

WHITE PAPER

State of Data in the CRE Industry: 2026

What has held, what has moved, and where the practical openings now sit for standards adoption across the building lifecycle.

Building Lifecycle Management Initiative

Executive Summary.....	3
Introduction: Why This Update	4
What Has Remained Stable	4
What Has Moved	5
Recognition became capital allocation.....	5
Semantic standards began to converge	5
Artificial intelligence reached a measured plateau	6
The regulatory forcing function relocated.....	6
Standards and Interoperability: The Adoption Picture.....	7
How to read a standards landscape	7
Semantic building ontologies	8
Real estate data models	8
Delivery-phase and cross-domain standards.....	9
Practical Near-Term Solutions	10
Lifecycle Implications.....	11
Persistent Constraints	12
Conclusion and Outlook.....	13
Works Cited.....	14
About This Paper.....	17
Evidence Base.....	17
Predecessor	17
About BLMI.....	18
Disclaimer	18
AI Use Transparency	18

Executive Summary

In March 2025 the Building Lifecycle Management Initiative (BLMI) published State of Data in the CRE Industry. It described a commercial real estate (CRE) sector whose operating information was scattered across systems that were never designed to exchange it, and it surveyed the remedies then visible. Seventeen months on, the diagnosis holds. What has changed is the practical picture: the industry now has measurements where it had assertions, a shorter and clearer list of data standards that are demonstrably active, and a set of obligations that supply both the deadline and the funding argument for acting.

This update reports what has remained stable, what has moved, and what a practitioner can reasonably do in the next twelve to eighteen months.

Stable. Fragmentation persists across the lifecycle. Legacy systems that predate any expectation of interoperability remain the structural cause. Spreadsheets remain in service for reporting, valuation, and budgeting. The absence of shared formats and definitions continues to make machine-to-machine exchange difficult, and the standards community says so itself.

Moved, and this is the substance of the update. Four shifts matter. Recognition became measurement: 81 percent of surveyed CRE firms now operate three or more systems that are not delivering expected results, and 88 percent have budgeted specifically to replace legacy technology. Semantic standards began to converge, with one ontology formally ceding vocabulary to a former competitor and the principal rival bodies now sharing a neutral governance foundation. Artificial intelligence moved from promise to measured plateau, with adoption near-universal and realized value falling, while practitioners themselves now rank data quality and integration as the leading barrier to scaling it. And the regulatory pressure that organizes building data relocated from corporate sustainability disclosure, which contracted sharply, to building-level compliance and investor requirement, which hardened and began producing published data.

The practical opening. The most useful change since 2025 is that the field of candidate standards has narrowed to a set that can be evaluated on evidence instead of on announcement. Release cadence and named implementers now distinguish the active efforts from the dormant ones. That makes an adoption decision tractable in a way it was not eighteen months ago.

The near-term path this paper sets out is deliberately modest in scope and specific in sequence: establish semantic consistency for one use case instead of launching a portfolio-wide data program, adopt a published ontology with a verifiable release history, let a compliance obligation supply the deadline and the budget, treat the handover from delivery to operations as an information requirement written into contract, and run data quality as a continuous discipline alongside artificial intelligence, not as a gate in front of it.

None of this resolves the discontinuity between how buildings are delivered and how they are operated. That remains the central unfinished work of building lifecycle management, and the standard governing it is now under revision.

Introduction: Why This Update

The Building Lifecycle Management Initiative exists to advance data continuity across the building lifecycle, from design through deconstruction, by synthesizing and advocating for the standards the built environment already has instead of proposing new ones. Its 2025 paper on the state of CRE data was written to establish a shared description of the problem. This update is written to establish a shared description of the opening.

Seventeen months is a short interval for an industry that measures asset life in decades. It is a long interval for data standards, artificial intelligence, and regulation, all three of which moved materially between March 2025 and August 2026. A practitioner working from the 2025 paper would still recognize the problem and would misjudge the remedies, in three specific ways: the list of active standards efforts is shorter than it appeared, the sequencing advice on artificial intelligence was directionally right but unworkable as stated, and the regulatory argument for investment has changed hands.

This paper is organized to serve a decision, not to compile a survey. It reports stability first, because stability is what justifies acting on a plan made earlier. It reports movement second, because movement is what requires the plan to change. It then spends the majority of its length on standards adoption and near-term action, which is where the evidence has become most useful and where the 2025 paper had least to offer.

The underlying evidence base was assembled through a structured research process spanning six independent lines of inquiry, with every source evaluated for authority before use and every material claim traced back to a cited source after drafting. Where the evidence is thin, this paper says so. Figures that could not be substantiated to that standard are not used here.

What Has Remained Stable

Four conditions described in 2025 are unchanged, and their persistence is itself informative. These are not problems awaiting a technology that has not arrived. They are problems whose remedies exist and have not been adopted at scale.

