

**MEGAPROJECT RISK ANALYSIS AND
SIMULATION: A DYNAMIC SYSTEMS
APPROACH**

MEGAPROJECT RISK ANALYSIS AND SIMULATION: A DYNAMIC SYSTEMS APPROACH

BY

PRINCE BOATENG

Koforidua Technical University, Koforidua, Ghana

ZHEN CHEN

University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK

STEPHEN O. OGUNLANA

Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK



United Kingdom – North America – Japan – India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2017

Copyright © 2017 Emerald Publishing Limited

The right of Prince Boateng, Zhen Chen, and Stephen O. Ogunlana to be identified as the Authors of this Work has been asserted in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

Reprints and permissions service

Contact: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. Any opinions expressed in the chapters are those of the authors. Whilst Emerald makes every effort to ensure the quality and accuracy of its content, Emerald makes no representation implied or otherwise, as to the chapters' suitability and application and disclaims any warranties, express or implied, to their use.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Classification (LCC) – HE1-9990

BIC - KJMP

BISAC - BUS101000

Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) – 388

ISBN: 978-1-78635-831-8 (Print)

ISBN: 978-1-78635-830-1 (Online)

ISBN: 978-1-78714-301-2 (Epub)



ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

To our families

Contents

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Abbreviations | <i>xi</i> |
| List of Figures | <i>xv</i> |
| List of Tables | <i>xix</i> |
| List of Exhibits | <i>xxv</i> |
| List of Equations | <i>xxvii</i> |
| Acknowledgements | <i>xxix</i> |
| About the Authors | <i>xxxi</i> |
| Preface | <i>xxxiii</i> |
| Foreword | <i>xxxv</i> |
| | |
| Chapter 1 Introduction | <i>1</i> |
| 1.1. Introduction | <i>1</i> |
| 1.2. The Problem with Megaprojects | <i>2</i> |
| 1.2.1. Megaproject Risks | <i>2</i> |
| 1.2.2. Megaproject Risk Assessment | <i>4</i> |
| 1.2.3. A New Risk Assessment Framework | <i>5</i> |
| 1.3. Purpose and Scope | <i>6</i> |
| 1.4. Structure of the Book | <i>9</i> |
| 1.5. Originality and Value | <i>10</i> |
| 1.6. Summary | <i>12</i> |
| | |
| Chapter 2 The Edinburgh Tram Network (ETN) Project | <i>15</i> |
| 2.1. Introduction | <i>15</i> |
| 2.2. Background to the Project | <i>15</i> |
| 2.2.1. The 1871–1956 Era | <i>15</i> |
| 2.2.2. The New Edinburgh Tram Network | <i>16</i> |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 2.2.3. Tram Network Construction and Civil Engineering Works | 17 |
| 2.2.4. Contractual Disputes | 28 |
| 2.3. STEEP Risks | 28 |
| 2.3.1. Social Issues | 28 |
| 2.3.2. Technical Issues | 29 |
| 2.3.3. Environmental Issues | 33 |
| 2.3.4. Political Issues | 35 |
| 2.4. Summary | 40 |
| Chapter 3 Megaproject Risks Assessment Framework | 43 |
| 3.1. Introduction | 43 |
| 3.2. Risk Analysis Framework | 46 |
| 3.2.1. The ANP Modelling Route | 48 |
| 3.2.2. The SD Modelling Route | 55 |
| 3.3. Risk Clusters | 58 |
| 3.3.1. The Social Risks Cluster | 59 |
| 3.3.2. Technical Risk Cluster | 61 |
| 3.3.3. Economic Risks | 64 |
| 3.3.4. Environmental Risk Cluster | 68 |
| 3.3.5. Political Risk Cluster | 70 |
| 3.4. Summary | 74 |
| Chapter 4 Megaproject Risk Quantification | 77 |
