

AI IN AEC 2026 | HELSINKI, FINLAND

6th International Conference AI in Architecture, Engineering & Construction

March 18–19, 2026 • 300+ Participants • 38 Countries

The Transformation Gap

Why AEC's AI problem isn't technology — and what the industry must rebuild to close it.

95%

of organizations report no ROI
from AI investment

90%

of AEC professionals are already
using large language models

The Transformation Gap

95%

of organizations report no return on their AI investment

Sam Zolfagharian (YegaTech), Keynote 1, citing industry research

THE GAP

90%

of AEC professionals are already using large language models in some form

Keynote 1; corroborated across Session 2 and Session 5 Panel

Three hundred participants from 38 countries arrived in Helsinki for the 6th AI in AEC conference, the largest in the series' history. Eighty-two percent attended on-site. The ambition was set high in the opening remarks. "With AI, you shouldn't aim for 50% improvements, but 500% improvements or even 5,000," said Vesa Jarvinen (AINS Group), quoting former Nokia Chairman Risto Siilasmaa. "Only then will you have to rethink the entire process and then AI shows its true power."

Then came the blow. The defining statistic pair of the two days: 95% of organizations see no return on their AI investment. 90% of professionals are already using AI tools. Everyone is using it. Almost nobody is getting organizational value from it. The gap between these two numbers is the conference's central diagnosis.

The problem is not capability. The problem is architecture. Sam Zolfagharian (YegaTech) introduced the metaphor that defined everything that followed. Organizations are installing Formula One engines into horse carriages: systems designed for human limitations, for the pace of human cognition. The engine is extraordinary. The vehicle cannot take it.

"Companies are trying to install the Formula One engine on the horse carriage, the system that has been designed for human limitations, for what we could do. And that's why the transformation is not happening."

Sam Zolfagharian, YegaTech — Opening Session Keynote 1

The evidence accumulated across every session. Ramboll has 9,400 AI users globally yet struggles to systematize outputs into organizational value. Adobe, with 32,000 employees and 43 years in market, was disrupted by Mid-Journey with 11 employees. A survey of 400+ construction professionals found 74% using ChatGPT or similar tools daily or weekly, while 68% believe their companies are not ready for AI disruption. Individual adoption and organizational transformation are running in different lanes.

CONFERENCE SCALE

300+ registered participants from **38 countries**. 6th event in the series. 82% on-site attendance. 50 presentations from 4 continents. Hosted in Helsinki, Finland.

THE ALGORITHMIC AGE

"For the last 50 years we built organizations around human limitations. But now we're not in the age of human intelligence. We're in the age of algorithmic intelligence."

Sam Zolfagharian (YegaTech), Keynote 1

DISRUPTION BENCHMARK

Uber runs **250 AI models simultaneously** to operate its app. The industry has crossed from "AI as experiment" to "AI as operational infrastructure." AEC has not made this transition.

THE SCALE OF ADOPTION

74% of construction professionals use ChatGPT or similar daily or weekly (Placer Solutions survey, 400+ respondents, cited by Bhargan Paramanatham, AECOM). 68% simultaneously believe their companies are not ready for AI disruption.

"If we were to be a statistics-based industry, we would probably not design any handicap ramps because statistically there's not enough people in wheelchairs to justify the effort and time and money. But we are not just designing for the majority. We're designing for everybody."

Nitzan Bartov, Henning Larsen — Session 1: AI Implementation

ACT 1 — ALARM

Culture Eats Governance

If the tools are not the problem, what is? Page after page of conference evidence converged on the same answer: organizational culture. The most provocative moment of the two days came not from a technologist, not from a strategist, but from a designer. Nitzan Bartov of Henning Larsen stopped the room with an argument about handicap ramps. It was the most honest statement anyone made about why data-driven governance without human values is dangerous in a design profession.

Henning Larsen's implementation philosophy rests on four principles developed through live project experience, not policy documents. They arrived at the principles by letting people experiment first, measuring what worked, and writing the framework afterwards. It is a deliberate inversion of how most large organizations approach digital change.

The governance-first instinct is understandable but costly. Multiple speakers from infrastructure departments described investing in strategic AI plans, compliance frameworks, and procurement guardrails before staff had meaningful experience to govern. Jesse Nyberg (HNTB/MassDOT) argued for governance as a prerequisite for funding and executive buy-in. Both positions are partially right. The sequence is what matters: culture before governance, not governance before culture.

