

**COST EFFECTIVENESS COMPARISON OF PRE-FABRICATION  
WITH CONVENTIONAL CONSTRUCTION METHOD  
FOR RMAF GROUND DEFENSE BUNKER**

**TAN SWEE KOK**

**UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA**

**COST EFFECTIVENESS COMPARISON OF PRE-FABRICATION  
WITH CONVENTIONAL CONSTRUCTION METHOD  
FOR RMAF GROUND DEFENSE BUNKER**

**TAN SWEE KOK**

**A project report submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master in Science  
(Construction Management)**

**Faculty of Civil Engineering  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia**

**APRIL, 2010**

## ABSTRAK

Kaedah pembinaan pre-fabrikasi bukannya perkara baru dalam industri pembinaan Malaysia, namun penggunaannya masih pada tahap yang rendah. Pihak kerajaan sewajarnya menggalakkan penggunaan pembinaan pre-fabrikasi terutamanya pada projek-projek pembangunan kerajaan termasuk projek pembangunan keselamatan negara. Kaedah pre-fabrikasi merupakan kaedah moden yang diimplimentasikan secara luas di negara-negara membangun dan ia telah dibuktikan berkesan menjimatkan kos pembinaan, tenaga kerja, tempoh pembinaan, dan kualiti pembinaan.

Pangkalan Udara Kuantan telah dipilih untuk kajian kes disebabkan ia merupakan Pangkalan TUDM yang pertama dilengkapi dengan kubu pertahanan pangkalan. Data-data yang diperlukan telah diperolehi daripada tiga fasa kajian kes ini, meliputi tinjauan tapak, temubual, dan perbandingan kos pembinaan antara kaedah pre-fabrikasi dengan kaedah pembinaan tradisional. Penemuan-penemuan daripada data yang dianalisis membuktikan kubu-kubu sedia ada tidak memenuhi spesifikasi dan menimbulkan masalah-masalah kepada TUDM dan JKR sewaktu pelaksanaan projek. Walau bagaimanapun, kaedah pre-fabrikasi akan menyumbang kepada penyelesaian masalah-masalah yang timbul dan terbukti dari segi keberkesanan kos jika digunakan. Kajian ini telah mencadangkan pengagihan kerja dan tanggungjawab menyeluruh perlu diterapkan kepada semua pihak yang terlibat dalam projek pembangunan kubu. Kajian juga mengesyorkan ketelusan maklumat kos pembinaan amat penting diperolehi daripada pihak JKR.

Tujuan utama dan objektif-objektif yang ditetapkan dalam kajian ini telah tercapai di mana masalah kerosakan yang terjadi kepada kubu-kubu yang sedia ada serta masalah-masalah pengoperasian pangkalan harian telah dikenalpasti. Persoalanan berkenaan perbandingan kos pembinaan kaedah pre-fabrikasi telah dibuktikan dan didaati kos pre-fabrikasi lebih berkesan, Maklumbalas daripada kebanyakan responden menunjukkan penggunaan kaedah pre-fabrikasi yang menyeluruh di semua Pangkalan/ Unit TUDM pada Rancangan Malaysia Ke-10 adalah memungkinkan dan boleh menjimatkan kewangan pertahanan TUDM.

## ABSTRACT

Pre-fabrication construction method is not new in Malaysian construction industry yet the utilization of such method still relatively low. Government should conduct thorough study of pre-fabrication method aspects and implement it widely especially for government based projects including national security development projects as well. Pre-fabrication method is a modern construction method that widely use by developed countries and it proven that to be more cost effective and cost saving on the aspect of cost, labor, time, quality and durability.

Pilot project of bunker construction in Kuantan Airbase (KAB) has chosen as case study for this research. While data required for this case study was generated from site survey, interview segment and construction cost comparison of pre-fabrication with conventional bunker construction. The findings showed that none of defense bunkers were fully complied with specifications. Majority of respondents agreed that current construction method caused several problems to RMAF and PWD. Pre-fabrication method was foresees contributed solutions to overcome current problems and furthermore this study identified that pre-fabrication is cost effectiveness for implementation. Recommendations suggested to improve current construction caused problems on site by imposing clear delegations and responsibilities for stakeholders whereas encourage cost information transparency provided by PWD.

