

CODE-ACCORD: A Corpus of Building Regulatory Data for Rule Generation towards Automatic Compliance Checking

Hansi Hettiarachchi^{1,†,*}, Amna Dridi^{2,†}, Mohamed Medhat Gaber², Pouyan Parsafard², Nicoleta Bocaneala², Katja Breitenfelder³, Gonçal Costa⁴, Maria Hedblom⁵, Mihaela Juganaru-Mathieu⁶, Thamer Mecharnia⁷, Sumeer Park³, He Tan⁵, Abdel-Rahman H. Tawil², and Edlira Vakaj²

¹Faculty of Science and Technology, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4WA, UK

²Faculty of Computing, Engineering and Built Environment, Birmingham City University, Birmingham B4 7XG, UK

³Fraunhofer Institute for Building Physics IBP, Department Indoor Climate and Climatic Impacts, Fraunhofer Str. 10, 83626 Valley, Germany

⁴Human Environment Research (HER), La Salle, Ramon Llull University, Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain

⁵Department of Computing, School of Engineering, Jönköping University, Box 1026, 551 11, Jönköping, Sweden

⁶Mines Saint-Etienne, Institut Henri Fayol, Département ISI, F - 42023, Saint-Etienne, France

⁷Université de Lorraine, CNRS, LORIA, 54506, Vandœuvre-lès-Nancy, France

*corresponding author(s): Hansi Hettiarachchi (h.hettiarachchi@lancaster.ac.uk)

†these authors contributed equally to this work

ABSTRACT

Automatic Compliance Checking (ACC) within the Architecture, Engineering, and Construction (AEC) sector necessitates automating the interpretation of building regulations to achieve its full potential. Converting textual rules into machine-readable formats is challenging due to the complexities of natural language and the scarcity of resources for advanced Machine Learning (ML). Addressing these challenges, we introduce CODE-ACCORD, a dataset of 862 sentences from the building regulations of England and Finland. Only the self-contained sentences, which express complete rules without needing additional context, were considered as they are essential for ACC. Each sentence was manually annotated with entities and relations by a team of 12 annotators to facilitate machine-readable rule generation, followed by careful curation to ensure accuracy. The final dataset comprises 4,297 entities and 4,329 relations across various categories, serving as a robust ground truth. CODE-ACCORD supports a range of ML and Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks, including text classification, entity recognition, and relation extraction. It enables applying recent trends, such as deep neural networks and large language models, to ACC.

Background & Summary

Building codes establish regulations and standards dictating the minimum safety and welfare requirements for buildings and structures. Compliance with these codes throughout a building’s lifecycle, including design, construction, and renovation/demolition, is essential to guarantee the stability, safety, usability and reliability of building designs. Although compliance checks have traditionally been conducted manually, there is now a growing motivation to automate this process due to the significant time and human resources demanded by the manual approach^{1,2}. Since building codes are initially written in text, as the first step, their underlying information needs to be extracted and converted into machine-readable formats to enable Automated Compliance Checking (ACC) via an intelligent approach³. However, extracting information from text has been a challenge due to the complexities associated with natural language, especially due to the unstructured nature and the human-centred design^{4,5}.

There are two fundamental types of information found in the text: (1) entities (also referred to as named entities) and (2) relations, which are crucial for comprehending the ideas conveyed in natural language⁶. An entity is a specific piece of information or a concept that can be categorised, or simply, anything that can be referred to using a proper name⁶. For example, given the sentence “A fire door must be self-closing.”, “fire door” and “self-closing” describe entities. A relation is a semantic connection/association between an entity pair⁶. For example, there is a “necessity” relation between the entities “fire door” and “self-closing” in the above sentence. Altogether, entities and relations form a network/knowledge graph which represents the rule(s) expressed in the text.

In early work within the AEC sector, rule-based methods were commonly used for entity extraction from regulatory texts⁷⁻¹⁰. However, these methods lacked generalisability across different domains since most rules are specific to a particular domain¹¹. Also, writing rules require intensive manual efforts, which are time-consuming and error-prone and demand extensive domain expertise. Due to these limitations, the focus has recently shifted towards developing supervised learning-based approaches. Deep learning techniques have shown great promise for extracting entities from regulatory texts, aligning with the recent trends in natural language processing (NLP)^{12,13}. Various architectures such as Bidirectional Long Short-Term Memory (Bi-LSTM), Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) and transformers have been adopted for entity extraction^{3,11,14,15}.

