52

53 **Refurbishment** and adaptation to current needs while maintaining or slightly changing the
54 original building and its historically established purpose. Croatto et al., (2016) and Balaras &
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Dascalaki, (2019) considered refurbishment as one of the approaches to saving money and
4 cultural preservation with long-term consequences on environmental sustainability such as
5 upgrade to energy efficiency to cut CO2 emissions, limits to waste materials from
6 demolition. Further to these findings, the significant relationship among the variable factors
7 of research conducted by Ogunnusi et al., (2021) pointed out the need for the Nigerian
8 government to consider the environmental, economic, and social impact of refurbishing
9 abandoned infrastructure in the country.
10
11
12

13
14 **Conversion** of the building into apartment housing and preservation of its architectural-
15 urban expression. Pavlovskis et al., (2017) considered conversion of buildings as more
16 apposite for redevelopment owing to the reduced consumption of energy, CO2 and other
17 resources, and the materials lengthier life. *Petković-Grozdanovića et al., (2016) argued the*
18 *conversion procedure should not be restricted to the prior intent of the building, rather*
19 *should respect the cultural background and the historical structures in which the building*
20 *was created. Nevertheless, architectural and structural criteria should be considered in*
21 *evaluating the suitability of conversion processes.*
22
23
24

25
26 **Demolition** of the building and the implementation of a new construction project. Rathi &
27 Khandve, (2014) defines demolition as the process of dismantling, collapsing down or
28 *destroying down of big buildings after its valuable lifetime period. Su et al., (2021) noted*
29 *that demolition support carbon emissions and the waste accounts for a large percentage of*
30 *about 70% to 80% of total construction waste. Nevertheless, demolition waste can be*
31 *considered for landfilling and recycling. The environmental, economic and social benefits of*
32 *recycling demolition waste supersedes that of landfills by reducing materials production in*
33 *new projects, saving landfill spaces, reducing emissions and saving energy. To achieve*
34 *energy-absorbing construction materials, Naeni et al., (2021) recent studies identify the*
35 *blends of recovered plastics with construction and demolition waste.*
36
37
38

39
40 **Procurement** or selling of these structures to private sector/ entities or investors. OECD
41 (2015) emphasised the need for countries to reform their procurement process of
42 infrastructure for their long life and the need to reform their governing administrations to
43 ascertain a balance between the need of the private and public investor to recover the cost
44 of infrastructure investment. For viability, Balogun (2016) noted that it is imperative for
45 project sponsors to work with co-investors with similar interest as it relates to investment
46 horizon, risk and expected returns.
47
48

49
50 It is imperative to note that the above-mentioned criteria and alternatives are from
51 Lithuania, United Kingdom, and other developed countries. Although, there are publications
52 on multi criteria decision making (MCDM), there exists a major gap in the application of
53 MCDM to the redevelopment of abandoned infrastructure using TOPSIS technique in Nigeria.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Figure 1 displays the conceptual framework of the research. Phase 1 includes literature review
4 of articles capturing global view of abandoned infrastructure, abandoned infrastructure and
5 sustainability in Nigerian context, evaluation of criteria and alternatives applicable to
6 sustainable development. The literature review allows critical evaluation of resources to
7 identify gap in knowledge and provide recommendation for future research (Creswell 2014).
8
9

10
11
12 >>>Insert Figure 1<<<<
13
14
15
16

17 **3.0 Research Methods and Materials**

18 A case study is presented in this section to investigate and appreciate how the proposed
19 methodology can function with an actual building (Pavlovskis et al., 2017, Sanda et al., 2021).
20 The Federal Government Secretariat, Lagos State, Nigeria considered for this purpose is among
21 the array of public office buildings abandoned due to relocation of the seat of the Federal
22 Government of Nigeria from Lagos State to the Federal Capital Territory (FCT) Abuja in 1991
23 (Wahab, 2020). Ayeyemi (2021) and Nwannekanma, and Gbonegun, (2019) estimated the
24 value of the abandoned 12-storey building complex as N72 billion (128million pound) with the
25 suggestion that if reformed into luxury apartment, it could generate income for the Federal
26 government. Hence, the necessity arises to evaluate the abandonment and develop a model
27 that includes the selection of the best alternative through the application of MCDM TOPSIS
28 method.
29
30
31
32

33 To conduct the empirical study, a quantitative method of data collection (questionnaire) was
34 considered as the most applicable method for obtaining data as it can provide a possibility of
35 access to a broader population with a constrained choice of questions (Dawson 2011). The
36 targeted sample size using random sampling was 120 participants. However, 161 professionals
37 indicated interest and participated in the survey. The additional 34% were mostly the non-built
38 environment professionals. Since the research focuses on sustainability, other allied
39 professionals who are knowledgeable in building sustainability but not necessarily construction
40 professionals were also encouraged to participate in the survey.
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **3.1 Demographic analyses of respondents**

48 165 responses were initially received with 161 of them validated. Two responses came without
49 demographic information while another two were repeated submissions from an individual.
50 Microsoft Excel was used to analyse the demography of the participants. 60% of the
51 respondents operate in the private sector and 6% in the public sector. The rest of the
52 respondents (34%) operates in both public and private sectors.
53
54

55 The respondent by profession includes engineers, quantity surveyors, project managers. The
56 other allied professionals as mentioned in section 3.0, an environmental scientist, soil scientist,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 financial analysts, urban planners, bankers, real estate managers, environmental technologists,
4 public analysts, lawyer, academics amongst others. Additional information on the participants
5 including the amount of experience they hold is detailed in table 2.
6
7