The primary aim and objectives of this study has been accomplished successfully in which the findings have eliminated uncertainties and arguments on pre-fabrication method cost effectiveness. Majority of respondents gave a feedback that pre-fabricated bunkers implementation are possibility for mass implementation of pre-fabricated bunkers in 10<sup>th</sup> Malaysian Plan in all RMAF Bases. This action will save financial of RMAF defense.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	TITLE PAGE	i
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATION	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
	ABSTRAK	v
	ABSTRACT	vii
	TABLE OF CONTENT	ix
	LIST OF TABLES	xv
	LIST OF FIGURES	xix
	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxi
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xxiii
<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	
	1.1 Introduction	1
	1.2 Research Background	3
	1.3 Research Problem Statement	4
	1.4 Aim and Objectives of Research	6
	1.5 Scope of Research	6
	1.6 Importance of Research	7

1.7	Brief Research Methodology	7
1.8	Expected Findings	8
<b>2</b>	<b>PRE-FABRICATION CONSTRUCTION METHOD</b>	
2.1	Introduction	9
2.2	Malaysian Construction Industrialization	12
2.2.1	Conventional Construction Method	13
2.2.2	Cast In-situ Construction Method	14
2.2.3	Pre-fabrication Construction Method	15
2.2.3.1	Industrialized Building System (IBS)	16
2.2.3.2	IBS Classification	19
2.2.3.3	Comparison of IBS Classification	20
2.2.3.4	IBS Groups	22
2.2.3.5	Modular Coordination System	24
2.3	Advantages of Using Pre-fabrication Method	25
2.4	Cost Effectiveness Using Pre-fabricated Construction Method	26
2.4.1	Effectiveness in Protecting RMAF Safety and Security	28
2.4.2	Effectiveness in Construction Cost	29
2.4.3	Effectiveness in Time of Completion	31
2.4.4	Effectiveness in Quality of Construction	32
2.4.5	Effectiveness in Labor Requirement	33
2.5	Building Elemental Cost Comparison	34
2.5.1	Building Design Information	35
2.5.2	Building Cost Information	36
2.5.3	Cost Comparison	36
2.6	Failure of Using Pre-fabricated Method	37



<b>3</b>	<b>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>	
3.1	Introduction	40
3.2	Case Study of Kuantan Air Base	42
3.2.1	Site Survey	43
3.2.2	Interview Segment	43
3.2.3	Construction Cost Comparison	45
3.3	Expected Result	46
<b>4</b>	<b>DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS</b>	
4.1	Introduction	48
4.2	Phase I – Site Survey	50
4.2.1	Structural Elements and Physical Appearance Comparison	50
4.2.2	Analysis of Structural Elements Dimensions and Physical Appearance	51
4.3	Phase II – Interview Segment	58
4.3.1	Analysis of Respondents Background Information	59
4.3.1.1	Distribution of Respondents by Position/ Appointment	60
4.3.1.2	Distribution of Respondents by Rank/ Grade	61
4.3.1.3	Distribution of Respondents by Field of Expertise	62
4.3.1.4	Distribution of Respondents by Years of Active Service/ Experience	63
4.3.1.5	Distribution of Respondents by Branch/ Trade	64

4.3.1.6	Distribution of Respondents by Academic Qualification	65
4.3.2	Analysis of Interview Questions	66
4.3.2.1	Responses on Bases' Safety and Security Issue	67
4.3.2.2	Responses on Lengthy Conventional Bunkers Construction Period	71
4.3.2.3	Responses on Negative Impacts Caused by Lengthy Construction Period	73
4.3.2.4	Responses on Current Bunkers Not Complying with Specification	76
4.3.2.5	Responses on Incompetency of Class F Contractors	79
4.3.2.6	Responses on Costly Conventional Bunker Construction Method	81
4.3.2.7	Suggestions to Improve Overall Base's Safety and Security, Duration, Cost and Quality for Current Bunkers Construction	83
4.3.2.8	Responses on Pre-fabrication Implementation to Improve Base's Safety and Security	86
4.3.2.9	Responses on Pre-fabricated Bunkers Require Shorter Construction Period	89
4.3.2.10	Responses on Pre-fabricated Bunkers Promote Better Quality and More Standardized	92