Similar to the trend in entity extraction, most of the approaches for relation extraction have mainly relied on rule-based methods. Both semantic and syntactic features have been used popularly for rule formalisation, considering the complexities associated⁷⁻⁹. However, the high domain dependence of these rules has mostly limited their application to identifying comparative and quantitative relations within specific domains. Syntactic parsing, which analyses text structure, is another widely used method for relation extraction^{3,16}. However, this approach also has limited expandability due to the need for domain-specific context-free grammars (CFGs). Following these limitations, recent research within AEC showed a tendency towards supervised learning-based approaches, with a focus on deep learning¹⁷, reflecting recent trends in NLP^{18,19}. However, this shift still seems to be in its early stages, as evidenced by the limited applications reported in the literature.

Annotated data that covers both entities and relations in building regulatory texts is essential to support the current trend in AEC research towards supervised learning approaches to extract information from text. Strengthening these supervised methods is also crucial for facilitating effective ACC, given the expandability issues of rule-based approaches, which limit their widespread application. However, to the best of our knowledge, there are no readily available datasets within the AEC sector that support comprehensive information extraction from regulatory texts, covering both entities and relations. We develop CODE-ACCORD to fulfil this limitation, empowering the capacity to involve recent trends in NLP to advance the ACC processes.

In summary, the CODE-ACCORD corpus comprises 862 self-contained sentences extracted from the building regulations of England and Finland. A self-contained sentence is defined as a regulatory sentence that expresses a rule and contains all the details itself without any linguistic co-references that are unresolvable within the sentence, references to external sources or incomplete/ambiguous concepts. Such sentences are essential for ACC as they express rules that can be directly extracted and interpreted without extensive cross-referencing or additional context. Each sentence was manually annotated for entities and relations, with subsequent rounds of curation to ensure accuracy. Overall, CODE-ACCORD contains 4,297 annotated entities distributed across four categories and 4,329 relations distributed across ten categories.

Methods

The development of the CODE-ACCORD corpus involved two main stages: (1) data collection and (2) data annotation. Initially, sentences were carefully extracted, and then, they underwent a thorough annotation process, resulting in the final dataset.

Data Collection Methodology

Our data collection approach mainly focused on extracting sentences that describe rules from building regulatory data to support our ultimate goal of creating a dataset that enables the automatic generation of machine-readable rules.

Data Sources

CODE-ACCORD utilised the published building regulations of England¹ and Finland² as its primary/raw data sources. The English translation of the Finnish National Building Code was used as this work aimed to build a corpus in English. England's building regulations included the guidelines and standards that dictate the construction and maintenance of buildings in England. These regulations were designed to ensure the safety, health, and welfare of people in and around buildings, as well as to conserve fuel and power in these structures. They cover various aspects of building construction, including structural integrity, fire safety, accessibility, energy efficiency, and more. These regulations are organised into different chapters or sections, each of which addresses a specific domain or aspect of construction, such as Part A: Structure, Part B: Fire Safety, Part K: Protection from Falling and Part L: Conservation of Fuel and Power. Finland's building regulations are similar to England's regulations in terms of their purpose but may have variations in specific requirements to suit the local context. They are issued as official government decrees organised into sections or chapters, such as Accessibility, Fire Safety and Energy Efficiency, each addressing specific domains or functional requirements. These regulations mainly guide the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of buildings to meet the country's standards for safety and environmental considerations.

¹England's building codes were collected from the official website of [UK Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government](#)

²Finland's building codes were collected from the official website of [National Building Code of Finland from the Ministry of Environment](#)

In both England and Finland, building regulations are published in PDF documents which are available online to the public. There is a combined total of 33 documents, consisting of 23 documents for English regulations, which span 1548 pages, and 10 documents for Finnish regulations, covering 140 pages. Table 1 presents the statistical overview of the data sources encompassing both English and Finnish regulations.

Table 1. Description and Statistics of CODE-ACCORD data sources

Regulations	Approved Document/Decree	#Volumes	#Pages
England	A: Structure	1	54
	B: Fire Safety	2	384
	C: Site preparation and resistance to contaminants and moisture	1	52
	D: Toxic Substances	1	10
	E: Resistance to Sound	1	86
	F: Ventilation	2	110
	G: sanitation, hot water safety and water efficiency	1	55
	H: drainage and waste disposal	1	64
	J: Combustion appliances and fuel storage systems	1	89
	K: Protection from falling, collision and impact	1	68
	L: Conservation of fuel and power	2	220
	M: Access to and use of buildings	2	143
	O: Overheating	1	44
	P: Electrical safety	1	22
	Q: Security in dwellings	1	20
	R: Infrastructure for electronic communications	2	56
	S: Infrastructure for charging electric vehicles	1	47
Material and workmanship: Approved Document 7	1	24	
Finland	Accessibility	1	6
	Fire Safety	1	25
	Energy Efficiency	1	18
	Planning and Supervision	1	7
	Strength and Stability of Structures	1	55
	Safety of Use	1	9
	Health (Indoor Climate; Water and sewerage; and Humidity)	3	16
	Acoustic Environment	1	4
Total		33	1688