8
9 >>>Insert Table 2<<<

10
11
12 The majority of the respondents are in the high end of the experience range (15+years). This
13 shows that a larger number of the participants are well knowledgeable in the subject. Their
14 input reflected their wealth of knowledge and experience.
15

16 17 **3.2 The participants awareness of sustainability issues**

18 In addressing abandonment and sustainability issues, the participants were provided with five
19 sustainability options to gauge their level of awareness. The environmental, economic,
20 technological, social, and political were provided as five option attributes. This is necessary to
21 ascertain their level of awareness that informed their decisions about the best option to select.
22 About 60% of the participants have good awareness of these fives options. From further
23 evaluation, 24% of the highly experienced participants were highly aware of the environmental
24 sustainability. These can be an added advantage to awareness of the impact of the subject of
25 discussion.
26
27
28

29
30 Considering the MCDM, four (4) close-ended questions are the most appropriate as they are
31 quicker to administer and effective to code (Dawson 2011).
32

33 **Q1-** How relevant would you consider the following criteria while **refurbishing** the original
34 buildings for their historical purposes?
35

36 **Q2 -** How relevant would you consider the following criteria while **converting** the buildings
37 into apartment housing and preserving the architectural-urban expression?
38

39 **Q3-** How relevant would you consider the following criteria for the **demolition** of the building
40 and the implementation of a new design?
41
42

43 **Q4-** How relevant would you consider the following criteria with **procurement or selling** of the
44 building to private sector / entities or investors?
45
46

47
48 The questions were carefully collated employing the 5-point Likert scale format (Least
49 relevance -1, Low relevance - 2, moderate relevance - 3, High relevance -4 and Highest
50 relevance -5) to appraise the perception of the participants in the relevance of the ten (10)
51 criteria to the four (4) alternatives (Please refer to Figure 2, level 3 & 4). The interpretation of 1
52 to 5 scale can be based on relevance as adopted from Omotayo et al., (2020) and Balioti et al.
53 (2018).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 SPSS Cronbach's alpha was used to measure consistency of the data collected with the
4 minimum acceptable criterion of 0.7 Cronbach alpha (α =alpha) for measuring the reliability of
5 the data (Pallant 2016). The Cronbach alpha result obtained for the data was $\alpha=0.823$.
6
7

8 9 **4.0 Multi Criteria Decision Making (MCDM)**

10 The MCDM tool has been utilized in many spheres. Decisions identified by Tan et al., (2021) are
11 judgements centered on information knowing that poor-quality information unavoidably leads
12 to poor decision making. It is necessary to determine the configuration of the problems and
13 assess multi criteria decision making. Usually, it is imperative to apply the decision maker's
14 aspiration to differentiate amongst solutions in situations where there are no optimum
15 solutions available to these problems. Preferred solutions could mean selecting best or most
16 preferred alternative from a set of alternatives, or selecting a small set of good alternatives, or
17 grouping alternatives into different preference sets (Aruldoss et al., 2013). Aruldoss et al.,
18 (2013) enlisted the various type of MCDM methods. While considering their advantages, the
19 disadvantages of ELECTRE as "Time consuming" and Grey Theory as "not provide optimal
20 solution" made the two types not considered for the analysis. Balioti et al., (2018) identifies the
21 analytical hierarchy process (AHP) for "decomposing a complex MCDM problem into a system
22 of hierarchies". However, TOPSIS was selected as discussed in the next section based on the
23 nature and the flexibility of the data.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **4.1 The technique for order preference by similarity to an ideal solution (TOPSIS)**

31 TOPSIS is one of the valuable MCDM techniques explored by Kabir and Hasin (2012) that is
32 appropriate for relatively simple and large-scale data. It is relevant when an enormous number
33 of criteria and alternatives are involved as the TOPSIS algorithm is direct with no complication
34 in calculation despite the large-scale data. Hence, calculation with the application of TOPSIS
35 principle is efficient to perform and execute (Ghorpade & Vasatkar, 2015).
36
37

38 The MCDM challenge with (m) alternatives ($A_1, A_2, A_3, \dots, A_m$) being appraised by (n) criteria ($C_1,$
39 C_2, C_3, \dots, C_n) can be experimental as a geometrical system with (m) points in (n) "dimensional
40 space". A component x_{ij} of the matrix signposts the performance score of the i th alternative,
41 A_i , regarding the j th criteria C_j .
42
43

44 The TOPSIS method presumes that each criterion possesses the tendency of monotonically
45 decreasing or increasing utility which results in easily defining the negative and positive ideal
46 solutions. An Euclidean distance approach can be applied to assess the comparative closeness
47 of the alternatives to the ideal solution (Ghorpade & Vasatkar, 2015).
48
49

50 Kabir & Hasin, (2012) adopted a hierarchical structure of four (4) levels: Goal, Attributes,
51 Criteria and Alternatives. Hence Figure 2 presents the main goal sequence for this study.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

>>>Insert Figure 2<<<

4.2 The performance average rating of the criteria

Prior to the TOPSIS analysis, with the use of Microsoft Excel, the performance average ratings of the responses from the 161 participants were cross referenced in the decision matrix (Table 3). The decision matrix was utilised for the TOPSIS analysis.

>>>Insert Table 3<<<

From Table 3, "**Structural Integrity and foundation**" one of the two criteria under *Technological* attributes in Figure 2 emerged top on the list for the *refurbishment* and *conversion* alternatives. This is necessary to ensure the stability of the structural elements of the structure before any of the two alternatives (Refurbishment - Q1 and Conversion - Q2) can be considered.