4.3.2.11	Responses on Cost Effectiveness of Pre-fabricated Bunkers Construction	95
4.3.2.12	Responses on Feasibility or Practicality of Pre-fabricated Bunkers Construction	97
4.3.2.13	Additional Suggestion to Improve RMAF Defense Bunker Construction	99
4.4	Phase III – Cost Analysis	102
4.4.1	Elemental Breakdown Cost Analysis for Current Bunkers’ Cost	102
4.4.2	Estimated Cost for Pre-fabricated Bunkers	104
4.4.3	Cost Comparison between Current Bunkers with Pre-fabricated Bunkers	104
4.4.3.1	Identical Elements Cost Analysis	105
4.4.3.2	Cost Comparison between Current Bunkers Construction with Pre- fabricated Bunkers Construction	110
4.5	Conclusion	112
<b>5</b>	<b>FINDING DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	
5.1	Introduction	114
5.2	Finding Discussions	115
5.2.1	Findings Discussions for Faultiness Identification	116
5.2.2	Findings Discussions on Construction Problems Identification	119
5.2.3	Findings Discussions on Pre-fabricated Bunkers Cost Effectiveness Identification	123
5.3	Recommendations for Research Problems	126

	5.3.1	Recommendations for Clear Delegations and Responsibilities	126
	5.3.2	Recommendations for Transparency in Cost Information	130
	5.4	Conclusion	131
<b>6</b>		<b>CONCLUSION</b>	
	6.1	Introduction	133
	6.2	Summary of Research	134
	6.2.1	Summary for Research Objective 1	134
	6.2.2	Summary for Research Objective 2	135
	6.2.3	Summary for Research Objective 3	136
	6.2.4	Summary for Research Aim	136
	6.3	Recommendations for Future Research	137
	6.3.1	Identify Defense Bunkers Strength Faultiness	137
	6.3.2	Identify Resources and Duration Cost Effectiveness	140
	6.4	Conclusion	141
		<b>REFERENCES</b>	143
		<b>APPENDICES</b>	147

## LIST OF TABLE

<b>TABLE NO.</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Table 2.1	The Ontology of IBS Building System (Part 1)	17
Table 2.1	The Ontology of IBS Building System (Part 2)	18
Table 2.2	Characteristics of IBS Building System (Part 1)	18
Table 2.2	Characteristics of IBS Building System (Part 2)	19
Table 2.3	Comparison of IBS Classification (Part 1)	20
Table 2.3	Comparison of IBS Classification (Part 2)	21
Table 4.1	RMAF Specifications and Completed Bunkers Comparison	51
Table 4.2	Bunkers' Slab Roof Dimensions Compliance Percentage	52
Table 4.3	Bunkers' Wall Dimensions Compliance Percentage	52
Table 4.4	Bunkers' Weapon Countertop Dimensions Compliance Percentage	53
Table 4.5	Bunkers' Metal Door Dimensions Compliance Percentage	53
Table 4.6	Bunkers' Metal Window Dimensions Compliance Percentage	54

Table 4.7	Bunkers' Ventilation Openings	
	Compliance Percentage	54
Table 4.8	Bunkers' Firing Hole I Dimensions	
	Compliance Percentage	55
Table 4.9	Bunkers' Firing Hole II Dimensions	
	Compliance Percentage	55
Table 4.10	Bunkers' Raised Floor Dimension	
	Compliance Percentage	56
Table 4.11	Bunkers with Roof Turfing	
	Compliance Percentage	56
Table 4.12	Bunkers with Earth Barrier	
	Compliance Percentage	57
Table 4.13	Bunkers with Earth Barrier	
	Compliance Percentage	57
Table 4.14	Overall Bunkers Compliance Percentage	58
Table 4.15	Position/ Appointment Distribution	60
Table 4.16	Rank/ Grade Distribution	61
Table 4.17	Field of Expertise Distribution	62
Table 4.18	Years of Active Service/ Experience Distribution	63
Table 4.19	Branch or Trade Distribution	64
Table 4.20	Academic Qualification Distribution	65
Table 4.21	Negative Responses for Question 1	68
Table 4.22	Positive Responses for Question 1 (Part 1)	68
Table 4.22	Positive Responses for Question 1 (Part 2)	69
Table 4.23	Percentage of Responses for Question 1	69
Table 4.24	Positive Responses for Question 2 (Part 1)	71
Table 4.24	Positive Responses for Question 2 (Part 2)	72
Table 4.25	Percentage of Responses for Question 2	72
Table 4.26	Positive Responses for Question 3	74
Table 4.27	Negative Responses for Question 3	75