"If this person has to ask for permission for everything, the role is just decorative. If they can make decisions, it's transformative."

Max Levander, AINS Group — Session 1: AI Implementation

The practical consequence is stark. Governance without culture creates shelfware policies: documents that employees route around or ignore. Culture without governance creates data security risks and liability exposure. The organizations that are actually advancing, Henning Larsen, AECOM, Arcadis, built the cultural foundation first and let governance frameworks grow from observed practice.

HENNING LARSEN'S 4 PRINCIPLES

- 1 People over technology.** Start with the humans who will use it, not the tool being sold.
- 2 Start with problems, not tools.** What is the actual workflow friction? Then find the tool.
- 3 Share everything internally.** Create a culture of transparent experimentation, not competitive hoarding.
- 4 Allow failure.** Measure afterwards. Write governance from real practice, not theoretical risk.

90–95%

of AECOM's workforce began as AI novices: never used AI professionally, or fearful of security risks. Honest baseline. Most organizations claim higher readiness than they have.

ON ACCOUNTABILITY

"We will always be accountable for our own actions on our own output. We can never move the accountability into AI."

Nitzan Bartov, Henning Larsen

THE AI LITERACY PRINCIPLE

"We don't teach people how to use AI. We teach people what AI is." Teach LLM mechanics and machine learning fundamentals. When people understand the technology, they find their own applications. Prompt engineering workshops miss the point

Multi-Agent Orchestration

Petri Kasari (Sweco) demonstrated a live multi-agent system dividing complex engineering tasks across specialized agents, with an orchestrator synthesizing outputs. Not a proof of concept: a production workflow.

Compliance Engine: Arcyn AI

Boris Levin and Tom Batito (Arcyn AI) showed a working compliance system reading regulations and cross-referencing against BIM models with full audit trails. Addresses professional liability in AI-assisted checking.

The "Design Pilot" Role

Kim Nyberg (Trimble) introduced the design pilot: a professional who steers AI agents rather than doing technical work directly. A new function emerging from multi-agent architectures.

MCP Protocol

The Model Context Protocol is becoming AEC's interoperability standard for agent systems, mirroring IFC's role for geometry data. Firms building MCP-compatible workflows now avoid future integration debt.

VLMS Beat CNNs

Christopher Mouflard (MarkedUp): Vision-Language Models outperform Convolutional Neural Networks for document-to-model comparison because they handle regulatory language ambiguity that rule-based systems cannot.

Document Intelligence

Jani Nevalainen (AINS Group) demonstrated multi-agent architecture for document intelligence: agents that read, classify, cross-reference, and flag project documents without human triage.

The Tools Are Here

This is not a waiting game. The demos session (Session 2) and multi-agent session (Session 3) showed an industry that has crossed the proof-of-concept threshold. Sweco, AINS Group, Trimble, and Tyréns all demonstrated multi-agent architectures working in production: specialized AI agents dividing complex tasks, handing off to each other, and producing coordinated outputs that no single model could generate alone.

The conference's Session 2 deserves particular credit for its honesty. Live demos failed in front of 300 people. Hallucinated outputs appeared on screen. The room watched AI make the kinds of errors that "toddler-level" is not too strong a word to describe. This was the most useful thing those demos could have done: demonstrate, in real time, that verification protocols are not optional overhead. They are the product.

The "capability overhang" is not everywhere. Leading firms have already moved decisively. Ramboll has deployed AI to 9,400 users globally for computational design and document work. AECOM built cohort-based training programs producing measurable productivity improvements. Arcadis tested the value of GitHub Copilot with a simple question to their developers after three months: do you want free lunch every week, or do you want to keep the license?

THE GENERATIONAL ANXIETY MOMENT — SESSION 2: DEMOS

"I have 3 sons and one of them just graduated as a coder. He can do coding. And he doesn't really know how to code. If I ask him, does the thing you've just coded do the job? He says yes. Can you follow it back through to the beginning? He says no."

Bart Brink, Federation of the Dutch Construction Industry

A parent's anxiety. The next generation can produce outputs but not understand them. "Vibe coding" with natural language interfaces has dissolved the specialist barrier between design intent and working code. This is both a productivity breakthrough and a verification problem. Seeja Sudhakaran's award-winning research at the University of West London addressed exactly this: how to keep designers "in the driver's seat" when AI handles generation. Her work won Best Presentation at the conference for its practical resolution of this tension.