Waste Generation and Prevention as criteria top the list of the four criteria under environmental attributes in Figure 2 and Table 3. Noor et al., (2020) identifies demolition wastes as debris that emanates from renovation, construction and demolition work with demolition representing 90% of the construction and demolition waste. The participants concerns are of modalities and logistics of how this waste can be managed if the buildings are demolished. Villoria Sáez et al., (2012) posit that efficient waste management should be considered.

For Procurement alternatives, **Profitability** ranked as the highest in the list of criteria for the economic attributes of Figure 2 and Table 3. Investors are keen on the profitability of the infrastructure anticipated for procurement. There is a need to understand the profit possibilities and the challenges positioned for the investment to be successful. For instance, with significant prospects for profits, international investors have taken stakes in United Kingdom airports infrastructure which made it remain an appealing investment proposal (BIS, 2011).

5.0 TOPSIS Analysis

This is the analysis of the four alternatives in Level 4 of Figure 2 with the application of TOPSIS. The MS Excel presentation of the analysis was adopted from Wilson (2013) as tables and simple displays are often required in some instance to present reasoning and thoughts. The values of the four alternatives were obtained from the decision matrix in Table 3.

1
2
3 Normalisation: This works towards attaining equivalent scales which permit the comparison of
4 alternatives. The vector normalisation method divides the rating of every alternative by its
5 standard to compute the (x_j) the normalised value. With the terminologies previously
6 discussed, the adapted TOPSIS method from Mathew (2018a) is described as follows:
7
8
9

10 **Step -1** Calculate Normalised Matrix.

11
12 This step transforms the different alternative sections into non-sectional alternatives, which
13 permits appraisal across criteria. The normalised matrix of Table 3 is calculated using the
14 formula in step 1 to achieve Table 4
15
16

$$\overline{X}_{ij} = \frac{X_{ij}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij}^2}}$$

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 >>>Insert Table 4<<<

26
27
28
29 **Step - 2** Calculate weighted Normalised Matrix

30
31 Compute the weighted normalised matrix by assuming a set of weights for each of the criteria
32 $w_j = 1/n$. The mean weight (MW) can be adopted in the absence of information or when the
33 information is not sufficient or available to attain a decision (Odu 2019; Mathew 2018b)
34

35 $W_j = 1/n$ i.e 1/10 that is 0.1 (Table 4)

36 where n is the number of criteria

37
38 Multiply the associate weight with each column of the normalised matrix. A component of the
39 new matrix will emerged as the content in table 5:
40
41
42

43
44
45 >>>Insert Table 5<<<

46
47
48
49 **Step -3** Calculate the ideal best and ideal worst value

50 This is achieved by evaluating the maximum value (V+) and the minimum value (V-) (Table 5).

51 Positive ideal best value, $\{V^+ = V_1, \dots, V_n\} = \{ \max (v_{ij}) \text{ if } j \in J; \min (v_{ij}) \text{ if } j \in J' \}$

52
53 Negative ideal worst value, $V^- = \{ v_1, \dots, v_n \}$, where $v^j = \{ \min (v_{ij}) \text{ if } j \in J; \max (v_{ij}) \text{ if } j \in J' \}$
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

J is referred to as a set of benefit attributes (larger – the - better category) and J' is referred to as a set cost attributes (smaller – the- better category)

Step - 4 Calculate Euclidean distance from the ideal best (S_i^+) (Table 6). Compute the measures for each of the alternatives. The separation of each of the alternatives from the positive ideal alternative is stated below:

$$S_i^+ = \left[\sum_{j=1}^m (V_{ij} - V_j^+)^2 \right]^{0.5}$$

Step – 5 Calculate Euclidean distance from the ideal worst (S_i^-) (Table 6). The separation of each of the alternative from the negative ideal alternative is stated below:

$$S_i^- = \left[\sum_{j=1}^m (V_{ij} - V_j^-)^2 \right]^{0.5}$$

Step - 6 Calculate Performance Score (Table 6). The Performance score as stated in the formula below is the division of the Euclidean distance from the ideal worst by the addition of both the Euclidean distance from the ideal best and the Euclidean distance from the ideal worst.

$$P_i = \frac{S_i^-}{S_i^+ + S_i^-}$$

>>> Insert Table 6<<<

In summary, the sixth-step formula ranked the alternatives according to Table 6 as Refurbishment > Conversion > Procurement > Demolition. With respect to the final scores, it can be determined that refurbishment is considered as the most sustainable development alternative for abandoned Federal Secretariat building in Nigeria. This study was steered to provide a model to the Federal Government of Nigeria to adopt a sustainable redevelopment

1
2
3 strategies of abandoned infrastructure with the integration of processes (*The technique for*
4 *order preference by similarity to an ideal solution - TOPSIS*).
5
6
7
8
9

10 **6.0 Discussion**

11 The robustness of MCDM techniques in general and TOPSIS specifically enabled the robustness
12 of analysing the data collated during this study. To confront decision making, this study has
13 generated diverse MCDM techniques as obtained from (Tan et al., 2021; Aruldoss et al., 2013).
14 Some literature reviewed by Tan et al., (2021) either uses these techniques as an individual
15 (single) approach or hybrid (multiple) approaches for providing a solution. TOPSIS has been a
16 feasible approach when specific performance rating is obtainable. This will also expedite the
17 decision-making process.
18
19
20
21

22 According to TOPSIS method with consideration of five alternatives and ten criteria as listed in
23 Figure 5, it is obvious that *Refurbishment and adaptation to current needs while maintaining*
24 *or slightly changing the original building and its historically established purpose (Q1-*
25 **Refurbishment***)* is considered most suitable and sustainable option for the redevelopment of
26 the abandoned Federal Government Secretariat.
27
28
29