Sentence Collection and Processing

We processed the data from the sources mentioned above to create our initial regulatory sentence collection, following the methodology illustrated in Figure 1. Initially, all PDF documents sourced from both English and Finnish data repositories were converted into plain text. Following this, a semi-automated process was applied to filter regulatory sentences. During the filtering, we particularly focused on data that encompasses quantitative, subjective, and deontic requirements, essential for rule identification. Afterwards, the extracted sentences were manually filtered to select self-contained sentences that clearly expressed rules without relying on preceding or subsequent sentences. Each of the steps is further described below.

Document Processing: This step consists of (i) extracting the textual data from the original PDF format using the PDFMiner³ library, (ii) parsing the digital regulatory documents by performing actions like de-hyphenation, removing line breaks and footnotes, and (iii) removing the non-convertible tables and figures, and unnecessary sections.

Sentence Splitting: This step consists of splitting the regulatory text into single sentences with punctuation marks indicating the sentence boundaries, with a specific sentence splitting that can handle sentences expressing rules, which often include a period.

Sentence Filtering: This step initially involved an automatic filtering process to select sentences that pertain to regulations based on three distinct features.

³PDFMiner documentation is available at <https://pypi.org/project/pdfminer/>




Figure 1. The Semi-Automatic CODE-ACCORD Data Preparation Methodology

- **Quantitative requirements** refer to specific stipulations that can be expressed numerically or with quantitative terms. These requirements often specify precise values, measurements, or numerical criteria that must be met to ensure compliance with the regulations. Examples of quantitative requirements may include keywords such as “less than”, “greater than”, “equal”, “at least”, “higher than”, “more than”, “lower than”, followed by numerical values or thresholds. The quantitative requirements are considered since they are mostly used in building codes for describing requirements³.
- **Subjective requirements** are stipulations that involve the use of subjective language or expressions. These requirements are not defined by precise numerical values or measurements, but rather by language that conveys recommendations, preferences, or suggestions. Subjective requirements often include terms like “should be”, “recommended”, “preferred” or “advisable”. While subjective in nature, these requirements are important in building regulations as they allow for flexibility and adaptation to different situations while still providing a framework for best practices and quality standards. To the best of our knowledge, existing research in the field of applying NLP for the automation of building regulations has not addressed subjective requirements in their analyses, methodologies, or datasets³.
- **Deontic logic** pertains to the logic that deals with the expression of permissions, obligations, prohibitions, and other normative statements. It is used to represent rules and requirements that are binding or mandatory, such as rules that specify what “must”, “shall”, “could” or “prohibit” within building regulations. Deontic logic plays a crucial role in modelling the normative aspects of these regulations, providing a formal framework to represent and reason about mandatory and discretionary requirements. Similarly to the subjective requirements, deontic logic has not been extensively considered in previous research efforts. This is primarily due to the focus of most research on quantitative requirements, given their higher frequency within building regulations³.

Following the automatic filtering, the next step involved manual curation. Specifically, one of the authors performed the manual removal of false positive sentences to maintain the accuracy of the final filtered sentences.

Sentence Annotation: The final step included manual annotation of filtered sentences to identify self-contained sentences, which are defined as sentences that encompass all necessary details without any linguistic co-references that cannot be resolved within the sentence itself. Moreover, self-contained sentences should not include references to external sources, such as sections, chapters, or documents, and should avoid the inclusion of incomplete or ambiguous concepts. Non-self-contained sentences were excluded from the final regulatory sentence collection.