Fragmentation persists, and is now quantified. The 2025 paper described data scattered across spreadsheets, documents, and disparate systems. That description holds. What is new is measurement. A 2025 survey of more than 1,000 senior CRE decision-makers across 16 markets found that 81 percent of firms operate three or more systems that are not generating expected results, and that more than 60 percent must first resolve duplicated or inactive systems before artificial intelligence can be applied usefully. A parallel survey of more than 880 C-suite executives across 13 countries found that 14 percent believe they have well-structured data collection and management processes.[1][2]

A caution belongs with those figures. Both measure system proliferation and process maturity, which sit close to fragmentation without being identical to it. No study yet measures fragmentation directly across a portfolio. The honest position is that the condition is well evidenced by proxy.

Legacy infrastructure remains the structural cause. Systems built for single purposes, in eras with no expectation that they would exchange information, still hold much of the industry's operating data. The

practical form this takes is mundane and expensive: the same physical asset carries a different identifier in each system that touches it, so every integration begins with manual reconciliation. A standards body described exactly this in early 2026, using the example of a pump identifier in one system and an asset tag in another.[3] Professional survey work in 2026 continues to name legacy system compatibility among the barriers that prevent artificial intelligence pilots from reaching production scale.[4]

Spreadsheets remain in service. The 2025 observation that spreadsheets carry reporting, valuation, cash flow analysis, and budgeting has not been contradicted, though it also has not been re-measured within the assessment window. The most recent quantified figure predates the window by several years and is not carried forward here.

Shared formats and definitions are still missing. This is the condition most directly within the reach of the standards work described later in this paper, and it remains unresolved. The clearest evidence is not external criticism but self-description: in 2026 the real estate standards community stated that the industry still lacks a standardized template for financial data exchange and continues to rely on customized, non-comparable formats across portfolios.[3] An industry that cannot agree how to express an operating statement will not agree how to express a building.

What Has Moved

Four shifts separate the 2026 picture from the 2025 one. Each changes what a practitioner should do, not merely what a practitioner should believe.

Recognition became capital allocation

The 2025 paper argued that the industry was beginning to treat fragmentation as a strategic concern rather than an operational nuisance. That argument now rests on spending rather than sentiment. In the 2025 executive survey, 81 percent of respondents named data and technology their leading spending priority for the coming year, and a separate survey found 88 percent allocating budget specifically to upgrade legacy technology.[1][2] Budget is a more reliable signal than stated concern, and it means the internal argument for a data program no longer has to be won from a standing start.

Semantic standards began to converge

This is the most consequential development for the built environment, and the 2025 paper could not have anticipated it. For a decade the building data field has carried several competing vocabularies, each describing equipment, points, and spaces in its own terms. Competing vocabularies are worse than no vocabulary, because they create the appearance of a standard while preserving the translation cost.

Two things changed. First, in June 2026 the Brick ontology published a release candidate that deprecates one of its own classes in favor of the equivalent class from RealEstateCore, and aligned its lighting model with the RealEstateCore working group.[5] Giving up a piece of one's own namespace in favor of a former rival is a materially harder commitment than publishing a translation table, and it is the first concrete evidence of convergence rather than coexistence. Second, in 2025 the Linux Foundation took the

Coalition for Smarter Buildings under neutral governance, with ASHRAE, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Project Haystack, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Brick, RealEstateCore, and LonMark all named as supporting organizations.[6][7] Rival bodies and national laboratories sitting under one governance roof is the structural precondition for convergence, which is not the same as convergence itself, and the distinction is worth holding.

Artificial intelligence reached a measured plateau

The 2025 paper described artificial intelligence as the leading emerging solution and cautioned that its effectiveness depended on the quality of the data beneath it. Both halves have been borne out, in a pattern worth stating precisely.

Adoption intent is now near-universal: 88 percent of investors and 92 percent of occupiers piloting or planning to pilot, against under 5 percent two years earlier, and roughly two-thirds of business leaders and facility management professionals reporting artificial intelligence in facility operations, with predictive maintenance the leading application.[1][8] Realized value moved the other way. In a year-over-year executive panel, respondents reporting transformative impact fell from 12 percent to 1 percent, incremental improvements fell from 24 percent to 7 percent, and those reporting implementation difficulty rose from 16 percent to 27 percent.[2] Two readings are compatible: expectations recalibrated as pilots met production conditions, and a larger, less experienced cohort entered the count.

The finding that matters most for this paper is who now identifies the constraint. In a 2026 survey of 1,020 business leaders and facility management professionals, practitioners ranked data quality and integration issues as the leading barrier to scaling artificial intelligence, ahead of budget, cybersecurity, and expertise.[8] The practitioner community reached the 2025 conclusion independently, which makes it considerably easier to fund the remedy.

One nuance has been added, and it changes the advice rather than the diagnosis. The 2025 formulation held that governance and standards must precede deployment. The 2026 evidence supports a narrower and more executable version: data readiness is not a one-time exercise and can only be assessed against a specific use case, which means a portfolio-wide governance gate in front of all deployment cannot be assessed, sequenced, or completed.[9] The workable formulation establishes semantic consistency and accessibility for each use case and runs quality management continuously through the pipeline. This is treated in the near-term solutions section below.