30 **6.1 Refurbishment and Adaptation to current needs**

31 It may augur well to consider incentives for refurbishment as suggested by
32 Buitelaar et al., (2021). This proposal will create a platform for energy efficiency and
33 technological innovation. Another benefit of refurbishment as mentioned by Croatto et al.,
34 (2016) are environmental preservation, money saving and cultural heritage, longer life cycle,
35 positive long-term effects on environmental sustainability, waste reduction, and climate
36 change mitigation on a broader scale. Refurbishment will also reduced polarization and social
37 segregation in the city by attracting people from other parts of the city. Balaras & Dascalaki,
38 (2019) argued the need for refurbishment stating that while new structures are built according
39 to more stringent energy codes, the existing infrastructure commonly have low energy
40 operations and therefore in need of renovation to improve “indoor environmental quality
41 (IEQ)”, the well being of occupants and lower their energy operating costs. This can be possible
42 especially when incentives are considered by the policy makers to encourage refurbishment as
43 against wide spread of static buildings.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **6.2 Conversion of the building into apartment housing**

51 Housing shortage can be resolved by the adaptive reuse and conversion of buildings into
52 residential ones (Petković-Grozdanovića et al., 2016). The revitalisation of these existings
53 structure through conversion provides renewal of outdated and obsolete urban areas, positive
54 impacts with regards to energy and material resources, negligible negative effects on the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 environment, and protection of architectural and historical integrity of the structure. However,
4 the conversion of these abandoned buildings into dwellings can be effectual when the attained
5 conversion meets with the needs and the wishes of probable users.

6
7 The dimension and spatial orientation of the office buildings mentioned in the case study may
8 affect the conversion of the office spaces into residential dwellings. To fulfil the basic
9 requirement of residential dwellings for living space, it is imperative for the spaces to be
10 naturally lit and ventilated. To realise a functional result that is cost effective, the conversion
11 process should be properly managed after the initial evaluation of the buildings. The evaluation
12 will include the process of exploring the spatial requirement for functionality, the existing
13 sustainability and legislative requirement, the location of the building, natural lighting, and
14 spatial capacity of the structure.
15
16
17

18 **6.3 Demolition of the building and the implementation of a new construction project**

19 Su et al., (2021) confirmed that the tools that can appropriately quantify the impact and
20 estimate the amount of demolition waste are lacking and later mentioned the Building
21 Information Modelling (BIM) as one of the major tools required to develop an evaluation and
22 estimation system for demolition waste from buildings. The building products may not be fit for
23 reuse, disassemble or recycle after demolition. They can be rejected and typically end up in
24 landfill. However, Naeini et al., (2021) supported the usefulness of demolition waste obtained
25 from construction material and can be blended with recovered plastics.
26
27
28
29

30 **6.4 Procurement or selling of the infrastructure to private sector or investors**

31 With the cash position and the current realities of the Nigerian government, Balogun (2016)
32 posit that the infrastructure development will entail a substantial funding by the private sector
33 with a robust collaboration between the private sector and the government, and a medium to
34 long term perception on the economic returns and benefits of investment to the nation. The
35 author further states that the political willpower is required to ensure that the Nigerian
36 environment is “investor ready” for new ways of partnership between private investors and
37 government agencies to ensure a realistic medium to long term benefits to all key parties
38 involved in the infrastructure investment. Significant opportunities also abound for the investor
39 to generate returns. With assurance of guaranteed safety on investment and possible
40 opportunity for a return on investment (ROI), the private investors are likely to be willing to
41 collaborate with the government (Arimoro 2018).
42
43
44
45
46

47 **6.5 Socio-economic Implications of findings**

48 The socio- economic need to repurpose the abandoned infrastructure is imperative for a
49 sustainable environment (Foster 2020; Amade et al., 2015; Tijani and Ajagbe 2016). The
50 outcome of the revitalisation will not only create a paradigm shift from new developments to
51 reusing existing buildings, but will also improve the economic development of the country.
52 This study was steered to evaluate the impact of abandoned infrastructure to the socio -
53 economic stability of the Nigerian environment and also developed a model that will be
54 adaptable for the redevelopment of abandoned infrastructure in Nigeria. The TOPSIS is an
55 efficient model that
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 will enables the evaluation of attributes, criteria and alternatives to support the choice of the
4 ideal best alternatives (Aruldoss et al., 2013) . The responsibility rests with the decision makers
5 such as Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission- (ICRC), The Federal Ministry of
6 Works and Housing (FMWH), Nigeria Institute of Architects (NIA), and Nigeria Institute of
7 Building (NIOB) to promote the adoption of TOPSIS in the sustainable redevelopment of
8 abandoned infrastructure in Nigeria. The outcome of the findings proffers more acumen into
9 further research on redevelopment possibilities of abandoned infrastructure using MCDM most
10 especially TOPSIS and Green BIM.

11 Redeveloping these structures will contribute to the change required by the decision makers
12 towards transformation to the new normal. In addition to that, it will also broaden the
13 knowledge of efficient use of these existings structures within the academia. Topics such as
14 “decision making outcome study for abandon buildings redevelopment” and “effectiveness in
15 the multi criteria decision tools for sustainability” can be considered for future research.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **7.0 Conclusion and Limitation**

23 This study has successfully identified Refurbishment as the most sustainable way for the
24 redevelopment of the presented case study- the abandoned Nigerian Federal Secretariat
25 building in Lagos. Considering sustainable development, the redevelopment of the public
26 buildings such as the Federal Secretariat is a multifaceted challenge, hence, the TOPSIS
27 technique is proved to be extremely suitable to validate the selection of the most sustainable
28 decisions. With TOPSIS method, ten (10) criteria were identified and sectioned into four
29 alternatives as refurbishment, conversion, demolition and procurement. Structural Integrity
30 and Foundation of the Technological attributes ranked highest out of the five (5) attributes of
31 social, economic, environmental, political and technological attributes. This indicated that
32 there is a relationship between Refurbishment and technological attributes. Innovative tools
33 such as green BIM will be needed to ascertain the integrity of the infrastructure to know how
34 exactly to address refurbishment. It is obvious that the confirmation of the structural stability
35 of abandoned infrastructure with the consideration of the four alternatives is dependent on
36 the application of innovative tools for integrity confirmation.
37
38
39
40

