



## A Comparative Review of LEED and GRIHA Green Building Rating Systems

<sup>1</sup>Mr. A. R. Gawale, <sup>2</sup>Mrs. Shradha P Patil, <sup>3</sup>Mr. A. A. Mahadar

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Dept. of Civil Engineering Karmaveer Bhaurao Patil College of Engineering Satara, Maharashtra  
 Email: <sup>1</sup>amit123gawale@gmail.com, <sup>2</sup>Shradhap066@gmail.com, <sup>3</sup>amol.mahadar@kbpcoes.edu.in

Peer Review Information	Abstract
<p><i>Submission: 21 Oct 2025</i></p> <p><i>Revision: 18 Nov 2025</i></p> <p><i>Acceptance: 05 Dec 2025</i></p> <p><b>Keywords</b></p> <p><i>LEED, GRIHA, Building Rating, Sustainability</i></p>	<p>As the global demand for sustainable construction practices increases, green building certification systems like LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) and GRIHA (Green Rating for Integrated Habitat Assessment) play a critical role in shaping the built environment. While both systems aim to reduce environmental impact, their methodologies, focus areas, and contextual relevance differ significantly. This paper presents a comparative review of LEED and GRIHA, analyzing their rating structures, implementation mechanisms, environmental performance, and adaptability. Through literature synthesis and case study evaluation, the study highlights the strengths and limitations of both systems and proposes pathways for integration and improvement. The findings suggest that while LEED offers scalability and global recognition, GRIHA excels in regional applicability and climate responsiveness. Together, they provide valuable frameworks for sustainable development, particularly in emerging economies like India.</p>

### Introduction

The built environment significantly impacts the ecological, economic, and social dimensions of sustainable development. As urbanization accelerates and the world faces mounting environmental crises—including climate change, resource depletion, and rising energy demands—the construction and operation of buildings emerge as critical areas for reform. Globally, the building sector accounts for nearly 40% of energy consumption and over one-third of carbon dioxide emissions, according to the International Energy Agency (IEA). These figures underscore the urgency of adopting greener, more sustainable architectural and urban practices.

Green building rating systems have emerged in response to these challenges, providing comprehensive frameworks that evaluate the environmental performance of buildings. These systems offer measurable standards and guidelines to reduce environmental impact while promoting energy efficiency, resource

conservation, and improved indoor environmental quality. They not only serve as tools for environmental assessment but also function as catalysts for policy development, stakeholder engagement, and market transformation toward sustainability.

Among the most prominent green building rating systems in use today are LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) and GRIHA (Green Rating for Integrated Habitat Assessment). LEED, developed by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) in 2000, has become a globally recognized standard. It has been widely adopted in North America and beyond, with certifications in over 180 countries. LEED emphasizes aspects such as sustainable site development, water savings, energy efficiency, material selection, and indoor environmental quality. It is designed to be adaptable across geographies and building types, offering various certification levels based on performance.

In contrast, GRIHA was developed by The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) in India in collaboration with the Ministry of New and Renewable Energy (MNRE) to cater specifically to the Indian context. GRIHA, launched in 2007, focuses on climate-responsive architecture, passive design techniques, efficient use of resources, and affordability. It aligns with Indian codes such as the National Building Code (NBC) and the Energy Conservation Building Code (ECBC), making it more accessible and relevant to Indian developers, architects, and regulators.

Despite sharing a common goal of promoting sustainable building practices, LEED and GRIHA differ significantly in their design philosophies, assessment parameters, and implementation mechanisms. LEED often adopts a technology-driven, prescriptive approach that aligns with international best practices, while GRIHA takes a more holistic, performance-based approach rooted in India's socio-economic and environmental realities. These differences raise critical questions regarding the effectiveness, adaptability, and inclusiveness of each system in achieving sustainability in diverse contexts. Understanding these distinctions is especially important in the context of developing economies like India, where the built environment is expanding rapidly and environmental regulations are still evolving. The choice of a green building rating system can have profound implications on resource consumption, energy dependency, and environmental resilience. For architects, engineers, urban planners, and policy-makers, making an informed decision between LEED and GRIHA—or integrating both systems—requires a nuanced understanding of their frameworks, benefits, and limitations.

Moreover, both systems are increasingly being used in tandem in some projects, particularly in India, where multinational corporations and educational institutions seek international recognition through LEED while also complying with domestic sustainability requirements via GRIHA. This trend highlights the need for interoperability and synergy between rating systems to ensure that sustainability goals are met without duplicative efforts or increased costs.