| 4.1. Introduction | 77 |
| 4.2. Analysis of Risk Interdependency | 77 |
| 4.2.1. Qualitative Approaches | 78 |
| 4.2.2. The Quantitative Approach | 81 |
| 4.2.3. Descriptive Quantitative Results and Analysis | 82 |
| 4.2.4. Standardized Quantitative Results and Analysis | 84 |
| 4.2.5. Adjustments of Participants' Opinions | 85 |
| 4.3. ANP Model | 85 |
| 4.4. Pairwise Comparison | 92 |
| 4.5. Risk Interdependency Matrix | 93 |
| 4.5.1. Project Objectives Cluster | 93 |
| 4.5.2. Potential Risks Cluster | 95 |
| 4.5.3. Potential Risks Sub-Clusters | 95 |
| 4.6. Supermatrix Calculation | 110 |
| 4.7. Risk Rating | 119 |
| 4.8. Consistency Test | 119 |
| 4.9. Risk Priority Index (RPI) | 124 |
| 4.10. Summary | 128 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Chapter 5 Risk Simulation | 131 |
| 5.1. Introduction | 131 |
| 5.2. Project Risk Systems Model | 131 |
| 5.2.1. Model Causality | 133 |
| 5.2.2. Initial Model Development | 135 |
| 5.2.3. System Boundaries | 136 |
| 5.3. STEEP Risks System | 141 |
| 5.3.1. Social Risks System | 141 |
| 5.3.2. Technical Risks System | 145 |
| 5.3.3. Economic Risks System | 148 |
| 5.3.4. Environmental Risks System | 154 |
| 5.3.5. Political Risks System | 157 |
| 5.4. System Verification | 162 |
| 5.5. System Modelling, Testing and Simulation | 165 |
| 5.5.1. Integrated Stock and Flow STEEP Models | 165 |
| 5.5.2. Model Equation Formulation | 169 |
| 5.5.3. Model Evaluation Tests | 170 |
| 5.5.4. Dynamic Simulation Results and Discussion | 184 |
| 5.6. System Validation | 216 |
| 5.6.1. Structure Verification | 218 |
| 5.6.2. Parameter Verification | 219 |
| 5.6.3. Boundary Adequacy | 219 |
| 5.6.4. Dimensional Consistency | 219 |
| 5.7. Summary | 221 |
| | |
| Chapter 6 Conclusions | 223 |
| 6.1. Introduction | 223 |
| 6.2. Value for Practice | 223 |
| 6.3. Contribution and Impacts | 226 |
| 6.4. Practical Guide | 229 |
| 6.5. Limitations and Further Research | 232 |
| 6.5.1. Limitations | 232 |
| 6.5.2. Further Research | 234 |
| | |
| References | 235 |
| | |
| Appendices | 249 |
| Appendix A: Model Validation | 250 |
| Appendix B: Structured Interview Questionnaire and Participants | 289 |
| Appendix C: Respondent's Mean Scores of Importance | 291 |
| | |
| Index | 327 |

Abbreviations

| | |
|-------|---|
| ANP | Analytical Network Process |
| AHP | Analytic Hierarchical Process |
| BBS | Bilfinger Berger Civil (UK) and Siemens plc |
| CEC | City of Edinburgh Council |
| CDR | Cost of Dispute Resolution |
| CDUD | Cost of Delay in Utility Diversion |
| CI | Consistency Index |
| CLA | Cost of Legal Action |
| CLD | Causal Loop Diagram |
| COD | Cost of Delays |
| COR | Cost of Rework |
| CR | Consistency Ratio |
| DEG | De-Escalation to Grievances |
| Disp. | Disputes |
| DOAF | Delay of All Forms |
| DOC | Delay in Obtaining Consent |
| EC | Economic Certainties |
| EcRM | Economic Risks Model |
| ETN | Edinburgh Tram Network (Project) |
| EG | Escalation to Grievances |
| EnC | Environmental Certainties |
| EnR | Environmental Risks |
| EnRE | Environmental Regulation Enforcement |
| EnRM | Environmental Risks Model |
| EnU | Environmental Uncertainties |
| EP | Energy Price |
| EPC | Engineering, Procurement and Construction |
| EPCO | Escalation to Project Cost Overrun |
| EPTO | Escalation to Project Time Overrun |