Sentence Statistics

After applying the semi-automatic data collection methodology to the selected data sources, we obtained some noteworthy statistics summarised in Table 2. The total number of sentences was 20,674, out of which 5,043 were subjected to auto-filtering for capturing regulatory sentences, representing 24% of the total sentences in the building regulations textual content. Interestingly, the semi-filtered sentences were significantly higher in number compared to the auto-filtered sentences, especially for the Finnish regulations. This discrepancy can be attributed to the nature of the auto-filtering process, which utilised periods as separators. The choice of using periods was justified by the fact that full rules are typically separated by periods. However,

this strategy had an unintended consequence. It grouped together sections, subsection headers, and introductory sentences that often contain colons and semi-colons, resulting in incomplete sentences. In response to this, manual tweaking was carried out during the sentence filtering step to carefully separate these sections, subsections, and introductory sentences into independent sentences. This adjustment was essential to ensure the accuracy and comprehensibility of the dataset for further analysis and processing for the manual annotation task, described in the next section.

Table 2. Statistics of the outputs of CODE-ACCORD semi-automatic data preparation methodology

Regulations	#Sentences	#Auto-filtered Sentences	#Semi-filtered Sentences	#Self-contained Sentences
England	19201	4219	3695 ⁴	963
Finland	1473	824	1391	283
Total	20674	5043	5086	1246

Data Annotation Methodology

In data annotation, we primarily focused on extracting information from text to facilitate automatic rule generation. There are two key types of information found in the text: named entities and relations, which are essential for comprehending the ideas conveyed in natural language⁶. Hence, our primary focus in this work was on annotating entities and relations.

For CODE-ACCORD manual annotations, we used a group of 12 annotators with either a computer science or a civil engineering/construction background. Since this work targets the automation of compliance checking using machine learning concepts, we believe it is important to involve experts from both areas in the annotation process. To collect human annotations, we used the LightTag text annotation platform²⁰, considering its coverage of different text annotations, including entities and relations, project management support and user-friendly interfaces. We provide an overview of our annotation methodology, highlighting the key concepts below. More detailed information is available in our comprehensive annotation manual⁵.

Entity Annotation

By named entity/entity, we refer to a specific piece of information or a concept that can be categorised. Simply, named entities are anything that can be referred to using a proper name⁶.

Entity Categories: Following the idea proposed in^{3,11}, we picked four named entity categories, described in Table 3, for entity annotation. However, deviating from previous work, we adopted a simple category structure, mainly aiming at the generalisability of our annotation approach across different subdomains, such as structure, fire safety and accessibility, when defining the named entities. Also, we considered the coverage of all information in a regulatory sentence.

Table 3. Entity categories

Named Entity	Description
object	An ontological concept which represents a thing that is subject to a particular requirement (e.g. window, fire door)
property	Property of an object (e.g., width, height)
quality	Quality or uncountable characteristic of an object/property (e.g. horizontal, self-closing)
value	A standard or a numerical value that defines a quantity (e.g. 1,500 millimetres, five per cent)

Annotation Process: The entity annotation process mainly consisted of two steps: (1) mark entity text spans and (2) assign entity categories. A few annotated samples are shown in Table 4. As can be seen, the selected categories are versatile enough to capture all entities in different sentence structures. Also, these samples are from Accessibility and Fire Safety regulations to indicate the general applicability of our annotation strategy in different subdomains.

Relation Annotation

Relations are semantic connections/associations among entities in the text⁶. Extraction of relations together with entities is a crucial process to transform information embedded in unstructured texts into structured data formats such as knowledge graphs.

⁴Documents C, D, H and J were not considered in the manual curation step.

⁵Our annotation manual is available at https://github.com/accord-project/CODE-ACCORD/blob/main/annotated_data/Annotation_Strategy_V1.0.0.pdf.

Table 4. Sample named entity annotations

Sentence	Annotated Sentence
The gradient of the passageway located in an outdoor space may not exceed five per cent.	The <property>gradient</property> of the <object>passageway</object> located in an <object>outdoor space</object> may not exceed <value>five per cent</value>.
There shall be a horizontal landing with a length of at least 1,500 millimetres at the lower and upper end of the ramp.	There shall be a <quality>horizontal</quality> <object>landing</object> with a <property>length</property> of at least <value>1,500 millimetres</value> at the <property>lower and upper end</property> of the <object>ramp</object>.
A fire door must be self-closing and self-bolting.	A <object>fire door</object> must be <quality>self-closing</quality> and <quality>self-bolting</quality>.

Relation Categories: Due to the lack of generic, non-domain-specific relation annotation approaches in compliance checking, after carefully analysing the possible relations in the regulatory text, we identified ten relation categories, detailed in Table 5. Similar to our approach in defining entity labels, we mainly focused on the generalisability across different subdomains and coverage of semantic information when identifying the relation categories. The final category, ‘none’, is added considering the potential model requirements for identifying instances without relation between entity pairs.