Table 4.28	Percentage of Responses for Question 3	75
Table 4.29	Positive Responses for Question 4	77
Table 4.30	Negative Responses for Question 4	77
Table 4.31	Percentage of Responses for Question 4	77
Table 4.32	Positive Responses for Question 5	79
Table 4.33	Negative Responses for Question 5	79
Table 4.34	Percentage of Responses for Question 5	80
Table 4.35	Positive Responses for Question 6	81
Table 4.36	Negative Responses for Question 6	82
Table 4.37	Percentage of Responses for Question 6	82
Table 4.38	Suggestions for Question 7	84
Table 4.39	Percentage of Suggestions for Question 7	85
Table 4.40	Positive Responses for Question 8 (Part 1)	87
Table 4.40	Positive Responses for Question 8 (Part 2)	88
Table 4.41	Percentage of Responses for Question 8	88
Table 4.42	Positive Responses for Question 9	90
Table 4.43	Percentage of Responses for Question 9	91
Table 4.44	Positive Responses for Question 10	93
Table 4.45	Percentage of Responses for Question 10	93
Table 4.46	Positive Responses for Question 11 (Part 1)	95
Table 4.46	Positive Responses for Question 11 (Part 2)	95
Table 4.47	Percentage of Responses for Question 11	95
Table 4.48	Positive Responses for Question 12	98
Table 4.49	Percentage of Responses for Question 12	98
Table 4.50	Suggestions for Question 13	100
Table 4.51	Percentage of Identical Suggestion Categorization for Question 13	101
Table 4.52	Project Information and Cost for Completed Bunkers in KAB	103
Table 4.53	Additional Cost for Bunker A1 Rectification	106
Table 4.54	Additional Cost for Bunker A2 Rectification	106

Table 4.55	Additional Cost for Bunker A3 Rectification	107
Table 4.56	Additional Cost for Bunker A4 Rectification	107
Table 4.57	Additional Cost for Bunker A5 Rectification	108
Table 4.58	Additional Cost for Bunker B1 Rectification	108
Table 4.59	Additional Cost for Bunker B2 Rectification	109
Table 4.60	Additional Cost for Bunker B3 Rectification	109
Table 4.61	Additional and Omission Cost for Bunker B4 Rectification	110
Table 4.62	Cost Comparison between Conventional with Pre-fabricated Bunkers	111
Table 5.1	Rectification Cost and Actual Construction Cost for Current Bunkers	124
Table 5.2	Comparison of Actual Construction Cost With Precast Costing	124



## LIST OF FIGURE

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Figure 2.1	Pre-fabricated Houses for Defense Designed by US	10
Figure 2.2	IBS Classification	19
Figure 3.1	Research Methodology Flow Chart	41
Figure 4.1	Rank/ Grade Distribution Percentage	61
Figure 4.2	Field of Expertise Distribution Percentage	62
Figure 4.3	Year of Active Service/ Experience Distribution Percentage	63
Figure 4.4	Branch or Trade Distribution Percentage	64
Figure 4.5	Academic Qualification Distribution Percentage	65
Figure 5.1	Bunkers' Faultiness Categorization	117
Figure 5.2	Percentage of Bunkers Faultiness	118
Figure 5.3	Problems and Problem's Root Causes Caused by Conventional Construction Method	120
Figure 5.4	Percentage of Responses on Problems Caused by Conventional Construction Method	121
Figure 5.5	Percentage of Responses on Advantages of Pre-fabrication Method Implementation	121
Figure 5.6	Advantages of Prefabricated Bunkers Construction Implementation	122

Figure 5.7	Cost Reduction Using Ezidek and Eastern Pretech Pre-fabricated Bunkers for Bunkers Sector A and Sector B	125
Figure 5.8	Clear Delegations and Responsibilities of Stakeholders	129
Figure 6.1	Additional Testing and Assessments for Site Survey	140

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Brig Gen	Brigadier General
Capt	Captain
CCD	Camouflage, Concealment and Decoy
CDD	Chief Deputy Director (PWD)
CIDB	Construction Industry Development Board
CMU	Concrete Masonry Units
C/ NC	Compliance/ Non- Compliance
Col	Colonel
DP&D	Department of Planning and Development
EXO	Executive Officer
IBS	Industrialize Building System
ID	Identification
KAB	Kuantan Air Base
Maj	Major
MC	Modular Coordination
MMC	Modern Method Construction
NBCR	Nuclear, Biological, Chemical, and Radiology
OPP	Outline Perspective Plan
PWD	Public Work Department
QA	Quality Assurance
QC	Quality Check