| | |
|--------|--|
| ER | Economic Risks |
| ERM | Environmental Resource Management |
| ErG | Error Generation |
| EU | Economic Uncertainties |
| FE | Foreign Exchange |
| GCP | Ground Conditions Problem at a Given Site |
| GFP | Government Funding Policy |
| IPV | Ideal Priority Value |
| LA | Legal Actions |
| LD | Liquidated Damages |
| LIR | Local Inflation Rate |
| LRC | Legislative & Regulation Changes |
| IRPI | Ideal Synthesized Risk Priority Indexes |
| IRPV | Ideal Risk Priority Index |
| MCDM | Multi-Criterion Decision Making |
| MLDMBI | Multi-Level Decision-Making Bodies Involvement |
| MP | Material Price |
| MPDS | Modification to Project Design & Specification |
| MPH | Material Price Hike |
| MUDFA | Multi-Utilities Framework Agreement |
| NPV | Normal Priority Value |
| O&M | Operations and Maintenance |
| PA | Social Acceptability |
| PC | Political Certainties |
| PDP | Political Debates on the Project |
| PH | Political Harmony |
| PI | Political Indecision |
| PIP | Political Interferences in the Project |
| PMPS | Pressure to Modify Project Scope |
| PoRM | Political Risks Model |
| PQD | Project Quality Deficiency |
| PR | Political Risks |
| Proj.C | Project Complexity |
| PS | Political Support |

| | |
|--------|--|
| Proj.S | Project Scope |
| PT | Project Termination |
| PU | Political Uncertainties |
| RMSI | Respondent's Mean Scores of Importance |
| RPCO | Risks of Project Cost Overrun |
| RPI | Risk Prioritization Index |
| RPIG | Global Risks Priority Index |
| RPIL | Local Risk Priority Index |
| RPTO | Risks of Project Time Overrun |
| SC | Social Certainties |
| SD | System dynamics |
| SFM | Stock and Flow Model |
| SG | Social Grievances |
| SI | Social Issues |
| SoRM | Social Risks Model |
| SPV | Special Purpose Vehicle |
| SR | Social Risks |
| SU | Social Uncertainties |
| TC | Technical Certainties |
| TDUU | Time to Divert Underground Utilities |
| TeRM | Technical Risks Model |
| TIE | Transport Initiatives Edinburgh Ltd. |
| TPAS | Threat to Personal & Asset Security |
| TPV | Total Priority Value |
| TR | Technical Risks |
| TRO | Traffic Regulation Order |
| TRPI | Total Risk Priority Index |
| TU | Technical Uncertainties |
| WCP | Worksite Coordination Problems |
| WQS | Weighted Quantitative Score |
| WI | Wage Inflation |