41 This study will contribute to the body of knowledge and create a pathway for extended
42 research in the Nigerian construction industry sustainably. There is no doubt that this study has
43 created a paradigm shift both academically and professionally from continous development of
44 infrastructure in aligning with sustainable development goals to include the refurbishment of
45 abandoned existing infrastructure. The implication of this study also buttress the necessity for
46 the government to consider the adoption of TOPSIS in the sustainable redevelopment of
47 abandoned infrastructure in Nigeria.
48
49
50

51 The limitation of this study is the inability to extend the TOPSIS to the grey area to determine
52 the weight of each criteria and this may be achieved through interview of expert groups to
53 determine the diverse weight of each criteria. Nevertheless, the outcome of this study proffers
54 a better understanding for consideration of sustainable redevelopment of abandoned
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 infrastructure. This will pave the way for further research on possibilities of redeveloping
4 abandoned infrastructure using TOPSIS and green BIM
5
6
7

8 **8.0 References**

9

- 10 Abdul, E. O., Raimi, K. O., & Ibisola, A. S. (2018). Effects of Abandoned Urban Infrastructure on
11 Environmental Development in Ogun State. *Geomatics and Environmental Engineering*,
12 12(3), 5. <https://doi.org/10.7494/geom.2018.12.3.5>
13
14
15 Ahmad, Najid; Luqman' Muhammad and Hayat, M. F. (2012). Importance of Investment for
16 economic growth: Evidence from Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal Of Contemporary*
17 *Research In Business*, 4(4), 680–685.
18
19 Ali, K. A., Ahmad, M. I., & Yusup, Y. (2020). Issues, impacts, and mitigations of carbon dioxide
20 emissions in the building sector. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(18).
21 <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU12187427>
22
23 Amade, B., Ubani, E. C., Amaeshi, U. F., & Okorochoa, K. A. (2015). Factors for Containing Failure
24 and Abandonment of Public Sector Construction Projects in Nigeria. *Journal of Building*
25 *Performance*, 6(1), 63–76.
26
27 Amadi, A. (2019). A cross-sectional snapshot of the insider view of highway infrastructure
28 delivery in the developing world. *International Journal of Construction Management*,
29 19(6), 472–491. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2018.1452097>
30
31 Araszkiewicz, K. (2016). Green Bim Concept- Scandina Vian. *Construction Innovation*, LXII(2),
32 134–150. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CI-01-2014-0002>
33
34 Ariffin, N. F., Md Jaafar, M. F., Ali, M. I., Ramli, N. I., Muthusamy, K., & Abdul Shukor Lim, N. H.
35 (2018). Investigation on factors that contribute to the abandonment of building in
36 construction industry in Malaysia. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 34(June 2015).
37 <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/20183401025>
38
39 Arimoro, A. (2018). Private-Sector Funded Investment in Infrastructure in Rivers State Nigeria:
40 Options for Investors. *Unpublished, August*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/rg.2.2.35109.35046>
41
42 Aruldoss, M., Lakshmi, T. M., & Venkatesan, V. P. (2013). A Survey on Fuzzy MCDM Methods
43 and Its Applications. *American Journal of Information Systems*, 1(1), 31–43.
44 <https://doi.org/10.12691/ajis-1-1-5>
45
46 Atamewan, E. E. (2020) 'Abandonment of Housing Projects in Nigeria: Appraisal of the
47 Environmental and Socio-Economic Implications', *European Journal of Environment and*
48 *Earth Sciences*, 1(4), pp. 1–6. doi: 10.24018/ejgeo.2020.1.4.29
49
50 Ayeyemi, D. (2021). *Fresh Concerns Over Abandoned FG 's Properties In Lagos*.
51
52 Balaras, C. A., & Dascalaki, E. G. (2019). Energy efficiency in building renovation. In *Handbook of*
53 *Energy Efficiency in Buildings: A Life Cycle Approach*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12->
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 812817-6.00042-5
4