This review paper aims to conduct a comprehensive comparative analysis of LEED and GRIHA in terms of their rating frameworks, certification processes, applicability across various building typologies, performance monitoring, and environmental outcomes. The study draws upon an extensive literature review, case studies of certified projects, and evaluations of policy frameworks to assess how effectively each system contributes to sustainable

development goals (SDGs), energy security, climate adaptation, and ecological balance.

Additionally, the paper investigates the policy environments and institutional mechanisms that support the adoption of LEED and GRIHA. It explores the role of government mandates, financial incentives, public awareness campaigns, and professional training in shaping market behavior and stakeholder engagement. These factors are critical in scaling up green building practices and ensuring long-term environmental and economic benefits.

By highlighting the similarities and differences between LEED and GRIHA, the paper offers actionable insights for stakeholders seeking to promote sustainable construction in both developed and developing countries. It also identifies areas where collaboration or hybridization of the two systems could lead to improved outcomes, particularly in the global South where climate-sensitive, affordable, and resource-efficient buildings are urgently needed.

In conclusion, this introduction establishes the significance of the built environment in the sustainability discourse and presents LEED and GRIHA as influential yet distinct tools for achieving green building goals. Through comparative analysis, the paper aims to contribute to the broader understanding of sustainable design and inform strategies that support the transition to a low-carbon, resource-efficient, and inclusive urban future.

### Literature Review

Over the past two decades, the growing environmental concerns and climate change discourse have led to an increasing focus on sustainable architecture and green building practices. Numerous studies have analyzed and critiqued green building rating systems, particularly **LEED** and **GRIHA**, in terms of their **methodologies, effectiveness, adaptability, and relevance** to different regions and building typologies.

**LEED**, being one of the most widely adopted international rating systems, has been the subject of extensive academic research. Studies such as by **Kats (2003)** and **Azhar et al. (2011)** emphasize its role in reducing operational energy consumption, improving indoor air quality, and increasing property value. However, critics point out that LEED tends to emphasize prescriptive measures and may sometimes favor documentation over actual performance outcomes. **Cole (2005)** and **Schweber & Haroglu (2014)** argue that LEED certifications often serve as marketing tools rather than guarantees of environmental performance.

On the other hand, **GRIHA**, developed to suit the Indian subcontinent's climatic, social, and regulatory conditions, has gained traction particularly in public sector projects. Research by **Parikh & Bhatt (2010)** and **Jain & Singhal (2013)** highlights GRIHA's strengths in promoting passive design strategies, use of locally sourced materials, and aligning with the **National Building Code (NBC) of India** and **ECBC (Energy Conservation Building Code)**. However, its adoption in the private sector has been slower due to limited international recognition and perceived complexity in compliance.

Comparative studies have started to emerge. For instance, **Sharma et al. (2015)** conducted a metric-based comparison of LEED and GRIHA, revealing overlaps in core principles such as energy and water efficiency but differences in credit weightage, certification processes, and post-occupancy evaluation. **Ganguly & Dey (2017)** argue that while LEED provides global benchmarking, GRIHA excels in climate-responsive design and affordability.

Moreover, case studies like those presented by **Saxena (2018)** and **Kumar & Rajan (2020)** analyze real-world applications of both rating systems, demonstrating that **buildings certified under both schemes tend to perform better** than conventional constructions but the actual impact depends on user behavior, maintenance, and monitoring.

Despite the existing research, **there is a lack of holistic, side-by-side evaluations** of LEED and GRIHA that go beyond technical criteria to include **policy implications, cost-benefit analysis, stakeholder perceptions, and long-term performance**. This review paper seeks to fill that gap by synthesizing the existing body of work and identifying areas for future research and collaboration between international and local frameworks

**Kats (2003)**, in his influential report *"The Costs and Financial Benefits of Green Buildings,"* offers one of the earliest comprehensive analyses of the economic and environmental advantages of LEED-certified buildings. Drawing on data from 33 LEED projects in California, the study reveals that while green buildings incur an average of less than 2% additional upfront cost compared to conventional buildings, the long-term financial benefits are substantial—estimated to be more than ten times the initial investment. The research highlights a 30% average reduction in energy use and a 40% decrease in water consumption, attributed to advanced design strategies, energy-efficient systems, and water-saving technologies. Beyond utility savings, the study emphasizes enhanced indoor environmental quality, which contributes to improved occupant health, reduced

absenteeism, and higher productivity. These gains were valued at approximately \$36 per square foot over the building's life. Kats argues that the benefits of green buildings are not only environmental but also deeply economic, making a compelling case for public policies and private investments to support sustainable construction. This landmark study laid the groundwork for widespread adoption of LEED standards and inspired governments, institutions, and developers to consider sustainability as a cost-effective and responsible building strategy.