| | | |
|------------------|---|-----|
| Figure 5.14 | Causal loop diagram for environmental risks system. | 155 |
| Figure 5.15 | Causes tree diagrams for the environmental risks model. | 158 |
| Figure 5.16 | Uses tree diagrams for the environmental risks model. | 159 |
| Figure 5.17 | Causal loop diagram for political risks system.. . . . | 160 |
| Figure 5.18 | Causes tree diagrams for the political risks model.. . . . | 163 |
| Figure 5.19 | Uses tree diagrams for the political risks model. | 164 |
| Figure 5.20 | A typical stock and flow model (SFM). | 165 |
| Figure 5.21 | Integrated stock and flow diagram for the social risks system.. . . . | 167 |
| Figure 5.22 | Integrated stock and flow diagram for the technical risks system. | 167 |
| Figure 5.23 | Integrated stock and flow diagram for the economic risk system. | 168 |
| Figure 5.24 | Integrated stock and flow diagram for the environmental risks system. | 169 |
| Figure 5.25 | Integrated stock and flow diagram for the political risks model. | 170 |
| Figure 5.26 | A typical SD equation representation. | 184 |
| Figure 5.27 | Evaluation tests for the STEEP risks models. | 185 |
| Figure 5.28 | Dynamic risk-free simulation patterns for social risks system model. | 196 |
| Figure 5.29 | Dynamic scenario graphs for the social risks system model. | 199 |
| Figure 5.30 | Simulation behaviour patterns for stocks in the technical risk system model | 203 |
| Figure 5.31 | Baserun and actual scenario simulation patterns for economic risks.. . . . | 206 |
| Figure 5.32 | Dynamic patterns for stock entities in the environmental risks model.. . . . | 209 |
| Figure 5.33 | Dynamic simulation patterns for stock entities in the political risks model.. . . . | 212 |
| Chapter 6 | | |
| Figure 6.1 | Proposed framework for dynamic risks assessment in megaproject. | 225 |

Appendices

| | | |
|------------|--|-----|
| Figure A1 | Model validation process. | 251 |
| Figure A2 | Behaviour reproduction test for the level of STEEP risks impacts on the system (all variables at baseline levels). | 259 |
| Figure A3 | Behaviour mode sensitivity graphs for social risks and social grievances.. . . . | 274 |
| Figure A4 | Behaviour mode sensitivity graphs for technical risks. | 275 |
| Figure A5 | Behaviour mode sensitivity graphs for economic risks.. . . . | 275 |
| Figure A6 | Behaviour mode sensitivity graphs for environmental risks.. . . . | 276 |
| Figure A7 | Behaviour mode sensitivity graphs for political risks. | 276 |
| Figure A8 | Dynamic confidence bounds sensitivity graph for social grievances. | 277 |
| Figure A9 | Dynamic confidence bounds sensitivity graph for technical risks. | 277 |
| Figure A10 | Dynamic confidence bounds sensitivity graph for economic risks.. . . . | 278 |
| Figure A11 | Dynamic confidence bounds sensitivity graph for environmental risks. | 278 |
| Figure A12 | Dynamic confidence bounds sensitivity graph for political risks. | 279 |
| Figure A13 | Disaggregation of the dynamic simulation models for transportation megaprojects.. | 283 |

List of Tables

Chapter 2

| | | |
|------------|---|----|
| Table 2.1 | Basic information of the ETN project. | 18 |
| Table 2.2 | The internal stakeholders of the ETN project. | 19 |
| Table 2.3 | The external stakeholders of the ETN project. | 21 |
| Table 2.4 | Stakeholder’s attitude and influence on ETN Project. . | 23 |
| Table 2.5 | Project organization of the ETN project. | 23 |
| Table 2.6 | Project environment of the ETN Project. | 24 |
| Table 2.7 | Original ETN project board governance structure.. . . | 26 |
| Table 2.8 | Bridges built to accommodate Edinburgh Tram.. . . . | 27 |
| Table 2.9 | Disputes and changes in the ETN project. | 29 |
| Table 2.10 | Project delivery against key milestones. | 30 |
| Table 2.11 | Organizations and groups consulted during the EIA for ETN Line One.. | 34 |
| Table 2.12 | Specific risks impacting on the project environment. . . | 38 |
| Table 2.13 | Specific technical risks impacting on the social and natural environments. | 40 |