QS	Quantity Surveyor
RMAF	Royal Malaysian Air Force
Sect A	Sector Alpha
Sect B	Sector Bravo
SO 1	Staff Officer 1
SO 2	Staff Officer 2
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
A	Elemental Breakdown Structure Cost Analysis	147
B	RMAF Defense Bunkers Construction Drawing	158
C	Interview Questions	163
D	Current Bunkers Construction Cost Quotation Bills	169
E	Application for Pre-fabricated Bunkers Costing from Local Precast Manufacturer	180
F	Pre-fabricated Bunkers Cost Estimating by Local Precast Manufacturer	187
G	Location Plans for Existing Constructed Defense Bunkers in Sector A and Sector B Kuantan Air Base	190

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Introduction**

Ground defense is part of defense plan for every Royal Malaysian Air Force (RMAF) bases. In conjunction with the enhancement of RMAF base ground base defense program, a series of study, planning, design and review has been conducted by RMAF Department of Planning and Development (DP&P) and its' selected project team. A complete RMAF ground defense program proposal had been delivered to the highest-level management of RMAF for their consent and approval. Among all the elements in the proposal, one of the important supporting elements is ground defense bunker.

A great numbers of standardized bunkers will be built throughout all the RMAF bases in Malaysia for the next Tenth Malaysian Plan. However, before the mass implementation of bunkers construction in all the RMAF bases, Kuantan AirBase (KAB) has been selected as the very first base to be equipped with these

bunkers. These bunkers are in the budget of Ninth Malaysian Plan. These pilot bunkers are purposely for design review and feasibility study of the future new designed bunker.

After two consecutive years of the construction of nine (09) bunkers in KAB, project design team assigned faced the same repetitive problems such as unstable yearly costing of bunker construction and no construction standardization in size and other specifications due to the lack of engineering knowledge and incompetency of Class-F contractors selected by Department of Public Work (PWD).

Furthermore, lack of influential power in contract awarding process and payment process by RMAF personnel has made it even more difficult to select capable contractor and reduce unnecessary cost incurred during construction. While contractor usually tries to gain as much profit as they can and tend to use sub-standard or low quality materials throughout the construction process. RMAF design team in fact generalize this problem after found out that all the contractors were using bricks to assemble the bunker's ventilation part, instead of using reinforcement concrete as what stated in method of construction.

Additional, by selecting any random contractor to work inside the base potentially offer a treat to base in term of information leakage, sabotage, and espionage, during period of On-site construction activities. Therefore, more work forces from military have to assign to project site to monitor movement of contractors.

## 1.2 Research Background

Issues of construction cost and specification standardization has raised the main concerns of the design team to find a better execution plan to mitigate the existing problems of bunkers development plan. Moreover, potential safety and security issue also have to take into consideration while implementing the plan.

Design team has to propose the alternative solutions and usage of pre-fabrication construction method could be one of the alternatives beside conventional construction method. Comparisons in term of cost effectiveness and specification standardization are needed in order to justify which alternatives are more reliable.

Prefabrication construction has the advantage of rapid erection and a fast onsite construction, and the elements are produced in factories, which secures good quality. But requires a detailed design and connection details are complicated. In the respect of generation of construction waste, a research conducted (Tam et. Al, 2004) had proved that prefabrication construction tends to produce less wastage than conventional construction.

In the RMAF, conventional construction method is the only implementation for the development of all type construction projects, even though issues of inadequate contractors, slow productivity, traditional and costly construction method is still repeating. However, determination to resolve and improve the current problematic situation, RMAF will be adapting contemporary construction method such as pre-fabrication system for the beneficial of RMAF organization.



## REFERENCES

- Abdul Kadir, M.R., Lee, W.P., Jaafar, M.S., Sapuan, S.M., Ali, A.A.A., (2006). Construction performance comparison between conventional and industrialised building systems in Malaysia: *Structural Survey*, Vol24,pp412-424
- Abdullah, M.R., Kamar, K.A., Nawawi, M.N., Haron, A.T. and Arif, M. (7-9 September 2009). *Industrialised Building System: A Definition And Concept*. Paper Proceedings In Arcom Conference 2009, Nottingham, United Kingdom
- Anderson, R. (Winter 2009). *USA/USSR: Architecture and War*. Inc. and Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Grey Room 34, pp. 80–103.
- Andres, C. K., and Smith, R. C. (1998). *Principal and Practices of Heavy Construction*. 5th Edition. New York, Prentice Hall.
- Ashworth, A. (1994). *Cost Studies of Buildings*, 2nd Edition.
- Badir, Y. F., M. R. A. Kadir., and A. A. A. Ali. (Oct 1998). *Theory of Classification and Badir-Razali Building Systems Classification*. Buletin Bulanan IJM, JURUTERA: pp.50-56.
- Bouwcentrum PRC. (1995). *A Comparison of International Building Costs Comparisons; A Guide into the “Jungle” of Costs and Price-comparing Studies for The Nertherlands, Belgium, UK, France and Germany, Bodegraven, The*

*Netherlands*. An Extensive Summary Of The Report Is Available In English And German -37 Pages.