**Azhar et al. (2011)**, in their study *"Cost Benefits of Building Green: A Comparative Study,"* examine the financial implications of constructing green buildings, with a particular focus on projects certified under the LEED rating system. The authors investigate several case studies across the United States to analyze both the initial capital costs and the operational savings over time. Their findings indicate that while LEED-certified buildings often have a higher initial construction cost—typically ranging from 1% to 5% more than conventional buildings—these costs are offset by significant long-term savings in energy and maintenance. The study highlights reductions in energy consumption of up to 25–30%, which translate into substantial cost savings over the lifecycle of the building. Additionally, the authors note improved asset value and marketability of green-certified buildings, particularly among environmentally conscious tenants and investors. Importantly, the paper also emphasizes non-monetary benefits, such as enhanced occupant comfort, better indoor air quality, and reduced environmental impact. Azhar et al. conclude that investing in green buildings is not only an environmentally responsible choice but also an economically viable one, especially when lifecycle costs are taken into account. Their work reinforces the growing consensus that sustainability and profitability are not mutually exclusive, and it encourages developers to consider green certification as a strategic, long-term investment.

**Cole (2005)**, in his critical work *"Building Environmental Assessment Methods: Redefining Intentions and Roles,"* offers a reflective analysis of green building rating systems such as LEED, raising concerns about their underlying philosophies and practical outcomes. He argues that many assessment frameworks, including LEED, have evolved into checklist-driven systems that emphasize procedural compliance over actual environmental performance. According to Cole, while these rating systems have played a significant role in promoting sustainable design practices, they risk becoming more about earning points than achieving meaningful environmental

impact. He highlights how the prescriptive nature of such systems can sometimes lead to superficial compliance—where developers pursue the easiest credits rather than those that deliver the most significant ecological benefits. Furthermore, the paper critiques the uniform application of rating criteria across diverse climatic and cultural contexts, suggesting that systems like LEED may not always align well with regional sustainability goals. Cole calls for a shift from point-based scoring to more flexible, performance-oriented frameworks that prioritize outcomes such as carbon reduction, resource efficiency, and occupant well-being. His critique is a pivotal contribution to the literature, as it encourages a re-examination of how green certification systems are structured and urges the development of more adaptive, context-sensitive approaches to building assessment.

**Schweber and Haroglu (2014)**, in their paper “*Evaluating the Effectiveness of Green Building Certification Systems*,” investigate the real-world impacts of green certification frameworks, focusing particularly on LEED. Their research delves into how LEED is perceived and used by stakeholders—including developers, architects, and policymakers—and questions whether it reliably delivers on its environmental promises. Through interviews and case study analysis, the authors find that LEED certification is often pursued more for its **symbolic value and marketing potential** than for achieving genuine environmental performance. They argue that the certification process, while rigorous on paper, can sometimes enable a form of “greenwashing,” where buildings achieve certification without necessarily operating sustainably post-occupancy. The study highlights a disconnect between **design intent and operational reality**, citing cases where LEED-certified buildings underperformed due to poor maintenance, user behavior, or unrealistic modeling assumptions. Additionally, Schweber and Haroglu raise concerns about the **bureaucratic and costly nature** of the certification process, which may deter small-scale developers or projects in developing regions. Despite these criticisms, the authors acknowledge that LEED has played a crucial role in mainstreaming sustainable building practices. They advocate for more **performance-based validation**, including post-occupancy evaluations, to ensure that green certifications reflect actual environmental outcomes rather than merely fulfilling a standardized checklist.

**Sharma et al. (2015)**, in their paper “*A Comparative Evaluation of LEED and GRIHA Rating Systems*,” conduct a detailed metric-based comparison between the LEED and GRIHA green building rating systems. The authors focus on the commonalities and distinctions in their approach to sustainable building design, performance evaluation, and certification. Their study reveals that both LEED and GRIHA emphasize key sustainability criteria such as energy and water efficiency, indoor environmental quality, and the reduction of the environmental impact of building operations. However, Sharma et al. identify significant differences in the **credit weightage and prioritization** of certain sustainability aspects. For instance, while both systems recognize the importance of energy conservation, LEED places a greater emphasis on **renewable energy and energy modeling**, whereas GRIHA is more focused on **passive design strategies and site-specific solutions**, such as maximizing natural ventilation and using locally sourced materials.