Table 5. Relation categories


Relation	Description
selection	A limit to the scope of an object/property based on another object or a quality
necessity	A qualitative/subjective/existential necessity of an object/property (e.g., should, should have, shall be, etc.)
part-of	Being a part of an object/property
not-part-of	Not being a part of an object/property
greater	A value that should be greater than to
greater-equal	A value that should be greater than or equal to
equal	A value that should be equal to
less-equal	A value that should be less than or equal to
less	A value that should be less than to
none	No relation

Annotation Process: Overall, the relation annotation process consisted of four steps: (1) mark entity text spans, (2) assign entity categories, (3) identify entity pairs which form relations, and (4) assign relation categories. This task has proven more challenging than entity annotations, primarily due to its multiple intricate steps and the potential for error propagation. However, we instructed the annotators to adhere to the entire flow and extracted entity and relation annotations upon completing the second and fourth steps, allowing them the flexibility to highlight all relevant content simultaneously. Furthermore, this approach enabled them to review the provided annotations by examining the final entity-relation representation. We only applied the manual annotation process targeting the first nine entity categories without the ‘none’ category because once all the available relations are known, the remaining possible entity pairs form the no relations. Table 6 shows a few annotated samples following the complete process.

Table 6. Sample relation annotations


Sentence	Entity Pair	Relation
The gradient of the passageway located in an outdoor space may not exceed five per cent.	The <property>gradient</property> of the <object>passageway</object> located in an outdoor space may not exceed five per cent.	part-of
	The gradient of the <object>passageway</object> located in an <object>outdoor space</object> may not exceed five per cent.	part-of
	The <property>gradient</property> of the passageway located in an outdoor space may not exceed <value>five per cent</value>.	less-equal

Entity-relation representation



There shall be a horizontal landing with a length of at least 1,500 millimetres at the lower and upper end of the ramp.	There shall be a <quality>horizontal</quality> <object>landing</object> with a length of at least 1,500 millimetres at the lower and upper end of the ramp.	selection
	There shall be a horizontal <object>landing</object> with a <property>length</property> of at least 1,500 millimetres at the lower and upper end of the ramp.	part-of
	There shall be a horizontal landing with a <property>length</property> of at least <value>1,500 millimetres</value> at the lower and upper end of the ramp.	greater-equal
	There shall be a horizontal <object>landing</object> with a length of at least 1,500 millimetres at the <property>lower and upper end</property> of the ramp.	necessity
	There shall be a horizontal landing with a length</property> of at least 1,500 millimetres at the <property>lower and upper end</property> of the <object>ramp</object>.	part-of

Entity-relation representation



Data Records

The CODE-ACCORD dataset is available at <https://zenodo.org/records/10210022>²¹. The data repository contains three main folders: *English_Regulations*, *Finnish_Regulations* and *Annotated_Data*. The first two folders include the textual data utilised for sentence collection, and the latter contains the annotated data, as further described below.

Sentence Collection

There are separate data folders, named *English_Regulations* and *Finnish_Regulations* for England’s and Finland’s regulatory text, respectively. Each folder’s hierarchy is structured as follows. Within the main data folder, there are two primary sub-folders. The first sub-folder, *PDF*, contains the original PDF files of the regulations documents. The second sub-folder, *Text and CSV*, is where TXT and CSV versions of the PDF files are stored after undergoing various pre-processing stages. This *Text and CSV* sub-folder consists of eight sub-folders, each corresponding to a specific pre-processing step. They are meticulously organised in sequential order to facilitate systematic data handling. The first sub-folder, *RawTextData*, contains the initial raw text data obtained through PDF-to-text conversion. The subsequent sub-folder, *CleanedData-RawText*, holds the cleaned data derived from the initial raw text. *AllSentences* sub-folder contains all sentences extracted from the cleaned text. Next, *AutoFilteredSentences* comprises sentences that have been automatically filtered, following the specific criteria described in the Data Collection Methodology above. *ManuallyFilteredSentences* contains manually curated sentences to ensure consistency and remove unnecessary content. The *FinalFilteredSentences* sub-folder stores the ultimate raw text of the semi-automatically filtered sentences after eliminating empty lines and redundant information. Moving on, *CSV-FinalFilteredSentences* presents the sentences from the *FinalFilteredSentences* folder in CSV format, preparing the data for the final sub-folder, *Classification* which categorises the sentences as either “*self-contained*” or “*others*”, where only the self-contained sentences were considered for final data annotation. This structured hierarchy streamlines the data processing and analysis of regulations documents, ensuring an organised and efficient workflow.