- 5 Balioti, V., Tzimopoulos, C., & Evangelides, C. (2018). Multi-Criteria Decision Making Using
6 TOPSIS Method Under Fuzzy Environment. Application in Spillway Selection. *Proceedings*,
7 2(11), 637. <https://doi.org/10.3390/proceedings2110637>
8
- 9 Balogun, A. (2016). Infrastructure Development in Nigeria: Better late than never. In *Pwc*
10 *Advisory outlook* (p. 6). www.pwc.com/ng
11
- 12 BIS. (2011). *Infrastructure supply chains: barriers and opportunities*. August, 1–88.
13
- 14 Buitelaar, E., Moroni, S., & De Franco, A. (2021). Building obsolescence in the evolving city.
15 Reframing property vacancy and abandonment in the light of urban dynamics and
16 complexity. *Cities*, 108(September 2020), 102964.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2020.102964>
18
- 19 Cascone, S., & Sciuto, G. (2018). Recovery and reuse of abandoned buildings for student
20 housing: A case study in Catania, Italy. *Frontiers of Architectural Research*, 7(4), 510–520.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foar.2018.08.004>
22
- 23 Creswell, J.W. and Creswell, J.D., 2018; 2018. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and*
24 *mixed methods approaches*. Fifth ed. Los Angeles: Sage.
25
- 26 Croatto, G., Turrini, U., & Bertolazzi, A. (2016). Criteria and guidelines about structural
27 reversibility for reinforced concrete historical buildings refurbishment. The excelsior
28 cinema in Milan (1926-30). *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 22(3), 189–198.
29 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556207.2017.1279866>
30
- 31 Dawson, C. (2011) *Introduction to Research Methods: A practical Guide For Anyone Undertaking*
32 *A Research Project*. London: How To Book Limited.
33
- 34 Doraisamy, V., S., Akasha, Z. A., & Yunus, R. (2015). A Review on Abandoned Construction
35 Projects: Causes & Effects. *Applied Mechanics and Materials*, 773–774(July), 979–983.
36 <https://doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/amm.773-774.979>
37
- 38 Elijah O., A., & Olumuyiwa M., A. (2011). Abandonment of Construction Projects in Nigeria:
39 Causes and Effects. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences*,
40 2(2), 2141–7024. [http://jetems.scholarlinkresearch.com/articles/Abandonment of](http://jetems.scholarlinkresearch.com/articles/Abandonment%20of%20Construction%20Projects%20in%20Nigeria.pdf)
41 [Construction Projects in Nigeria.pdf](http://jetems.scholarlinkresearch.com/articles/Abandonment of Construction Projects in Nigeria.pdf)
42
- 43 Fatihudin, D., Jusni, & Mochklas, M. (2018). How measuring financial performance.
44 *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 9(6), 553–557.
45
- 46 Foster, G. (2020). Circular economy strategies for adaptive reuse of cultural heritage buildings
47 to reduce environmental impacts. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 152(October
48 2019), 104507. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.104507>
49
- 50 Garba, Y. Y. (2019) 'Effect of Abandoned building Projects on the Neighbourhood of Abuja,
51 Nigeria', *Environmental Technology & Science Journal*, 10(2), pp. 19–22. Available at:
52 <http://repository.futminna.edu.ng:8080/jspui/handle/123456789/9759>.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ghorpade, K. H., & Vasatkar, P. A. R. (2015). *Selection Of Most Suitable Contractor By Using*
4 *MCDM Techniques*. 1(5).
5
- 6 Gupta, J. & Chakraborty, M. (2021). Energy efficiency in buildings. Elsevier Inc. Available at:
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-822989-7.00016-0>
8
- 9 Hamma-adama, M., Ogunnusi, M., Mashwama, N. X., & Ahmad, A. S. (2021). *Assessment of Risk*
10 *Associated with Road Infrastructure Development in the Developing Countries*. 9(7), 1223–
11 1229.
12
- 13 Hanachor, M. E. (2012). Community Development Project Abandonment in Nigeria : Causes and
14 Effect s. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(6), 33–37.
15
- 16 Hoe, Y. E. (2013). Causes of Abandoned Construction Projects In Malaysia. *Thesis, May*.
17
- 18 Kabir, G., & Hasin, M. A. A. (2012). Comparative Analysis of Topsis and Fuzzy Topsis for the
19 Evaluation of Travel Website Service Quality. *International Journal of Quality Research*,
20 6(3), 169–185.
21
- 22 Luangcharoenrat, C., Intrachooto, S., Peansupap, V., & Sutthinarakorn, W. (2019). Factors
23 influencing construction waste generation in building construction: Thailand’s perspective.
24 *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(13). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11133638>
25
- 26 Mathew, M. (2018a). TOPSIS using Excel - MCDM Problem. [TOPSIS using Excel - MCDM problem](#)
27 [- YouTube](#) .
28
- 29 Mathew, M. (2018b). TOPSIS - Technique for Order by Similarity to Ideal Solution.
30 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kfcN7MuYVel>
31
- 32 Mcguinn, J., Fries-Tersch, E., Jones, M., Crepaldi, C., Masso, M., Kadarik, I., Samek Lodovici, M.,
33 Drufuca, S., Gancheva, M., & Geny, B. (2020). *SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY : Concept and*
34 *Brenchmarks*. April.
35
- 36 Muzenda, A. (2018). *Abandoned Buildings in Lagos ,. December 1991*, 1–6.
37
- 38 Naeini, M., Mohammadinia, A., Arulrajah, A., & Horpibulsuk, S. (2021). Stress-dilatancy
39 responses of recovered plastics and demolition waste blends as a construction material.
40 *Construction and Building Materials*, 297, 123762.
41 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2021.123762>
42
- 43 Noor, T., Javid, A., Hussain, A., Bukhari, S. M., Ali, W., Akmal, M., & Hussain, S. M. (2020). Types,
44 sources and management of urban wastes. In *Urban Ecology*. Elsevier Inc.
45 <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-820730-7.00014-8>
46
- 47 Nwannekanma, B. and Gbonegun, V. 2019. (2019). *A nation mired in waste as multi-billion naira*
48 *properties rot away — Property — The Guardian Nigeria News – Nigeria and World News*.
49