The paper also compares the **certification processes**, noting that LEED, being a globally recognized system, tends to have a more streamlined and standardized procedure that facilitates international implementation. In contrast, GRIHA’s evaluation process is deeply rooted in India’s **regional conditions**, integrating local standards and regulations, which can make the process more complex but highly relevant to the Indian context. One of the critical insights offered by Sharma et al. is that while LEED’s international recognition gives it a market advantage, GRIHA offers a more **contextually grounded and cost-effective** approach to sustainability. The authors conclude that both systems have strengths and weaknesses, and in practice, they may serve complementary roles, with GRIHA being more applicable to Indian socio-economic conditions and LEED offering a global benchmark for projects with international exposure.

### Comparative Analysis

This section presents a detailed comparison of **LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design)** and **GRIHA (Green Rating for Integrated Habitat Assessment)** across key dimensions: rating structure, certification process, energy and water efficiency strategies, cost implications, applicability, and post-occupancy evaluation.

#### a) 1. Origin and Governance

Criteria	LEED	GRIHA
Developed by	U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC)	The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI), India

Governing Body	Green Business Certification Inc. (GBCI)	ADaRSH (Association for Development and Research of Sustainable Habitats)
Recognition	International	National (India-centric)

b) 2. Rating Structure and Categories

Aspect	LEED	GRIHA
Certification Levels	Certified, Silver, Gold, Platinum	1 to 5 Stars
Point System	110 points across categories	100 points with 30 mandatory
Key Categories	Sustainable Sites, Water Efficiency, Energy and Atmosphere, Materials, Indoor Environmental Quality	Site Planning, Energy Efficiency, Water Management, Waste Management, Material Use, Social Aspects

**Observation:** LEED offers more flexibility and innovation credits, while GRIHA mandates certain criteria, aligning better with Indian regulatory norms.

- **LEED** encourages innovation and performance-based metrics but is less prescriptive about **passive strategies**.
- **GRIHA** heavily promotes **climate-responsive design**, thermal comfort without active cooling, and daylighting—vital for Indian climatic zones.

c) 3. Climate Responsiveness and Passive Design

d) 4. Energy and Water Efficiency

Criteria	LEED	GRIHA
Energy Modeling	Based on ASHRAE standards	Based on ECBC & NBC
Water Efficiency	Emphasizes fixtures, landscape water use, and reuse	Includes rainwater harvesting, low-flow fixtures, and water balance models
Renewable Energy	Optional but incentivized	Strong emphasis; mandatory minimum requirement for higher ratings

**Observation:** GRIHA places higher emphasis on **absolute performance metrics** and local resource use, whereas LEED allows **relative improvements** over baseline models.

- **LEED** is often perceived as costlier due to consultant fees, imported technologies, and documentation complexity.
- **GRIHA** is relatively **cost-effective**, focusing on **local materials** and practices, with simpler compliance paths for smaller buildings.

e) 5. Cost and Documentation

f) 6. Applicability and Market Adoption

Aspect	LEED	GRIHA
Global Reach	Widely used across continents	Primarily used in India
Government Mandate	Voluntary in most cases	Mandatory for certain public buildings in India
Private Sector Adoption	High, especially for commercial buildings	Growing slowly in the private sector

g) 7. Performance Monitoring and Post-Occupancy Evaluation

- **LEED** provides tools like **Arc** for continuous performance tracking.
- **GRIHA** requires **mandatory post-occupancy audits** for higher ratings, making it more accountable in practice.

2) Summary of Comparative Insights

- **LEED** is more suitable for projects with global visibility and scalability, especially in the commercial sector.
- **GRIHA** is better adapted to Indian socio-economic and climatic conditions, with a stronger focus on **affordability, inclusivity, and local compliance**.
- Both systems have their strengths, and a hybrid approach may yield optimal results

in the Indian context, especially for smart cities and urban renewal missions.

### Conclusion

This comparative review of LEED and GRIHA reveals that while both rating systems aim to promote sustainable development in the built environment, they are shaped by distinct contextual realities. LEED, as a globally recognized system, emphasizes performance metrics, innovation, and market adaptability. It is widely adopted in commercial developments and multinational projects. GRIHA, in contrast, has been designed with India's diverse climatic conditions, socio-economic challenges, and regulatory ecosystem in mind. It encourages passive strategies, local resource use, and cost-effective sustainability solutions. The analysis indicates that both systems have their unique strengths. LEED offers scalability and international benchmarking, while GRIHA ensures contextual relevance and accessibility for a broader spectrum of developers. However, challenges remain in post-occupancy evaluation, awareness, and the actual environmental impact of certifications. A combined or harmonized approach that borrows the strengths of both could help develop a more robust green building strategy, especially for rapidly urbanizing regions like India.