The regulatory forcing function relocated

The 2025 paper connected data silos to sustainability and environmental, social, and governance (ESG) reporting. That connection holds, but the mechanism has inverted, and any business case built on the 2025 version needs rebuilding.

Corporate disclosure obligation contracted sharply. The European Union's Omnibus I directive, adopted in February 2026, raised Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive thresholds to more than 1,000 employees and more than 450 million euros in turnover, ended the phased rollout, and removed reasonable assurance; an estimated 85 to 90 percent of previously covered entities now fall outside scope, and no sector-specific reporting standard for real estate will be developed.[10][11] The revised

European Sustainability Reporting Standards cut mandatory datapoints by approximately 60 percent.[12] In the United States, the Securities and Exchange Commission proposed full rescission of its 2024 climate disclosure rules in May 2026, and one of the two California climate statutes remains enjoined.[13][14]

Building-level obligation hardened in the same period. New York City published its first Local Law 97 compliance dataset in April 2026: approximately 28,000 buildings filed, representing 93 percent of covered properties, with roughly 1,400 non-filers referred to enforcement.[15] In Europe, the recast Energy Performance of Buildings Directive requires Member States to establish national building energy performance databases and transfer aggregated data annually to a common European template, linking energy performance certificates, cadastre registers, and three-dimensional urban models, and to establish renovation passport schemes delivering passports in machine-readable format.[16][17] Transposition was due in May 2026 and the Commission opened infringement procedures against all 27 Member States in July 2026, so these obligations are legally due and practically absent, which is a timing question and not a cancellation.[18]

Investor requirement moved in the same direction independently of statute. The 2026 GRESB Real Estate Standard moves upfront carbon reporting from portfolio level to asset level with four new fields effective 2027, requires flagging which assets sit inside entity net-zero targets, and reclassifies landlord-controlled tenant-space emissions from Scope 3 into Scopes 1 and 2.[19] A European association for non-listed real estate investors added an asset-level data section with machine-readable labels to its standard data delivery sheet in late 2025.[20] For most portfolios, investor reporting is now the most concrete asset-level data requirement they actually face, and it arrives by contract rather than by law.

The net effect is favorable for building lifecycle management, even though it began as a contraction. Obligation has moved from the corporate consolidated reporting layer to the building and portfolio layer, which is where the industry's data problems have always lived. The compliance conversation and the data continuity conversation are now about the same objects.

Standards and Interoperability: The Adoption Picture

The 2025 paper listed the standards efforts then visible. The most useful service this update can perform is to narrow that list on evidence, because narrowing it is what makes an adoption decision possible.

How to read a standards landscape

One test separates efforts that can be adopted from efforts that cannot: does the body publish dated releases on a regular cadence, and can it name organizations outside itself that have implemented them? Announcements, strategy statements, and prestigious backers are not evidence of either. Across the bodies examined for this update, announcements outnumbered shipped artifacts by a wide margin, and the endorsements that carry the most weight with a CRE audience proved among the least predictive of activity.

The test is not a judgment about intent. It is a practical filter. A standard that ships on a cadence can be planned against. A standard that does not ship cannot be, whatever its merits.

Semantic building ontologies

The Brick ontology is the clearest case of an adoptable standard in this landscape. Its release history runs from version 1.4.0 in April 2025 through a version 1.5.0 release candidate in June 2026, with five intervening point releases, and its consortium publishes a roster of fee-paying full members that includes major controls and equipment manufacturers alongside four university institutional members.[5][21] Its version 1.5.0 release candidate carries the convergence step described earlier. It has also progressively replaced its own quantity definitions with an external vocabulary, which is the same discipline applied outward.

RealEstateCore is the counterpart in that convergence and has obtained third-party validation of its own: its lighting domain extension was tested at an academic testbed in October 2025 with two major lighting manufacturers participating.[22] Validation by a named testbed and named participants outside the issuing consortium is uncommon in this field and is worth weighting. Its release notes carry no dates, which is a provenance weakness in an otherwise credible body.

ASHRAE Standard 223, a semantic data model for analytics and automation applications in buildings, is frequently discussed as though it were settled. It is not. It completed a first public review in the summer of 2025 and had not been published as of August 2026, and community documentation supporting it states plainly that it is neither developed nor endorsed by ASHRAE.[23][24] The accurate position for planning purposes is that 223 is a proposed standard in review.

The relationship among these three is layering, not merger, and this is the point most often misread. Modeling a building with 223 neither requires nor eliminates Brick or RealEstateCore, which sit above it: Brick point classes annotate 223 property instances, and RealEstateCore space types augment 223 physical space.[24] The useful analogy is a building's structural frame and its interior fit-out. The frame is slow to design, formally reviewed, and rarely changed. The fit-out moves faster and adapts to use. Both are necessary, and neither substitutes for the other. An organization can begin at the fit-out layer today and gain the frame later without rework.