- 50 Odu, G. O. (2019) ‘Weighting methods for multi-criteria decision making technique’, *Journal of*
51 *Applied Sciences and Environmental Management*, 23(8), p. 1449. doi:
52 10.4314/jasem.v23i8.7.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Odutola, A. and Adeniran, Y. (2017). *10 states abandon N3trn projects – Investigation - The*
4 *Point*.
5
6
7 OECD. (2015). *Fostering Investment in Infrastructure - Lessons learned from OECD Investment*
8 *Policy Reviews*. January, 57.
9
10 Ogunnusi, M., Salman, H., & Laing, R. (2021). Infrastructure development and abandonment.
11 *Proceedings of International Structural Engineering and Construction*, 8(1), INF-08-1-INF-
12 08-6. [https://doi.org/10.14455/ISEC.2021.8\(1\).INF-08](https://doi.org/10.14455/ISEC.2021.8(1).INF-08)
13
14 Okafor, F. O., Osadebe, N. N., & Sylvester, I. J. (2018). Abandoned projects-implication on the
15 strength of exposed steel and concrete in the Southern region of Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal*
16 *of Technology*, 37(3), 562. <https://doi.org/10.4314/njt.v37i3.1>
17
18 Olalusi, O., & Otunola, A. (2012). Abandonment of building projects in Nigeria- A review of
19 causes and solutions. *Politics*, 50(20), 24–26.
20
21 Olumide Odeyinka, O. O. and F. O. (2018). An Assessment of the Causes and Effects of
22 Abandonment of Road Construction Projects in Osun State Nigeria. *The Pacific Journal of*
23 *Science and Technology*, 19(2), 187–195.
24
25 Omotayo, T., Awuzie, B., Egbelakin, T., Obi, L., & Ogunnusi, M. (2020). AHP-systems thinking
26 analyses for kaizen costing implementation in the construction industry. *Buildings*, 10(12),
27 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings10120230>
28
29 Oyewobi, L. O., Ija, M. I., & Jimoh, R. A. (2017). *Achieving Sustainable Procurement Practices in*
30 *the Nigerian Construction Industry : Examining Potential Barriers and Strategies*.
31
32 Pallant, J. (2016) *SPSS survival manual: A step-by-step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS*.
33 6th ed. Maidenhead, Berkshire, England.: McGraw-Hill Education.
34
35 Pavlovskis, M., Antucheviciene, J., & Migilinskas, D. (2017). Assessment of Buildings
36 Redevelopment Possibilities using MCDM and BIM Techniques. *Procedia Engineering*, 172,
37 846–850. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2017.02.083>
38
39 Petković-Grozdanovića, N., Stoiljković, B., Keković, A., & Murgul, V. (2016). The Possibilities for
40 Conversion and Adaptive Reuse of Industrial Facilities into Residential Dwellings. *Procedia*
41 *Engineering*, 165, 1836–1844. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2016.11.931>
42
43 Rathi, S., & Khandve, P. (2014). Demolition of Buildings - An Overview. *International Journal of*
44 *Advance Engineering and Research Development*, 1(06).
45 <https://doi.org/10.21090/ijaerd.010643>
46
47 Sanda, Y. N., Anigbogu, N.A., Izam, Y.D., Nuhu, L.Y. (2021) 'Designing Case Study Research in
48 Construction Management', *Journal of Surveying, Construction & Property*, 12(1), pp. 27–
49 35. doi: 10.22452/jscp.vol12no1.3.
50
51 Scales, P. (2013). An introduction to ontology and epistemology for undergraduate students.
52 *www.Peter-Scales.Org.Uk*, August, 1–9. [https://www.peter-scales.org.uk/he-and-he-in-fe-](https://www.peter-scales.org.uk/he-and-he-in-fe-resources/)
53 [resources/](https://www.peter-scales.org.uk/he-and-he-in-fe-resources/)
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Su, S., Li, S., Ju, J., Wang, Q., & Xu, Z. (2021). A building information modeling-based tool for
4 estimating building demolition waste and evaluating its environmental impacts. *Waste*
5 *Management, 134*(July), 159–169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2021.07.025>
6
7 Tan, T., Mills, G., Papadonikolaki, E., & Liu, Z. (2021). Combining multi-criteria decision making
8 (MCDM) methods with building information modelling (BIM): A review. *Automation in*
9 *Construction, 121*(September 2020), 103451.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2020.103451>
11
12 Tijani, M., & Ajagbe, W. (2016). Professional view on the causes and effects of construction
13 projects abandonment in Ibadan metropolis, Nigeria. *Ethiopian Journal of Environmental*
14 *Studies and Management, 9*(5), 593. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ejesm.v9i5.6>
15
16 Ubani, E., & Ononuju, C. (2013). A study of failure and abandonment of public sector-driven civil
17 engineering projects in Nigeria: An empirical review. *American Journal of Scientific and*
18 *Industrial Research, 4*(1), 75–82. <https://doi.org/10.5251/ajsir.2013.4.1.75.82>
19
20 Villoria Sáez, P., Del Río Merino, M., & Porrás-Amores, C. (2012). Estimation of construction and
21 demolition waste volume generation in new residential buildings in Spain. *Waste*
22 *Management and Research, 30*(2), 137–146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734242X11423955>
23
24 Vizzarri, C. (2020). The refurbishment of abandoned industrial areas with adaptive re-use
25 strategies: analysis of decision making models and design criteria. *Journal of Urban*
26 *Environment, April*, 15–28. <https://doi.org/10.34154/2020-jue-0101-15-28/eurass>
27
28 Wahab, B. (2020). Abandoned Federal Govt buildings in Lagos are now homes to miscreants
29 and robbers. In *Pulse, Nigeria*. [https://www.pulse.ng/news/local/abandoned-federal-govt-](https://www.pulse.ng/news/local/abandoned-federal-govt-buildings-in-lagos-are-now-homes-to-miscreants-and-robbers/33e14hx)
30 [buildings-in-lagos-are-now-homes-to-miscreants-and-robbers/33e14hx](https://www.pulse.ng/news/local/abandoned-federal-govt-buildings-in-lagos-are-now-homes-to-miscreants-and-robbers/33e14hx)
31
32 Wilson, G. (2013) ‘an Integrated Decision Support Model for the Sustainable Refurbishment of
33 Hospitals and Healthcare Facilities: Developing a Prototype’, (1). Available at:
34 <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/29653/>.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