Smart Infrastructure and Computational Design

Beyond multi-agent design workflows, AI is entering buildings and cities.

Knut Nordanger of SINTEF introduced the "Digital Janitor": an AI layer embedded in building systems that monitors performance, anticipates failures, and communicates with operators in plain language. The research testbed underpinning this work, the Zero Emission Building laboratory at NTNU and Sintef in Trondheim, runs 1,500 sensors, 150 controllable objects, and generates 17,000 data points. The challenge is no longer data volume. It is making that data semantically accessible to the humans who need to act on it.

On urban scale, the stakes become planetary. Rania Labib of Prairie View A&M University demonstrated an AI pipeline that can analyze the urban heat island profile of an entire city the size of Houston in three hours, producing 6,000 individual analysis tiles. The same analysis previously required weeks of manual expert work. The democratization of climate analysis has arrived. Whether it drives better decisions is a separate question that Labib was candid about: "Is AI being adopted because it solves real problems, or because of cultural pressure to adopt?"

39% of global CO2 emissions from construction
Sigrid Brell-Cokcan (RWTH Aachen), Closing Session

40% of total EU energy consumption from buildings
Mohammad Seyfi (LUT University), Session 6: Smart Buildings

8% of global CO2 from cement alone
RWTH Aachen, Closing Session video narration

Ramboll's Roope Palomaa brought the practitioner dimension: lifecycle carbon assessment tools that make AI outputs auditable for regulatory contexts. The sustainability imperative and the AI imperative are converging. AEC firms with mandatory ESG reporting clients are discovering that concept-stage performance prediction is becoming a fee-generating capability, not a back-end verification step.

THE DIGITAL JANITOR

SINTEF's concept: an AI layer embedded in buildings that monitors 17,000 data points, communicates faults in plain language, and optimizes energy performance continuously. Buildings as conversational systems. The ZEB laboratory in Trondheim is the research testbed.

Knut Nordanger (SINTEF Community), Session 6

Houston in 3 Hours

AI pipeline processes an entire city for urban heat island analysis: 6,000 individual tiles. Previous timeline: weeks. Now: an afternoon. Climate analysis democratized for planners and students.

Rania Labib (Prairie View A&M), Session 7

Voice-Controlled BIM

Upskiller.xyz demonstrated voice-controlled BIM interfaces in Session 10: natural language commands navigating parametric models. The specialist barrier between language and geometry is dissolving.

Alejandro Pacheco Dieguez (Upskiller.xyz), Session 10

Predictive, Not Generative

Seeja Sudhakaran (University of West London) won Best Presentation for research on AI that forecasts performance consequences at concept stage, not just generates images. Performance-first design at RIBA Stage 1.

Session 9: Conceptual Design

9,400 Users, Still Unsolved

Ramboll has deployed AI to 9,400 users globally. The admission: converting individual user productivity into systematized organizational output remains unsolved. Scale of adoption does not equal organizational intelligence.

Session 10: Computational Design

The question isn't whether AI will transform AEC. It's whether the industry will transform itself.

The tools are real. The capability is proven. The demonstrations worked and failed in front of 300 people in the same room. What remains is the harder question: the organizational architecture, the billing models, the cultural inertia, and the commercial frameworks that determine whether any of it creates value.

"We charge by the hour and we charge for the human work, but not for the machines' work. And machines cost. We have hardware, we have software, we have tokens. Competence costs money that we can't charge for. And at the same time we can charge for much less hours. So the model collapses."

Petra Svensson Gleisner, IHOP — Session 8: Sustainable Business Models

ACT 3 — TENSION

The Business Model Crisis

When AI compresses a 100-hour task to 10 hours, firms charging by the hour cannot capture the value they create.

This is not a future threat. Sam Saatchi (Sweco), Chief Strategy Officer of one of Europe's largest engineering consultancies, described it as a present-tense reality: consultants who save 10 hours using AI and then charge exactly the same hourly fee they charged before. Productivity gains are being transferred to clients, silently and at scale, with no commercial mechanism to capture them.

The math is straightforward and the implications are existential. AI investment requires hardware, software, tokens, and the competence to use them. That competence has a cost. If the billing model cannot price competence and capability, only time and headcount, then every AI efficiency gain is simultaneously an investment and a revenue reduction. The model collapses, as Svensson Gleisner put it, because both sides of the equation move in the wrong direction at once.