Real estate data models

The OSCRE Industry Data Model remains the most complete real estate lifecycle data model available to the industry and the closest thing the sector has to a shared vocabulary for its commercial and operational objects. Two facts bear on adoption planning. Governance changed: operational leadership passed to a facility management association under a managed services agreement effective January 2025, and a February 2026 strategy announcement proposed semantic and synonym-aware layers above the model with a universal chart of accounts as the first initiative, though without a published version, ship date, or released artifact.[3][25][26] Access terms are more specific than the phrase open standards suggests: browsing requires registration, and the model operates under both an end user license and a commercial user license, with commercial users required to contact OSCRE directly, alongside paid implementation support and toolkit subscriptions.[27] For an owner-operator this is a low

barrier. For a software provider, consultancy, or service provider intending to embed the model in a product, it is a license conversation that belongs early in the evaluation rather than late.

The Mortgage Industry Standards Maintenance Organization (MISMO) continues to maintain commercial data exchange standards covering appraisal, financial operating statements, rent roll, and utility data. Its commercial appraisal dataset advanced to candidate recommendation status in March 2025 and added a modern exchange format alongside its original one.[28] Three of the four commercial artifact families do not publish version numbers or release dates, and the organization's principal release in the period does not address commercial or multifamily content.[29][30] For commercial mortgage participants the standards are usable; for the broader lifecycle they are narrow in scope by design.

The International Building Performance and Data Initiative Common Data Model warrants a direct statement, because its stated backing invites confidence that its current state does not support. Its public repository has published no releases in its history, its documentation build is dated January 2023 and covers seven of the thirteen clusters its own description anticipates, and its most recent press and news items date from January 2022 and October 2021 respectively.[31][32] Nothing dated 2025 or 2026 appears in its repository, on its site, or in the public record. Organizations evaluating a common data model should weigh that state directly, and should note that the initiative's most frequently cited adoption evidence refers to decarbonization pathways developed by a separate body rather than to the data model itself.

Delivery-phase and cross-domain standards

For the delivery phases, Industry Foundation Classes remains the schema of record, with version 4.3.2 published in 2024 and designated as an International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standard, and successor work in development.[33] More consequentially for lifecycle continuity, ISO 19650-1, the standard governing information management across delivery and operations, is recorded in the ISO catalog as under revision at draft international standard stage.[34] Widely circulated descriptions of what that revision changes have not been verified against a primary statement and are not repeated here. Establishing the revision's actual scope from the standard itself is a worthwhile task for any organization whose information requirements reference it.

Two adjacent instruments deserve more attention than they receive. ISO 55013, published in 2024, provides guidance on the management of data assets and sits alongside the asset management standards that many owner-operators already use, making it a natural bridge between existing asset management practice and data governance.[35] And the Energy Performance of Buildings Directive's national database requirement, described earlier, is in substance a data standard with a legal deadline: it specifies what building data must exist, in what linkage, and on what reporting rhythm.

Taken together, the adoption picture is better than the 2025 paper could report, and narrower. Fewer efforts are live, but the live ones can be evaluated, planned against, and joined.

Practical Near-Term Solutions

The 2025 paper offered a list of solution categories: centralize data, apply artificial intelligence and automation, use industry data standards, adopt cloud platforms, and train personnel. Those categories remain defensible and are too broad to act on. What follows is narrower, sequenced, and drawn from what the 2026 evidence shows actually moves.

The organizing principle is scope discipline. The most common failure in this domain is not choosing the wrong standard. It is choosing the right standard and attaching it to a program too large to finish. Six actions follow, ordered so that each produces a result that funds the next.

1. Scope the first effort to one use case, not to the portfolio. Data readiness cannot be assessed in the abstract, because readiness is defined relative to what the data will be used for. A portfolio-wide data quality program therefore has no completion criterion and no way to demonstrate progress to the people funding it. Choose one use case with a named owner and a measurable outcome, such as equipment fault detection in one asset class, energy reporting for one compliance obligation, or lease abstraction for one portfolio segment. Establish semantic consistency for the objects that use case touches, and nothing more. The first result is the argument for the second.

2. Adopt a published ontology with a verifiable release history, at the vocabulary layer. Apply the cadence test from the preceding section. Adopt a body that ships on a dated schedule and can name implementers outside itself, and prefer the vocabulary layer over the formal substrate as the entry point, because the vocabulary layer is where releases are currently happening and because it can be adopted without waiting for the substrate beneath it to publish. The convergence now visible between the leading ontologies substantially lowers the risk of this choice: the practical cost of picking one has fallen because the two are moving toward each other rather than apart.

3. Use a compliance obligation as the anchor for sequencing and funding. The obligations that now carry deadlines and penalties, building performance standards, energy performance certificate regimes, national building databases, and investor reporting requirements, all demand asset-level data of exactly the kind a lifecycle data program produces. They supply three things an internal initiative usually lacks: an external deadline, a defensible budget line, and a specified data scope. Building an asset-level data collection and management capability across a portfolio of 50 or more assets has been reported to take up to two years, and that work is being driven in practice by certificate and investor reporting requirements rather than by corporate disclosure.[36] Organizations that align the two efforts pay for the data infrastructure once.