Annotated Data

A randomly selected 862 sentences out of 1246 self-contained sentences extracted from the building regulations of England and Finland underwent our comprehensive data annotation process, targeting both entities and relations, which are essential for extracting information from text. All annotated data are available in *Annotated_Data* folder. There are two sub-folders named *entities* and *relations* within it, which hold entity-annotated data and relation-annotated data, respectively. Each folder has three CSV files named *all.csv*, *train.csv* and *test.csv*. File *all.csv* contains the full dataset. *train.csv* has 80% of the full dataset, which can be used to train machine learning models, and *test.csv* has the remaining 20%, which can be used for models’ performance testing. All three files within one folder follow the same format. The entity and relation data file formats are further described below.

Entity Data Format

The format of an entity data file available within the *ner* folder is summarised in Table 7. The entity annotations are available in the BIO (Beginning, Inside, Outside) format, which is considered the standard for information extraction tasks²², as shown in the sample in Figure 2. *object* and *quality* tags shown in the figure are two categories of the selected entity categories, which are further described in the Data Annotation Methodology above.

Table 7. Format of entity data file

Attribute	Description
example_id	Unique ID assigned for each sentence
content	Original textual content of the sentence
processed_content	Tokenised (using NLTK’s word_tokenize package) textual content of the sentence
label	Entity labelled sequence in IOB format
metadata	Additional information of sentence (i.e. original approved document from which the sentence is extracted)

Relation Data Format

The format of a relation data file available within the *re* folder is summarised in Table 8. We adopted the following format to tag the entity pair denoting the relationship within a data sample, in accordance with formats utilised in recent studies^{18,23}:




Figure 2. Sample of entity labels in BIO format

The <e1>gradient</e1> of the <e2>passageway</e2> located in an outdoor space may not exceed five per cent.

The special tags <e1> and </e1> represent the start and end of the first entity that appeared in the sentence. Similarly, <e2> and </e2> represent the second entity.

Table 8. Format of relation data file

Attribute	Description
example_id	Unique ID assigned for each sentence
content	Original textual content of the sentence
metadata	Additional information of sentence (i.e. original approved document from which the sentence is extracted)
tagged_sentence	Sentence with tagged entity pair
relation_type	Category of the relation in between the tagged entity pair

Technical Validation

Annotation Quality

We employed several methods to ensure the quality of the annotations. For both entities and relations, we conducted the annotations in rounds. Before moving into the actual rounds, we had two test rounds using a team of two annotators to refine the annotation strategy. Once the strategy was finalised, we had seven rounds for actual annotations. Each sentence was independently annotated by two or three annotators through these rounds.

To measure the quality of annotations, we calculated Inter Annotator Agreements (IAAs) throughout our rounds. As the entity IAA, we used the pairwise relative agreement of entities. The annotator A’s agreement with Annotator B is calculated using Equation 1²⁰. An entity annotated by one annotator is considered a match to an entity by another annotator only if the marked text span and assigned label are equal. Figure 3 summarises the distribution of entity IAA values obtained throughout the annotation rounds. The mean IAA is 0.37, with a maximum of 0.66. The task’s complexities (i.e. two-step annotation process and domain-specific knowledge requirements) and strict matching criteria used during the agreement calculation can be identified as the primary factors contributing to this distribution. However, given the further complexities associated with relation annotations following its four-step process, we limited our IAA calculations only to entities.

$$A's \text{ agreement with } B = \frac{\text{Number of } B's \text{ entities matched with } A's \text{ entities}}{\text{Total entities annotated by } B} \quad (1)$$

Moreover, to enhance the accuracy of the annotations, each annotation round was followed by a curation round to determine the final annotations. Three members from the annotation group joined as data curators, and their curation jobs were assigned without any overlaps with the annotation jobs. During curation, the final annotations for all entities and relations with disagreements between annotators have been decided by the curator, considering the proposed annotations and the overall entity-relation representation of each sentence.

Descriptive Statistics

The statistical analysis of the final annotated dataset is vital for future efforts that will use CODE-ACCORD as a resource for automating the conversion of textual rules into machine-readable formats, facilitating Automated Compliance Checking (ACC).




Figure 3. Distribution of entity IAA values

Entity Statistics: Our final entity annotated dataset contains 862 sentences. It has 4,297 entities distributed over four categories, as shown in Figure 4. The illustrated distribution of the number of entities per sentence in Figure 5 provides a detailed insight into the annotated data. As can be seen, most sentences contain up to five entities. We further analysed the sequence lengths of text spans from each category, and the resulting histograms are presented in Figure 6. Most of the entity spans are composed of one or two words/tokens. However, overall, there are more lengthy text spans under *quality* than in the other categories.