Projectos Engineering offered the only proof that the transition is survivable.

Last year was the first year in their history that they grew revenue while reducing billable hours, achieved by moving to fixed-price contracts on AI-enabled deliverables. Notably, only 14% of their engineers reported concern about losing their jobs to AI. When staff participate in the transition rather than being displaced by it, anxiety drops and performance improves. The Swedish Traffic Administration went further: publicly stating a willingness to share 30% of AI-generated savings with vendors and partners. The clients who understand the new economics are ahead of the firms who supply them.

"A lot of the things that we do today, a lot of the hours we sell, we won't be able to sell. They will be worthless in the future."

Sam Saatchi, Sweco — Session 5 Panel

"Clients will not pay a premium price for something that they can generate faster, cheaper at scale."

Ivana Kildsgaard, Tengbom — Session 8

THE API MODEL

"The delivery model will change from hours. I see it like selling compute, like APIs. Engineering firms may sell intelligence and capability, not time and drawings."

Simon Oster, Arcadis — Session 5 Panel

KEY EVIDENCE

- **Projectos:** Revenue grew while billable hours fell. First year this occurred. Fixed-price model.
- **Sweden:** Traffic Administration willing to share 30% of AI-generated savings with vendors.
- **Finland:** 4 million euros spent annually on redundant quantity calculations. Structural waste from information fragmentation.

Building AI Capability

If the business model is the structural problem, capability is the human one. The AI Capability Pyramid framework, introduced by Simon Oster (Arcadis) and Bhrgan Paramanatham (AECOM) in the Session 5 Keynote, became the conference's most referenced organizational tool. It provides a map for where firms actually are versus where they imagine themselves to be.

The pyramid names the capability overhang: a term borrowed from OpenAI describing what happens when AI innovation outpaces organizational absorption. Tools are licensed and deployed. The organizational muscle to extract value from them does not yet exist. The result is what AECOM found when they ran an honest internal audit: 90 to 95% of the workforce had never used AI professionally, or were actively apprehensive about it.

The practical solutions were characteristically pragmatic. Paramanatham described the most effective executive buy-in hack in the room: train the executive assistants first. They loved it. They told the executives. Sponsorship followed. Oster cited a developer productivity test so clean it became a conference touchstone: offer developers a choice after three months with GitHub Copilot. Free lunch every week, or keep the license? They chose the license. When people choose a productivity tool over a free meal, you know it works.

"It's like a gear system. If you have one gear out of three of them running fast, then the system will break. So we need to consider the whole network effect."

Sam Zolfagharian, YegaTech — Session 5 Panel: Impact of Agentic AI

The gear metaphor diagnoses exactly why most AI pilots succeed technically and die organizationally. An isolated gear spinning faster does not accelerate the machine. It breaks it. Value is only generated when the gear meshes with the adjacent ones: with delivery workflows, with billing mechanisms, with client deliverables. The question for any AI investment is not "does this work in a demo?" but "what does it connect to?"

AI CAPABILITY PYRAMID

Oster (Arcadis) & Paramanatham (AECOM), Session 5 Keynote

5. Integration & Orchestration

4. Tool-Specific Skills

3. Prompt Engineering

2. AI Literacy

1. Psychological Safety

Base tier enables all others. Most firms invest in tiers 3-5 while underinvesting in 1-2.

40%

of construction teams allocating dedicated AI budgets
Dodge Construction Network survey, cited by Paramanatham (AECOM)

38%

creating formal AI implementation teams
Dodge Construction Network, Session 5 Keynote

14%

of Projectos engineers concerned about job loss to AI
Joaquin Arocena (Projectos Engineering), Session 1

THE EXECUTIVE ASSISTANTS HACK

"We got all the executive assistants to come into our training. They loved it. Then they told all the executives. That was a really good way to get a mandate."

Bhrgan Paramanatham, AECOM — Session 5 Keynote

Our vision is that all logistics should go by night. So when workers come to the construction site in the morning, the materials are where they should be, the whole documentation is done by the robots, it's documented, it's uploaded to the BIM so that they know where and what has been built the last day."

Sigrid Brell-Cokcan, RWTH Aachen University — Closing Session

ACT 4 — RESOLUTION

The Construction Site of Tomorrow

Sigrid Brell-Cokcan brought 25 years spanning architecture, structural engineering, and construction robotics to the closing session. Her authority is not borrowed from theory. She has watched her own drawings fail to reach construction sites since 2003, when "only 1% of my information got digitally on the construction site." The figure has improved to roughly 10%. The trajectory is better than it was. The gap remains dangerous.