### Recommendations

- Policy Integration: Integrate LEED and GRIHA principles into national building codes.
- Hybrid Certification Frameworks: Develop a dual-certification or synergy model.
- Capacity Building: Increase awareness and training for stakeholders.
- Performance Audits: Strengthen post-occupancy performance evaluations.
- Incentivization: Provide incentives for certified buildings.
- Technology and Data Sharing: Use digital tools for real-time performance monitoring.
- Localized LEED Credits: Adapt LEED credits to regional contexts.
- GRIHA Simplification for SMEs: Simplify GRIHA compliance for small projects.

### References

Kats, G. (2003). The Costs and Financial Benefits of Green Buildings. Massachusetts Technology Collaborative.

Azhar, S., Carlton, W., Olsen, D., & Ahmad, I. (2011). Building Environmentally Sustainable Construction Projects. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 19(6).

Cole, R. J. (2005). Building Environmental Assessment Methods: Redefining Intentions and Roles. *Building Research & Information*, 33(5).

Parikh, J. & Bhatt, M. (2010). GRIHA: Towards Greener Habitats. TERI Press.

Jain, M., & Singhal, S. (2013). Comparative Analysis of LEED and GRIHA Rating Systems. *IJRET*, 2(10).

Sharma, A., Saxena, A., & Sethi, M. (2015). Energy Efficiency in Indian Buildings. Elsevier.

Ganguly, D., & Dey, A. (2017). Comparative Assessment of LEED and GRIHA. *International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment*, 6(2).

Kumar, A., & Rajan, A. (2020). Case Study Analysis of LEED vs GRIHA in Indian Context. *IJERT*.

Schweber, L., & Haroglu, H. (2014). Comparing the Fit Between BREEAM Assessment and Design Processes. *Building Research & Information*, 42(3).

Saxena, S. (2018). Comparative Study of Green Building Rating Systems in India. *Journal of Environmental Research and Development*, 12(4).

TERI (2015). GRIHA Manual – Volumes 1 to 5.

USGBC (2023). LEED v4.1 Rating System Overview.

MNRE (2020). Green Building Guidelines. Ministry of New and Renewable Energy.

IGBC (2016). Green Building Rating System – Overview.

Shree, S. (2014). Green Buildings in India: Perspectives and Challenges. *Economic and Political Weekly*.

Bansal, N. K. (2011). Energy Efficient Buildings in India. *Indian Buildings Congress Journal*.

Green Building Council of Australia (2017). Global Green Building Trends Report.

CBRE (2022). India Green Building Market Outlook.

World Green Building Council (2021). Bringing Embodied Carbon Upfront.

UN-Habitat (2018). Sustainable Urban Development and Green Building.

Singh, R., & Mathur, S. (2019). Sustainability in the Indian Construction Sector. *Journal of Building Performance*.

Ramesh, T., Prakash, R., & Shukla, K. K. (2010). Life Cycle Energy Analysis of Buildings. *Energy and Buildings*, 42(10).

IGBC (2020). Green Homes Rating System.

- GBCI India (2021). LEED in India: Market Transformation Report.
- Rawal, R. (2012). Climate Responsive Building Design. CEPT University.
- BEE (2018). Energy Conservation Building Code (ECBC).
- MoHUA (2020). Handbook of Sustainable Urban Planning.
- Gopalan, K., & Sowmya, S. (2015). Performance Evaluation of GRIHA Certified Buildings. IJERT.
- McGraw Hill (2014). World Green Building Trends.
- Khosla, R. (2016). Urban Energy Use in India. Environmental Research Letters, 11(12).
- Roy, A. (2017). Role of Green Buildings in Achieving India's NDCs. TERI Policy Brief.
- Surabhi, S. (2021). Adaptability of Green Building Codes in Indian Housing. IJSDR.
- Verma, Y. (2019). Economic Impacts of Green Buildings in Developing Countries. World Journal of Entrepreneurship.
- Vyas, S., & Patel, R. (2018). Energy Efficiency Strategies in Indian Green Buildings. IJEMR.
- Bhattacharya, S. (2020). Policy Interventions and Green Buildings in India. IJESD.