4. Write the delivery-to-operations handover as an information requirement in contract. The handover discontinuity is not primarily a software problem, and it has not yielded to two decades of software. It is a specification problem: the operating organization rarely states, before design begins, what information it will require at handover, in what structure, validated how. Stating those requirements in the delivery contract, in the vocabulary the operating systems actually use, converts a downstream data migration into an upstream deliverable. The information management standard governing this is under revision, which makes this a good moment to review existing information requirements rather than a reason to defer.

5. Treat the verification gap as a design problem, not a training problem. The 2026 evidence shows a specific and unusual pattern: high-frequency use of artificial intelligence combined with very low trust in its output for consequential decisions, and a substantial share of practitioners reporting that assisted work takes longer than manual work once checking is included.[37][38] That is not a capability shortfall and will not respond to more training. It responds to provenance: outputs that carry their sources, extractions that surface confidence, and workflows that route only the uncertain cases to a person. Semantic consistency in the underlying data is what makes that provenance possible, which is the connection between this action and the first two.

6. Run data quality as a continuous discipline alongside deployment, with early emphasis. The governance-first instinct is sound and its strong form is unexecutable. The workable version treats quality management as a practice that runs through the pipeline, not as a gate in front of it, with deliberate weight at the early stages where defects are introduced and from which they propagate. One distinction earns its keep here: structural quality, meaning consistent formatting and normalization, matters less than semantic quality, meaning consistent and unambiguous labeling. Language models handle messy structure competently and cannot recover meaning that was never expressed. Where systems act on building data autonomously instead of only advising a person, this requirement rises, because an agent can act on a mislabeled point before anyone reviews the reasoning.

A note on what is deliberately absent from this list. It contains no recommendation to select a particular platform, integration product, or vendor. The 2025 paper's platform list has been overtaken by a market in which operations and design platforms are acquiring adjacent data streams and performing integration internally, which relocates the interoperability question without resolving it. Platform selection is a real decision, and it is downstream of the semantic decisions above, not a substitute for them.

Lifecycle Implications

The Building Lifecycle Management Initiative's distinctive claim is that building information should persist and remain usable from design through deconstruction, and that most of the industry's data problems are symptoms of the places where that persistence breaks. The 2026 evidence bears on each phase differently, and on one boundary decisively.

Design and delivery. The schema of record for delivery-phase information is stable and internationally standardized, and the standard governing how information is managed and exchanged across delivery is under revision. The practical implication is that information requirements written today should be reviewed against that revision when it publishes. The opportunity is that the operating organization can specify what it needs before design begins, and the evidence is that few do.

The handover boundary. This is where the lifecycle argument earns its keep, and where the 2026 evidence is least comfortable. Market research published in 2026 states that despite years of advocacy for carrying design and construction information into operations, there remain remarkably few examples of owners actually doing it.[39] A study of one deployment found work order processing times rising in some trades against a predicted 8.7 percent reduction, with 30 percent of the data excluded for inconsistent recording.[40] Lifecycle information continuity is an aspiration, not an achieved state, and

any paper claiming otherwise is describing a demonstration and calling it a practice. The near-term action that addresses it is contractual, not technological, and appears as the fourth action above.

Operations. This is the phase where the 2026 movement concentrates. Semantic ontologies describe operational objects, equipment, points, spaces, and their relationships, which is why convergence among them matters most here. Compliance obligations land here, because building performance standards and energy databases measure operating buildings. Artificial intelligence is being applied here first, with predictive maintenance the leading application. An organization that establishes semantic consistency in operations gains compliance capability and analytical capability from the same work.

Disposition and deconstruction. This phase remains the least evidenced in the literature and the least served by current standards work. The 2026 scan located no study measuring the effect of data fragmentation on disposition, and no standards effort specifically addressing information transfer at asset sale or at end of service life. This is a genuine gap in the industry's data agenda rather than a settled question, and it is one where the lifecycle perspective has something to contribute precisely because no one else is looking at it.

The through-line is that information created in one phase is specified, structured, and governed by people who will not be present in the next. Every remedy in this paper is, at bottom, an attempt to make the handoffs survivable. The relay analogy is apt and incomplete: in a relay the baton is designed for the exchange. In the building lifecycle, each runner still brings a baton of their own design.

Persistent Constraints

The constraints named in 2025 have not disappeared. They are treated briefly here because the 2026 evidence suggests they are less determinative of outcomes than the availability of adoptable standards and the presence of an external deadline, both of which improved. Three warrant a current note.

The skills constraint changed shape. The general technology skills gap described in 2025 has narrowed into something more specific. Professional surveys in 2026 identify skilled personnel as the leading barrier to artificial intelligence adoption while use rose from just over half of commercial property respondents in 2025 to more than three-quarters in 2026, and executive guidance now frames artificial intelligence literacy as a board-level competence covering value cases, data privacy, and model risk.[4][2] The gap is no longer between practitioners and tools; it is between use and warranted confidence.