Chapter 3

| | | |
|-----------|---|----|
| Table 3.1 | Relative importance and data transformation in pairwise comparison.. | 51 |
| Table 3.2 | The average random index. | 54 |
| Table 3.3 | Typical stakeholders involved in transport projects. . . | 60 |
| Table 3.4 | A summary of review on social risks cluster in megaprojects. | 62 |
| Table 3.5 | A summary of review on technical risks in megaprojects. | 65 |
| Table 3.6 | A summary of review on economic risks in megaprojects. | 69 |
| Table 3.7 | A summary of review on environmental risks in megaprojects. | 71 |
| Table 3.8 | Sources of environmental risks in mega construction projects. | 71 |

| | | |
|------------------|---|-----|
| Table 3.9 | A summary of review on political risks in megaprojects. | 75 |
| Chapter 4 | | |
| Table 4.1 | Summary of interviewees' profile and demography. . . | 79 |
| Table 4.2 | Summary of survey conducted. | 82 |
| Table 4.3 | Summary of descriptive results and analysis for the questionnaire survey.. . . . | 83 |
| Table 4.4 | Respondent's mean scores of importance. | 86 |
| Table 4.5 | Matrix for project objectives with respect to decision goal. | 94 |
| Table 4.6 | Comparison matrices for PR with respect to cost, time and quality. | 96 |
| Table 4.7 | Pairwise comparison matrix for social risk variables. | 98 |
| Table 4.8 | Pairwise comparison matrix for technical risk variables.. . . . | 100 |
| Table 4.9 | Pairwise comparison matrix for economic risk variables.. . . . | 103 |
| Table 4.10 | Pairwise comparison matrix for environmental risk variables.. . . . | 106 |
| Table 4.11 | Pairwise comparison matrix for political risk variables. | 107 |
| Table 4.12 | Unweighted super matrix for potential risks.. . . . | 111 |
| Table 4.13 | Weighted supermatrix for potential risks. | 112 |
| Table 4.14 | Final mode ANP decision-making priorities for potential risks cluster. | 113 |
| Table 4.15 | Final mode ANP decision-making priorities for social risk sub-cluster. | 114 |
| Table 4.16 | Final mode ANP decision-making priorities for technical risk sub-cluster. | 115 |
| Table 4.17 | Final mode ANP decision-making priorities for economic risks sub-cluster.. . . . | 116 |
| Table 4.18 | Final mode ANP decision-making priorities for Environmental Risk sub-cluster. | 117 |
| Table 4.19 | Final mode ANP decision-making priorities for political risk variables. | 118 |
| Table 4.20 | Deriving priorities for risks ratings. | 120 |

| | | |
|------------|--|-----|
| Table 4.21 | Verbal ratings for potential risks. | 120 |
| Table 4.22 | Verbal ratings for social risk variables.. . . . | 121 |
| Table 4.23 | Verbal ratings for technical risk variables. | 121 |
| Table 4.24 | Verbal ratings for economic risk variables.. . . . | 122 |
| Table 4.25 | Verbal ratings for environmental risk variables. | 123 |
| Table 4.26 | Verbal ratings for political risk variables. | 123 |
| Table 4.27 | Values of CI, RI, CR and inconsistency for all the pairwise comparison matrices. | 124 |
| Table 4.28 | Summary of final ANP decision-making priority results for all risks. | 125 |

Chapter 5

| | | |
|------------|---|-----|
| Table 5.1 | Technical uncertainties influence. | 135 |
| Table 5.2 | System boundary for social risks system.. . . . | 136 |
| Table 5.3 | System boundary for technical risks system. | 137 |
| Table 5.4 | System boundary for economic risks system.. . . . | 138 |
| Table 5.5 | System boundary for environmental risks system. | 139 |
| Table 5.6 | System boundary for political risks system. | 140 |
| Table 5.7 | Stock variables for STEEP models. | 166 |
| Table 5.8 | Mathematical equation for the social risks system variables.. | 171 |
| Table 5.9 | Mathematical equation for the technical risks system variables.. | 173 |
| Table 5.10 | Mathematical equation for the economic risks system variables.. | 176 |
| Table 5.11 | Mathematical equation for the environmental risks system variables. | 179 |
| Table 5.12 | Mathematical equation for the political risks system variables.. | 181 |
| Table 5.13 | ANP inputs to the STEEP risk system modelling. | 195 |
| Table 5.14 | Summary of the simulation results for the social risks system model. | 202 |
| Table 5.15 | Summary of dynamic simulation results for technical risks system model. | 205 |
| Table 5.16 | Dynamic simulation results for the economic risks system model. | 208 |