The construction site, Brell-Cokcan argued, is primarily a logistics problem, not a construction problem. Only 30% of work on site is actual construction. Approximately 30% is logistics. Ten percent of total project cost goes to transport and searching for tools and materials. An industry that has invested heavily in design intelligence and parametric modeling has not yet solved the physical coordination problem that drives this waste.

The RWTH Aachen research program provides a concrete vision.

The Robiton deconstruction robot achieved an 83% reduction in setup and disassembly time versus manual process, at 1.5mm accuracy, using AI-solved inverse kinematics. The MAX robotic system targets scaffold-free facade refurbishment: a European market worth an estimated 400 billion euros, currently inaccessible to small and medium construction enterprises because scaffold erection costs make margins impossible.

The environmental stakes ground the vision in urgency. Construction accounts for over 39% of global CO2 emissions. Current global construction contains over 28 billion tons of concrete, 42% of all building materials. Cement alone generates 8% of global CO2. The Robiton project targets 70% reuse of existing concrete for secondary building parts: if it reaches scale, a 1% reduction in global cement CO2 emissions.

But Brell-Cokcan's most pointed observation was about resistance. Her data from 15 years of robotics adoption research shows that mid-50s executives demonstrate 0.7% interest in robotics adoption. The CEOs who are the decision makers are the ones actually scared of new technologies, not the workers on the floor who would use the tools.

10%

of planning data reaches the construction site

30%

of site work is actual construction. 30% is logistics.

83%

reduction in setup and disassembly time: Robiton deconstruction robot, RWTH Aachen, Closing Session

€400B

European scaffold-free facade refurbishment market. Target addressable market for construction robotics. RWTH Aachen, Closing Session.

SAFETY AI IN SESSION 11

Guido Maciocci (AECFoundry) demonstrated a safety monitoring platform that achieved adoption through simplicity: a single visual dashboard flagging risks in plain language. Roxi Mkhani (Kingston University) presented research: simple, interpretable models consistently outperform complex black-box systems where practitioners need to verify and defend the reasoning.

Session 11: Construction

THE RESISTANCE IS AT THE TOP

"The CEOs who are the decision makers, they are the ones who actually are scared of new technologies." Mid-50s executives: 0.7% interest in robotics adoption. 15 years of adoption data.

Sigrid Brell-Cokcan, RWTH Aachen — Closing Session

National and Industry Strategies

The geography of AI readiness is uneven, and the gap is widening. Three national strategies stood out from the 38 countries represented in Helsinki. Their approaches differ in emphasis, but they share a recognition that firm-level AI investment without collective infrastructure produces fragmented, duplicated effort and leaves the hardest problems, data standards, procurement reform, interoperability, unsolved.

THE NETHERLANDS

Bart Brink (TKI Bouw en Techniek) presented the most comprehensive national program at the conference: government-backed AI for the built environment, with public co-investment, industry sandboxes, and deliberate pairing of technology deployment with business model transition support. Pre-competitive data collaboration benefits all participating firms. The template other nations should study.

Bart Brink, TKI Bouw en Techniek — Session 8

SWEDEN

Academic-industry partnerships producing business model research at Tampere University. Tengbom's Ivana Kildsgaard described the Swedish AI Playbook and its implications for consultancy pricing. Research on business model transitions for Scandinavian AEC firms. An unusual combination: commercial firms funding the research that will reshape their own pricing models.

Ivana Kildsgaard, Tengbom; Piia Sormunen, Tampere University — Session 8

FINLAND

Active BIM standardization infrastructure through the Building Information Foundation RTS. Tommi Arola described Finland's national effort to standardize and open BIM data for AI use. The host country's position: data standards as national infrastructure, not proprietary competitive advantage. Enables the AI ecosystem rather than competing within it.

Tommi Arola, Building Information Foundation RTS — Session 4

\$1.1M

US DOT pooled fund from 17 states for joint AI research and development. Jesse Nyberg (HNTB) cited MassDOT leadership of a collective infrastructure model that individual state budgets could not sustain alone. Collective action working at national scale in the US transportation sector.