Security moved from constraint to responsibility. Building systems security has shifted from a background technical concern to a matter discussed in asset management terms and priced through insurance underwriting, with professional surveys recording privacy and security concern rising from 22 percent to 30 percent of respondents as deployment scaled.[4] Trade reporting describes substantial exposure across building management systems, and one reported incident produced a 90-day operations recovery.[41] Treating this as a constraint understates it; it is now a driver, and it argues for the same asset-level data discipline the rest of this paper recommends.

Organizational governance is beginning to formalize. Industry bodies have started creating senior data roles explicitly to unify disconnected technology and data functions.[42] One appointment is not a trend, and it indicates that the organizational remedy is being recognized rather than that it has been applied.

Cost and resistance to change remain real and were not re-measured within the assessment window in any CRE-specific form. They are noted rather than quantified, which is the honest position.

Conclusion and Outlook

The 2025 paper described a problem and surveyed remedies. This update reports that the problem is stable and the remedies have sorted themselves.

Three conclusions follow from the evidence. First, the standards landscape can now be evaluated on cadence and named adoption rather than on ambition, which narrows the field to something a practitioner can actually choose from, and the leading semantic vocabularies are converging rather than diverging, which lowers the cost of choosing. Second, the sequencing advice on artificial intelligence should be restated: semantic consistency and accessibility established for each use case, with quality management running continuously through the pipeline instead of standing as a gate before it. That version can be executed, and it strengthens as the industry moves from analyzing documents toward systems that act on building operations. Third, the obligation to organize building data has moved to the building and portfolio layer, which is where the industry's information has always lived, so the compliance argument and the data continuity argument now point at the same work.

What remains unfinished is the handover. The discontinuity between how buildings are delivered and how they are operated has outlasted two decades of technology aimed at it, and the 2026 evidence gives no reason to expect the next technology to close it either. The standard governing information management across that boundary is under revision, and establishing what that revision actually changes is the most useful piece of homework available to the industry right now.

The Building Lifecycle Management Initiative's position is unchanged and better supported than it was in 2025: the industry does not need another data standard. It needs adoption of the ones that are shipping, specified early enough in the lifecycle to survive the handoffs, and anchored to obligations that already carry deadlines. Every element of that is now available. What the next eighteen months will measure is whether it is used.

The initiative welcomes correspondence from practitioners applying these standards, particularly from organizations working on the delivery-to-operations boundary and on information requirements at disposition, where the evidence base remains thinnest and where practitioner experience is currently ahead of the literature.

Works Cited

Endnotes correspond to bracketed markers in the text. Where a note covers a series of publications from one organization, both editions are listed together.

- [1] JLL. (2025). Reality Check: The True Pace and Payoffs of AI Adoption in Corporate Real Estate. Global Real Estate Technology Survey, 1,000+ senior decision-makers across 16 markets. <https://www.jll.com/en-us/insights/global-real-estate-cre-technology-survey>
- [2] Deloitte. (2025 and 2026). Commercial Real Estate Outlook, 2025 and 2026 editions. 880+ and 850+ C-suite respondents respectively, 13 countries. <https://www.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/industry/financial-services/commercial-real-estate-outlook.html>
- [3] REMI Network. (2026). OSCRE Advances Data Infrastructure Strategy. <https://www.reminetwork.com/articles/oscre-advances-data-infrastructure-strategy/>
- [4] RICS. (2026). AI in Commercial Property and Construction Report 2026. Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, 3,100+ professionals. <https://www.rics.org/news-insights/ai-in-commercial-property-and-construction-report-2026>
- [5] Brick Consortium. (2025 and 2026). Releases: BrickSchema/Brick, versions 1.4.0 through 1.5.0 release candidate 1. <https://github.com/BrickSchema/Brick/releases>
- [6] Linux Foundation. (2025). Linux Foundation Welcomes C4SB, Announces Intent to Form C4SB Foundation. <https://www.linuxfoundation.org/press/intent-to-form-c4sb-foundation>
- [7] Linux Foundation. (2025). Coalition for Smarter Buildings Foundation Enables Building Management Innovation with Open Source Technical Project Contributions. <https://www.linuxfoundation.org/press/coalition-for-smarter-buildings-foundation-enables-building-management-innovation-with-open-source-technical-project-contributions-to-the-linux-foundation>
- [8] IFMA and Johnson Controls. (2026). 2026 AI and Digitalization in Facilities Management Report. 1,020 respondents; study sponsored by a building systems manufacturer, sample and method disclosed. <https://www.johnsoncontrols.com/building-insights/thought-leadership/2026-ai-digitalization-in-facilities-management-report>
- [9] Gartner. (2025). Lack of AI-Ready Data Puts AI Projects at Risk. 1,203 data management leaders. <https://www.gartner.com/en/newsroom/press-releases/2025-02-26-lack-of-ai-ready-data-puts-ai-projects-at-risk>
- [10] Council of the European Union. (2026). Council Signs Off Simplification of Sustainability Reporting and Due Diligence Requirements. <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2026/02/24/>
- [11] ISS Corporate. (2026). EU Sustainability Rules Reset: What the 2026 Changes Mean. <https://www.iss-corporate.com/resources/blog/eu-sustainability-rules-reset-what-the-2026-changes-mean/>
- [12] EFRAG. (2025). Draft Simplified ESRS. European Financial Reporting Advisory Group. <https://www.efrag.org/en/draft-simplified-esrs>
- [13] United States Securities and Exchange Commission. (2026). SEC Proposes Rescission of Climate-Related Disclosure Rules. <https://www.sec.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2026-49-sec-proposes-rescission-climate-related-disclosure-rules>
- [14] Ashurst Perkins Coie. (2026). California Climate Disclosure Laws Update. <https://www.ashurstperkinscoie.com/en/insights/update/california-climate-disclosure-laws-update/>