xxii List of Tables

| | | |
|-------------------|---|-----|
| Table 5.17 | Summary of the dynamic simulation results for environmental risks system. | 211 |
| Table 5.18 | Dynamic simulation results for the political risks system model. | 215 |
| Table 5.19 | One-way analysis of variance: The extent to which steep risks impact on project objectives. | 217 |
| Table 5.20 | Data validity on the ETN project. | 220 |
| Chapter 6 | | |
| Table 6.1 | SDANP procedure for risks reduction in megaprojects. | 228 |
| Table 6.2 | Practical guide for using SDANP methodology in megaprojects. | 230 |
| Appendices | | |
| Table A1 | Tests for building confidence in the integrated SDANP models.. . . . | 253 |
| Table A2 | Parameters in the STEEP models. | 256 |
| Table A3 | Parameter distributions of stock and exogenous system entities for STEEP risks models. | 261 |
| Table A4 | Numerical sensitivity test for the social risks parameters. | 263 |
| Table A5 | Numerical sensitivity test for the technical risks parameters. | 265 |
| Table A6 | Numerical sensitivity test for the economic risks parameters. | 267 |
| Table A7 | Numerical sensitivity test for the environmental risks parameters. | 269 |
| Table A8 | Numerical sensitivity test for the political risks parameters. | 271 |
| Table A9 | The significance of the dynamics simulation models for transportation megaprojects in addressing policy problems. | 285 |
| Table C1 | Respondent's mean scores of importance for project objectives (P_o). | 291 |
| Table C2 | Respondent's mean scores of importance for potential risks (PR1): Social risks. | 297 |
| Table C3 | Respondent's mean scores of importance for potential risks (PR2): Technical risks. | 303 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| Table C4 | Respondent's mean scores of importance for potential risks (PR3): Economic risks. | 309 |
| Table C5 | Respondent's mean scores of importance for potential risks (PR4): Environmental risks. | 315 |
| Table C6 | Respondent's mean scores of importance for potential risks (PR5): Political risks. | 321 |

List of Exhibits

Chapter 2

| | | |
|-------------|---|----|
| Exhibit 2.1 | Utility diversions for Edinburgh Trams Network construction | 27 |
| Exhibit 2.2 | Road interruption due to tram construction in the Edinburgh city centre | 32 |
| Exhibit 2.3 | Rework and adverse environmental impacts such as waste. | 35 |
| Exhibit 2.4 | The impact of bad weather conditions on productivity and construction delay | 36 |
| Exhibit 2.5 | Delayed construction process caused by bad weather conditions | 36 |
| Exhibit 2.6 | Poor well-being conditions on construction site: A worker was having his lunch in a cold rainy day. . . | 37 |

List of Equations

Chapter 3

| | | |
|---------------|--|----|
| Equation 3.1 | Weighted quantitative score method | 49 |
| Equation 3.2 | Pairwise comparison matrix computation | 52 |
| Equation 3.3 | Vector normalization | 53 |
| Equation 3.4 | Initial eigenvalue computation | 53 |
| Equation 3.5 | Maximum eigenvalue computation. | 53 |
| Equation 3.6 | Computation of value of consistency index | 54 |
| Equation 3.7 | Consistency ratio computation. | 54 |
| Equation 3.8 | Final risk prioritization index | 55 |
| Equation 3.9 | Mathematical definition of the integral for stock computation | 58 |
| Equation 3.10 | Basic stock computation | 58 |