Din, H. (1994). *Industrialised Building and its Application in Malaysia* , Journal of Ministry of Housing and Local *Government*, Malaysia, Vol. 1, p.p 5-10

Dr. Fadhil, C.W., (2005). *Realising The Industrialisation Of Malaysian Construction Industry: Construction It Perspective*. IBS Digest (July – Sept 2005)

Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department. *The Third Outline Perspective Plan 2001-2010*. <http://www.epu.jpm.my>.

Elias, I., (2000). *Industrialised Building System for Housing in Malaysia*. The 6th Asia-Pasific Science and Technolog Management Seminar, Vietnam.

*Field Manual No. 20-3.*, (August 1999). Headquarters Department of the Army, Washington, DC, 30

Haron,N.A., Hassim, S., M. R. A. Kadir and Jaafar, M.S. (Dis 2005). *Building Cost Comparison Between Conventional And Formwork System*. Jurnal Teknologi, Vol.43(B): pp.1-11

Haron, N.Z., Ir. Hassim, S., Assoc. Prof. Ir. Dr. Abdul Kadir, M.R., (2005). *Building Cost Comparison Between Conventional And Composite Construction System In Malaysia: A Case Study Of Single Storey House*.

IBS Digest, (Jan-Mac 2005). *IBS Road Map 2003-2010*. <http://ibscentre.com.my/v7/pdf/ibsdigest/IBS Digest 1 2005.pdf>

IBS Digest, (01 2008). *Malaysian Government Incentives and Directives*.

IBS Digest (02 /2008). *Weather is unpredictable, but construction shouldn't be – Use IBS*.

- Indra, G. (2005). *A Productivity Comparative Study Between Precast Buildings with Conventional Cast In-situ Buildings*. IBS Digest (Apr – Jun 2005) Malaysia University of Science and Technology.
- Malaysian Standard. (2001). *MS 10064: Part 1 -10: Ninth Malaysian Plan 2006-2010*, (2006). pp 21.36 and 21.37
- Nokomi. ([Jun 1991](#)). *Prefabricated Modular Buildings: Lower Cost, Fewer Headaches*. [Communications News](#), Vol. 28, Iss. 6; pp. 52, 2 pgs.
- Paul, B.M. ([2005](#)). *IBS A Short History*. IBS Digest.
- Poon, C.S., Ann, T.W., Ng, L.H., (2003). Comparison of low-waste building technologies adopted in public and private housing projects in Hong Kong: *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*. Vol10.pp.88-98.
- Schroder, Hannah., (1 Apr. 2010). *Precast All the Way: Building Design & Construction* 50.11 (2009): 119. Academic One File.
- Shaari, S.N. (June 2003). *Dirty, Difficult and Dangerous? Simplify it...Use IBS*. Institution of Engineers Malaysia (IEM). Jurutera Journal.
- Straatman, R., Vambersky, J. N. J. A., (2001). *Precast All the Way: Precast Construction and Environment*. Structural Concrete, Thomas Telford Ltd Vol. 2: Iss2: pp.93-98.
- Tan, E.P. (1997). *Guide to Precast Concrete and Prefabricated Reinforcement for Buildings*. Construction Industry Development Board Report, Malaysia.
- Trikha, D. N. (1999). *Industrialised Building System Prospects in Malaysia*. Proceeding of the World Engineering Congress (WEC). Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Vacharapoom, B., Nashwan, D. (2005). *A Case Study of Artificial Intelligence Planner for Make-to-Order Precast Concrete Production Planning*. ASCE

Zainal, Z. ( June 2007). *Case study as a research method*. Jurnal Kemanusiaan bil.9. Faculty of Management and Human Resource DevelopmentUniversiti Teknologi Malaysia.

Zuhairi, A.H., Mohd, K.G., Hazim, A. R., Kamarul, A. M.,(2007) *IBS: Current Challenges and The Vital Roles of R&D*. IBS Digest (02 /2007), Construction Research Institute of Malaysia (CREAM).