- [15] City of New York, Department of Housing Preservation and Development and Department of Buildings. (2026). New Compliance Data Shows Impact of Local Law 97. <https://www.nyc.gov/site/hpd/news/023-26/new-compliance-data-shows-impact-local-law-97-improve-sustainability-new-york-city>
- [16] European Commission. (2025). Commission Notice C/2025/6438: EPBD Transposition Guidance. Official Journal of the European Union. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=OJ:C_202506438
- [17] European Commission, BUILD UP. (2026). Renovation Passports: Commission Issues Guidance for Implementation Across Member States. <https://build-up.ec.europa.eu/en/resources-and-tools/publications/renovation-passports-commission-issues-guidance-implementation>
- [18] European Commission. (2026). Commission Calls on EU Countries to Transpose the Reinforced Rules on the Energy Performance of Buildings. https://energy.ec.europa.eu/news/commission-calls-eu-countries-transpose-reinforced-rules-energy-performance-buildings-2026-07-15_en
- [19] GRESB. (2025). Real Estate Standard 2026 Updates. https://cdn.svc.gresb.com/gresb-prd-public/2025/Foundation/Real_Estate_Standard_2026_Updates.pdf
- [20] INREV. (2025). ESG Standard Data Delivery Sheet. European Association for Investors in Non-Listed Real Estate Vehicles. <https://www.inrev.org/esg-sdds>
- [21] Brick Consortium. (2026). Consortium Members. <https://brickschema.org/consortium/>
- [22] KTH Dig-IT Lab. (2025). New RealEstateCore Lighting Extension Tested at KTH Dig-IT Lab. Royal Institute of Technology. <https://www.digitlab.kth.se/2025/10/24/new-realestatecore-lighting-extension-tested-at-kth-dig-it-lab/>
- [23] ASHRAE. (2025). Standards Actions, Volume XV, Issue 26. First public review of BSR/ASHRAE Standard 223P. https://www.ashrae.org/file%20library/technical%20resources/standards%20and%20guidelines/standards%20actions/sajun_27_2025.pdf
- [24] Open223 community. (2026). Open223 User Documentation, including Using 223 with Brick and RealEstateCore. Explicitly not developed or endorsed by ASHRAE. <https://docs.open223.info/>
- [25] ConnexFM and OSCRE International. (2025). Managed Services Agreement to Drive Innovation with Data Management in the Built Environment. <https://www.prweb.com/releases/connexfm-and-oscre-international-partner-on-a-managed-services-agreement-to-drive-innovation-with-data-management-in-the-built-environment-302399493.html>
- [26] OSCRE International. (2026). OSCRE Unveils Vision for a Smart Data Highway. <https://www.prweb.com/releases/oscre-unveils-vision-for-a-smart-data-highway-to-take-real-estate-data-standards-to-the-next-level-302696018.html>
- [27] OSCRE International. (2026). Licensing to Fit Your Needs. <https://www.oscre.org/Industry-Data-Model/Licensing-to-Fit-Your-Needs>
- [28] MISMO. (2025). Commercial Appraisal Dataset. Mortgage Industry Standards Maintenance Organization. <https://www.mismo.org/standards-resources/mismo-product/commercial-appraisal-dataset>
- [29] MISMO. (2026). Commercial Standards. <https://www.mismo.org/standards-resources/commercial>
- [30] Mortgage Bankers Association. (2026). MISMO Updates Reference Model with Enhancements for Servicing, Property Data, and VA Workflows. <https://newslink.mba.org/mba-newslinks/2026/june/>
- [31] IBPDI. (2023, documentation build; repository accessed 2026). IBPDI Real Estate Common Data Model v2.0 and cdm repository. <https://ibpdi.github.io> and <https://github.com/ibpdi/cdm>
- [32] IBPDI. (2021 and 2022; accessed 2026). Press and News and Events. <https://ibpdi.org/press/> and <https://ibpdi.org/blog/>