List of Figures




Figure 1: Conceptual framework.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2 : The main goal sequence for the sustainability appraisal of the abandoned infrastructure redevelopment (Pavlovskis et al., 2017; Kabir & Hasin, 2012; Mcguinn et al., 2020)

List of Tables

Table 1: The ten (10) criteria for sustainable redevelopment alternatives (*in italics*)

N	Criteria
C1	Pavlovskis et al., (2017) considered <i>Project preparation and coordination</i> under technological attributes.
C2	With expert perception into social sustainability concept and the means of addressing it in legislation and policy making, Mcguinn et al., (2020) identified <i>creation of employment</i> as one of the main determinants for social sustainability
C3	An <i>energy efficient</i> construction generates comfortable living conditions with the minimum likely amount of energy consumption while maximizing the efficient use of resources (Gupta et al., 2021)
C4	To curb and manage these <i>waste generation</i> , a complete understanding of issues around the waste generation in construction is essential (Luangcharoenrat et al., 2019).
C5	Pavlovskis et al., (2017) considered <i>preservation of historical value</i> as one of the key aspects of sustainable redevelopment consideration of infrastructure
C6	Ahmad et al., (2012) critically evaluated the relationship between investment and economic growth. <i>Investment</i> expenditure creates direct contribution to economic activity as the most unpredictable component of GDP
C7	<i>Profitability</i> is the achievement of an organisation or an entity base of financial performance (Fatihudin et al., 2018).
C8	The building lifetime in Pavlovskis et al., (2017) was changed to <i>Structural Integrity and Foundation</i> . This is also part of the technological criteria with the intention of evaluating the structural stability of the projects
C9	Vizzarri, (2020) considered political attributes <i>as government regulations and policies</i> which includes national laws, the urban management and landscape protection
C10	Ali et al., (2020) claimed that the construction sector plays a vital role in the <i>carbon dioxide (CO2) emission</i> into the atmosphere in large number resulting to diverse issues that needs to be addressed.

Table 2: The demography of the respondents.

Description	Category	Number	%
Profession	Architects	34	21.11
	Building Engineers	6	3.72
	Civil Engineers	21	13.04
	Electrical Engineers	5	3.13
	Construction/Project Managers	25	15.63
	Quantity Surveyors	32	19.87
	Property Developers	4	2.48
	Contractors	4	2.48
	Others	30	18.63
Years of experience	Somewhat experienced (<5)	24	14.90
	Experienced (5-10years)	49	30.43
	Very experienced (11-15)	32	19.87
	Highly experienced (more than 15 years)	56	34.78
Academic qualification	College / Ordinary National Diploma (OND)	1	0.62
	Higher National Diploma (HND)	12	7.45
	First Degree	48	29.81
	MSc	94	58.38
	PhD	6	3.72
Sector of operation	Public Sector	10	6.21
	Private Sector	97	60.24
	Both (Public and Private)	54	33.54

Table 3: Decision Matrix.

N	Criteria	Q1	Rank	Q2	Rank	Q3	Rank	Q4	Rank
C1	Project preparation and coordination	4.15	3	4.09	3	3.74	3	3.74	
C2	Creation of employment opportunities	4.17	2	4.05		3.51		3.81	
C3	Energy efficiency	3.99		3.99		3.54		3.58	
C4	Waste generation / prevention	3.83		3.82		3.93	1	3.44	
C5	Preservation of historical value	3.48		3.24		3.63		3.19	
C6	Investments	4.11		4.11	2	3.63		4.12	2
C7	Profitability	3.99		4.05		3.45		4.17	1
C8	Structural integrity and foundation	4.47	1	4.38	1	3.85	2	3.96	3
C9	Government regulations and policies	3.58		3.58		3.44		3.48	
C10	CO2 emissions	3.61		3.73		3.58		3.29	

Table 4:

Weightage	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Alternatives	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10
(Q1))	0.527	0.535	0.527	0.509	0.513	0.514	0.509	0.536	0.508	0.507
(Q2)	0.519	0.52	0.527	0.508	0.478	0.515	0.516	0.524	0.509	0.524
(Q3)	0.476	0.451	0.469	0.522	0.535	0.454	0.439	0.461	0.489	0.503
(Q4)	0.476	0.49	0.474	0.458	0.471	0.515	0.531	0.475	0.494	0.463

Table 5:

Table 5										
Altern	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10
(Q1))	0.0527	0.0535	0.527	0.0509	0.0513	0.0514	0.0509	0.0536	0.0508	0.0507
(Q2)	0.0519	0.052	0.527	0.0508	0.0478	0.0515	0.0516	0.0524	0.0509	0.0524
(Q3)	0.0476	0.0451	0.469	0.0522	0.0535	0.0454	0.0439	0.0461	0.0489	0.0503
(Q4)	0.0476	0.049	0.474	0.0458	0.0471	0.0515	0.0531	0.0475	0.0494	0.0463
v+	0.0527	0.054	0.053	0.052	0.054	0.052	0.053	0.054	0.051	0.052
v-	0.0476	0.045	0.047	0.046	0.047	0.045	0.044	0.046	0.049	0.046

Table 6:

Alternatives	S_i^+ (C1-10)	S_i^- (C1-C10)	P_i (C1-C10)	Rank
Refurbishment (Q1)	0.003838492	0.018367905	0.82714476	1
Conversion (Q2)	0.006389463	0.017400313	0.7314198	2
Demolition (Q3)	0.017823215	0.009894978	0.35698496	4
Procurement	0.015315897	0.011796972	0.435106	3