THE CORE TENSION: INDIVIDUAL INNOVATION VS. COLLECTIVE COORDINATION

From an economic perspective, there is no reason to compete in a sector with labor shortage and more work than any firm can do alone. Yet firms also need competitive differentiation to justify AI investment. The resolution is not either-or. The Dutch TKI model separates what should be competitive (client-facing capabilities, proprietary workflows) from what should be collaborative (data standards, interoperability protocols, training datasets). Build the commons together; compete on what you do with it.

The organizations that were experimenting in Helsinki in March 2026, from 38 countries, are building commercial structures and technical capabilities that will be baseline requirements in 48 months. The firms that are still running isolated pilots in 2028 will not be catching up. They will be restructuring.



The question is, if we have to upskill people through the technology or if the technology has to downscale to people, and I think the latter is more important.

Sigrid Brell-Cokcan, RWTH Aachen University — Closing Session, final answer of the conference

"In the next decade it's not our competitors that are going to do what we do better. The next ticket belongs to those who are going to make what we do irrelevant based on the new opportunities that are possible right now with AI."

Sam Zolfagharian, YegaTech — Keynote 1

"AI innovation is drastically outpacing our ability to adopt new tools and our ability to absorb capability inside of the organization. AI capability is improving at an exponential rate. But inside our organization, we're improving at a linear rate."

Bhrgan Paramanatham, AECOM — Session 5 Keynote

"Any vendors that suggested they have very sophisticated data, let me tell you something: they lied. Construction data is very simple data. A simple model works well, is interpretable, and the accuracy is high."

Roxi Mkhani, Kingston University London — Session 11

The closing inversion is not anti-progress. It is better engineering.

Voice-controlled BIM, conversational buildings, simple models that construction workers trust and verify: these are not concessions to reluctant users. They are the design principle that makes progress possible at scale. The organizations that will lead the next decade are not the ones with the most sophisticated AI. They are the ones willing to rebuild how they work, think, and charge. The transformation gap is organizational, not technological. Technology downscaling to people is the architecture that closes it.

Key Takeaways & Conference at a Glance

- 1

Fix the organizational architecture, not the technology
95% of AEC organizations report no AI ROI because the organizational vehicle was designed for human limitations. Restructure workflows, billing models, and team architecture before buying more tools. The Formula One engine needs a new carriage.
- 2

Audit your billing model before deploying more AI
When AI saves 10 hours and you charge the same hourly fee, the productivity gain is invisible to revenue. Map every service line where AI has reduced delivery time by more than 20%. Calculate the margin impact now. Pilot outcome-based pricing with one trusted client within six months.
- 3

Culture before governance: use Henning Larsen's four principles
Governance frameworks written before adoption create friction that prevents the experimentation needed to discover what works. Six months of culture-first exploration, with an experiment log and no approval barriers. Then write governance from real practice.
- 4

Build the gear system: connect every pilot to delivery
Before approving any AI pilot, require a one-page gear map: how does this connect to a live project, a client deliverable, and a billing line? Isolated gears spinning faster break the machine. Kill pilots that cannot complete the map.
- 5

Technology must downscale to people, not the other way around
Voice interfaces, simple models, context-aware agents that fit existing workflows will outperform sophisticated tools that demand practitioners become technologists. The AI Capability Pyramid's lower tiers are enabled by downscaled tools. Only champions (5-10% of staff) need genuine technical upskilling.

CONFERENCE AT A GLANCE

300+

registered participants

38

countries represented

50

presentations, 4 continents

82%

on-site attendance

6th

event in the series

THE DEFINING TENSION

95%

no ROI from AI investment

90%

already using LLMs

TOP THEMES

Transformation Gap

Culture First

Hours Billing Crisis

Agentic AI

Data Quality

Human Agency

National Strategies

Capability Overhang

AI + Sustainability

Trust + Verification

"In the next decade it's not our competitors that are going to do what we do better. The next ticket belongs to those who are going to make what we do irrelevant."

Sam Zolfagharian, YegaTech



Are you building the gear system, or just buying more gears?

The transformation gap is organizational, not technological. The tools are real, the capability is proven, and the path is clear for those willing to rebuild how they work, think, and charge. The first-mover window closes in 2027-2028. The organizations building commercial architecture now will set the baseline everyone else must meet.

AI in AEC 2026

March 18–19, 2026 • Helsinki, Finland

6th International Conference on AI in Architecture, Engineering & Construction

Organised by RIL - Finnish Association of Civil Engineers