Figure 4. Distribution of entity categories




Figure 5. Distribution of the number of entities per sentence

Relation Statistics: Altogether, we annotated 862 sentences, resulting in 3,329 relations. We automatically identified the unannotated entity pairs within sentences as unrelated entity pairs which belong to the *'none'* category. Out of 8,104 samples categorised as *'none'*, we included a random subset of 1,000 in our final dataset to ensure a balanced distribution with other relations. The breakdown of a total of 4,329 relations across ten categories is depicted in Figure 7. Additionally, Figure 8 illustrates the distribution of the number of relations per sentence. Most sentences contained two or three relations, although a minority had over ten relations.




Figure 6. Sequence length distribution of annotated text spans as entities




Figure 7. Distribution of relation categories




Figure 8. Distribution of the number of relations per sentence

Data Splits


Alongside the complete annotated dataset, CODE-ACCORD offers two data splits: train and test, for each annotation type (i.e. entities and relations). Each train split comprises 80% of the corresponding full dataset and is intended for training machine learning models. The remaining 20% forms the test splits, designed for evaluating model performance. Stratified sampling was used to create these splits, ensuring that the class distribution in each split mirrors that of the original data. Figures 9 and 10 illustrate the distribution of entity and relation categories in the train and test data splits, respectively, demonstrating the consistency of distributions across these splits.

Code availability


CODE-ACCORD GitHub repository is available at <https://github.com/Accord-Project/CODE-ACCORD/>. It consists of intermediate outputs of the data collection methodology, final annotated datasets and Python codes to access the datasets via HuggingFace.

References

1. Fuchs, S. & Amor, R. Natural language processing for building code interpretation: A systematic literature review. In *Proceedings of the Conference CIB W78*, vol. 2021, 11–15 (2021).
2. Zhang, Z., Ma, L. & Nisbet, N. Unpacking ambiguity in building requirements to support automated compliance checking. *J. Manag. Eng.* **39**, 04023033, [10.1061/JMENEA.MEENG-5359](https://doi.org/10.1061/JMENEA.MEENG-5359) (2023). <https://ascelibrary.org/doi/pdf/10.1061/JMENEA.MEENG-5359>.




(a) Train split




(b) Test split

Figure 9. Distribution of the entity categories in train and test data splits



(a) Train split



(b) Test split

Figure 10. Distribution of the relation categories in train and test data splits

- Zhou, Y.-C., Zheng, Z., Lin, J.-R. & Lu, X.-Z. Integrating nlp and context-free grammar for complex rule interpretation towards automated compliance checking. *Comput. Ind.* **142**, [10.1016/j.compind.2022.103746](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2022.103746) (2022).
- Zhang, J. & El-Gohary, N. Extraction of construction regulatory requirements from textual documents using natural language processing techniques. In *Congress on Computing in Civil Engineering, Proceedings*, 453–460, [10.1061/9780784412343.0057](https://doi.org/10.1061/9780784412343.0057) (2012).
- Locatelli, M., Seghezzi, E., Pellegrini, L., Tagliabue, L. C. & Di Giuda, G. M. Exploring natural language processing in construction and integration with building information modeling: A scientometric analysis. *Buildings* **11**, [10.3390/buildings11120583](https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings11120583) (2021).
- Jurafsky, D. & Martin, J. H. *Speech and Language Processing (2Nd Edition)* (Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 2009).
- Zhang, J. & El-Gohary, N. M. Semantic nlp-based information extraction from construction regulatory documents for automated compliance checking. *J. Comput. Civ. Eng.* **30**, 04015014, [10.1061/\(ASCE\)CP.1943-5487.0000346](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CP.1943-5487.0000346) (2016). <https://ascelibrary.org/doi/pdf/10.1061/%28ASCE%29CP.1943-5487.0000346>.
- Zhang, J. & El-Gohary, N. M. Integrating semantic nlp and logic reasoning into a unified system for fully-automated code checking. *Autom. Constr.* **73**, 45–57, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2016.08.027> (2017).
- Zhou, P. & El-Gohary, N. Ontology-based automated information extraction from building energy conservation codes. *Autom. Constr.* **74**, 103–117, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2016.09.004> (2017).