- [33] buildingSMART International. (2024; accessed 2026). IFC Schema Specifications, IFC 4.3.2 designated ISO 16739-1:2024. <https://technical.buildingsmart.org/standards/ifc/ifc-schema-specifications/>
- [34] International Organization for Standardization. (catalog entry accessed 2026). ISO 19650-1:2018, stage 90.92, to be revised. <https://www.iso.org/standard/68078.html>
- [35] International Organization for Standardization. (2024). ISO 55013:2024, Asset Management, Guidance on the Management of Data Assets. <https://www.iso.org/standard/82455.html>
- [36] JLL. (2026). From Compliance to Competitive Advantage. <https://www.jll.com/en-uk/insights/from-compliance-to-competitive-advantage>
- [37] First American Data and Analytics with DealGround. (2026). Study Finds Surging AI Adoption in CRE, But Trust Lags. 255 respondents. <https://www.firstam.com/news/2026/fa-dna-dealground-ai-adoption-20260512.html>
- [38] Dealpath. (2026). 2026 State of AI in CRE Investing Survey. Vendor-sponsored; sample and method disclosed. <https://finance.yahoo.com/technology/ai/articles/dealpath-2026-state-ai-cre-133300850.html>
- [39] Memoori. (2026). Digital Twin and AI 2026: Startups Demolish Construction Silos. <https://memoori.com/digital-twin-ai-startups-construction-2026/>
- [40] IFMA Knowledge Library. Quantifying the Effect of BIM and COBie for FM. <https://knowledgelibrary.ifma.org/quantifying-the-effect-of-bim-and-cobie-for-fm/>
- [41] Insurance Edge. (2026). Why Digital Investment is Widening Real Estate's Attack Surface; and Facilities Dive. (2026). Iran Conflict Highlights Cyberthreat Exposure of U.S. Facilities. Trade reporting; underlying studies not named by the publications. <https://insurance-edge.net/2026/04/16/> and <https://www.facilitiesdive.com/news/816215/>
- [42] National Association of REALTORS. (2025). National Association of REALTORS Appoints First-Ever Chief Data Officer. <https://www.nar.realtor/press-releases/national-association-of-realtors-appoints-first-ever-chief-data-officer>

About This Paper

Evidence Base

This paper draws on a structured research assessment completed in September 2026, which tested each material claim from the March 2025 edition against evidence published between March 2025 and 31 August 2026. That assessment evaluated candidate sources against a four-tier authority hierarchy before use, traced every material claim in its own draft back to a cited source after writing, and recorded its evidence gaps rather than filling them by inference. Where a figure could not be substantiated at an adequate standard, it has been omitted from this paper rather than repeated with qualification.

Several limits should travel with the material. No study yet measures data fragmentation prevalence directly. No survey measures deployment share of the semantic ontologies discussed here across commercial real estate or facility management portfolios, so adoption evidence rests on published implementer rosters and named validations. The cybersecurity figures cited come from trade reporting that does not name an underlying study. Two artificial intelligence quality findings rest on preprints of unconfirmed peer-review status. The description of the ISO 19650 revision's content could not be verified against a primary statement and has been excluded accordingly. The sponsored surveys cited disclose their samples and methods, and each reports findings that run against its sponsor's commercial interest.

Predecessor

This paper updates State of Data in the CRE Industry, published by the Building Lifecycle Management Initiative in March 2025. It supersedes that edition for all matters of fact and recommendation. The 2025 edition remains the reference for the baseline against which movement in this update is measured.

About BLMI

The Building Lifecycle Management Initiative (BLMI) is a volunteer-led, not-for-profit initiative working at the intersection of Facility Management, Commercial Real Estate, PropTech, and Data Governance. BLMI advances a single foundational premise: that buildings generate valuable data across their entire lifespan (from design through deconstruction) and that the industry's persistent failure to preserve and transfer that data across ownership transitions, operational phases, and technology generations remains an industry-wide challenge the built environment has been slow to systematically address.

BLMI does not create new standards. Its role is synthesis and advocacy: connecting the work of established frameworks (IFMA, BOMA, CoreNet Global, OSCRE, ASHRAE, and USGBC) into a coherent lifecycle perspective, and translating that perspective into actionable guidance for the professionals who manage, own, and operate buildings at scale.

Publications are produced through a research and editorial process developed by domain practitioners and made freely available to the industry. To contribute, collaborate, or access the full research library, visit blmi.org.

blmi.org

Disclaimer

The content of this publication is provided for informational purposes only and does not constitute legal, financial, or professional advice. While reasonable care has been taken to ensure the accuracy and currency of the information presented, Building Lifecycle Management Initiative makes no representations or warranties regarding its completeness or fitness for a particular purpose. References to third-party organizations, standards bodies, products, or services do not imply endorsement. Sponsor relationships do not influence editorial content or conclusions. Views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the positions of any affiliated organization, standards body, or sponsor.

© 2026 Building Lifecycle Management Initiative. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0

AI Use Transparency

This publication was produced with the assistance of AI tools in content drafting, research synthesis, and editorial review. All strategic analysis, source selection, factual claims, and interpretive conclusions represent the professional judgment of Building Lifecycle Management Initiative's human contributors. Every factual assertion has been verified against primary sources prior to publication. Building Lifecycle Management Initiative maintains full editorial independence; no claim appears in this publication solely on the basis of AI-generated content.

Produced under Building Lifecycle Management Initiative AI Use Policy | Effective April 2026