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Introduction

In 1989, the CICA, in collaboration with Peat Marwick Mclintock, surveyed the use of CAD in the top 100 companies in four major sectors of the construction industry. The results were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil &amp; Structural Engineers</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity Surveyors</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A pilot survey was carried out in January 1994 by the RIBA IT Group: this indicates that 92% of the architectural practices which responded were using computers and of these 74% were using CAD. [68% of respondents] Some 27 systems were identified. 57% of the total were using AutoCad, 13% were using one of four Macintosh-based systems and 30% using the remaining 22 systems.

Further responses to the questionnaire were analysed in June 1994. The total sample is small, 274 respondents, and is likely to be biased towards users. The percentage of non-users has not changed [8%], but 25% are not using CAD. The results showed that 67% of respondents were using CAD and of these 54% were using AutoCad, the next most popular being PowerDraw with 8%. 31 systems were identified.

The RIBA IT group has obtained sponsorship for a full national survey. It is hoped that the results will be available in September.

The pattern of use is different in the 36 Schools of Architecture. [1993 figures] 24 were using PCs and 18 Apples. 23 were using AutoCad. Here Macintosh based software has a greater share as it is considered to be more 'designer-oriented'.

Numerous institutions are undertaking or funding research, but there is not enough coordination in the UK between research funding bodies, professional institutions and academics. In a European perspective the lack of coordination becomes even more apparent.

Standards are developed and encouraged but not applied rigorously because of commercial interests, conflicts of interest in the building industry and a lack of knowledge of individuals within it. In a multi-disciplinary and increasingly international construction market should there not be a greater movement towards the acceptance of common standards and a common building model?

These statements are provocative; are there any courses of action that might improve the situation?
Order a complete set of eCAADe Proceedings (1983 - 2000) on CD-Rom!

Further information: http://www.ecaade.org