10. Xue, X. & Zhang, J. Building codes part-of-speech tagging performance improvement by error-driven transformational rules. *J. Comput. Civ. Eng.* **34**, 04020035, [10.1061/\(ASCE\)CP.1943-5487.0000917](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CP.1943-5487.0000917) (2020). <https://ascelibrary.org/doi/pdf/10.1061/%28ASCE%29CP.1943-5487.0000917>.
11. Zhang, R. & El-Gohary, N. A deep neural network-based method for deep information extraction using transfer learning strategies to support automated compliance checking. *Autom. Constr.* **132**, 103834, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2021.103834> (2021).
12. Shen, Y. *et al.* Parallel instance query network for named entity recognition. In Muresan, S., Nakov, P. & Villavicencio, A. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 947–961, [10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.67](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.67) (Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland, 2022).
13. Shen, Y. *et al.* DiffusionNER: Boundary diffusion for named entity recognition. In Rogers, A., Boyd-Graber, J. & Okazaki, N. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 3875–3890, [10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.215](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.215) (Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 2023).
14. Wang, X. & El-Gohary, N. *Deep Learning-Based Named Entity Recognition from Construction Safety Regulations for Automated Field Compliance Checking*, 164–171 (2021). <https://ascelibrary.org/doi/pdf/10.1061/9780784483893.021>.
15. Zheng, Z., Lu, X.-Z., Chen, K.-Y., Zhou, Y.-C. & Lin, J.-R. Pretrained domain-specific language model for natural language processing tasks in the aec domain. *Comput. Ind.* **142**, 103733, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2022.103733> (2022).
16. Zheng, Z., Zhou, Y.-C., Lu, X.-Z. & Lin, J.-R. Knowledge-informed semantic alignment and rule interpretation for automated compliance checking. *Autom. Constr.* **142**, 104524, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2022.104524> (2022).
17. Wang, X. & El-Gohary, N. Deep learning-based relation extraction and knowledge graph-based representation of construction safety requirements. *Autom. Constr.* **147**, 104696, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2022.104696> (2023).
18. Plum, A., Ranasinghe, T., Jones, S., Orasan, C. & Mitkov, R. Biographical semi-supervised relation extraction dataset. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '22*, 3121–3130, [10.1145/3477495.3531742](https://doi.org/10.1145/3477495.3531742) (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2022).
19. Yang, S., Choi, M., Cho, Y. & Choo, J. HistRED: A historical document-level relation extraction dataset. In Rogers, A., Boyd-Graber, J. & Okazaki, N. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 3207–3224, [10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.180](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.180) (Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 2023).
20. Perry, T. LightTag: Text annotation platform. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, 20–27 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 2021).
21. Hettiarachchi, H. *et al.* Accord-project/code-accord: v1.0.0 (2023).
22. Ramshaw, L. & Marcus, M. Text chunking using transformation-based learning. In *Third Workshop on Very Large Corpora* (1995).
23. Bastos, A. *et al.* Recon: Relation extraction using knowledge graph context in a graph neural network. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021, WWW '21*, 1673–1685, [10.1145/3442381.3449917](https://doi.org/10.1145/3442381.3449917) (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2021).

Acknowledgements

This work is funded by the European Union’s Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement no 101056973 (ACCORD). UK Participants in Horizon Europe Project [ACCORD] are supported by UKRI grant numbers [10040207] (Cardiff University), [10038999] (Birmingham City University and [10049977] (Building Smart International).

Author contributions statement

H.H.: Conceptualisation, Data preparation, Data annotation methodology, Data annotation, Data curation, Validation, Visualisation, Project administration, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing. A.D.: Conceptualisation, Data preparation methodology, Data preparation, Formal analysis, Data annotation methodology, Data annotation. Data curation, Writing - Original Draft. M.M.G.: Conceptualisation, Data annotation methodology, Supervision, Writing - Review & Editing. P.P.: Data annotation, Data curation, Writing - Review & Editing. N.B.: Data annotation, Writing - Review & Editing. K.B.: Data annotation, Writing - Review & Editing. G.C.: Data annotation, Writing - Review & Editing. M.H.: Data annotation, Writing - Review & Editing. M.J.-M.: Data annotation, Writing - Review & Editing. T.M.: Data annotation, Writing - Review &

Editing. S.P.: Data annotation, Writing - Review & Editing. H.T.: Data annotation, Writing - Review & Editing. A-R.H.T.: Data annotation, Writing - Review & Editing. E.V.: Conceptualisation, Data annotation methodology, Project administration, Funding acquisition, Writing - Review & Editing.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.