Chapter 4

| | | |
|--------------|---|----|
| Equation 4.1 | Respondent's mean scores of importance | 85 |
| Equation 4.2 | Priority matrix computation for the project objectives | 93 |

Acknowledgements

This book summarizes a dedicated research funded and conducted under the megaproject management research theme at Heriot-Watt University and in the Scott Sutherland School of Architecture and Built Environment at Robert Gordon University in the United Kingdom. The research was also conducted through collaborative research amongst researchers from 24 European countries inside the COST Action TU1003 MEGAPROJECT (2011–2015), which was funded by the European Cooperation in Science and Technology (COST) and focuses on the effective design and delivery of megaprojects in the European Union. The COST Action on MEGAPROJECT was chaired by Professor Naomi Brookes at the University of Leeds in the United Kingdom.

The authors would like to thank all participants for making time and efforts to support the research through interview and questionnaire survey for data collection from the Edinburgh Tram Network (ETN) project. The authors would also like to thank colleagues at the COST Action TU1003 for their advice and comments on the research into the ETN project. Without their supports, this research cannot be completed.

The research theme on megaproject management at Heriot-Watt University was set up in 2012 and has been strongly supported by the following world renowned experts:

- Geoff Baskir, Chair, Aircraft/Airport Compatibility Committee, Transportation Research Board, National Academy of Sciences, USA
- Naomi Brookes, Professor of Complex Project Management, University of Leeds, and CEO, Projektlernen, UK
- Volker Buscher, Director, Global Digital Business, Arup, UK
- John Connaughton, Professor of Sustainable Construction, Head of Construction Management and Engineering, University of Reading, UK
- Henry Ergas, Professor of Infrastructure Economics, University of Wollongong, Australia
- Stuart Ladds, Head of Property Strategy & Logistics, College of Policing Limited, UK
- Heng Li, Chair Professor in Construction Informatics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China
- Edward W. Merrow, Founder and President, Independent Project Analysis, Inc., USA

xxx *Acknowledgements*

- Stanley G. Mitchell, CEO, Key Facilities Management International, Scotland. Chair, ISO TC 267 Facilities Management Committee
- David Mosey, Professor of Law and Director, Centre of Construction Law and Dispute Resolution, King's College London, UK
- John Pike, Chairman, Bellrock Property Services, UK
- Rodney Turner, Professor of Project Management, SKEMA Business School, France.

The authors would like to thank the entire publishing team at Emerald. Special thanks to colleagues at Emerald Publishing Limited, including Amy Barson, Senior Content Editor; Carole Caines, Books Production Controller; Nicki Dennis, Publisher; Charlotte Hales, Editorial Assistant; Liron Gilenberg, Cover Designer; Philippa Grand, Executive Publisher; Jen McCall, Publisher; and Kousalya Krishnamoorthy, Project Manager at MPS Limited.

About the Authors

Prince Boateng, PhD, MASCE, AFHEA, is Lecturer in Building Technology & Quantity Surveying in Koforidua Technical University, Ghana. He is a former Lecturer in Construction and Project Management at Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen, the United Kingdom. He is proficient in working with and analysing complex risk data. He uses analytical and system dynamics modelling tools to prioritize and simulate project risks overtime during risks assessment in megaprojects at the construction phase. He has used this expertise in developing innovative risk assessment tool known as SDANP methodology to model and predict project cost and time overruns in many megaprojects in Europe and Africa. Prince's areas of expertise include risks analysis and modelling with system dynamics and the analytical network process for multi-criteria decision making for the effective megaproject delivery within the European Union and beyond.

Zhen Chen is Lecturer in Construction Management in the Department of Architecture at the University of Strathclyde. He is a former Lecturer in Facilities Management and the founder and leader of Megaproject Management research theme at Heriot-Watt University. He serves at technical committees (Facility Management; Project, Programme and Portfolio Management; and Service Life Planning) at British Standards Institution (BSI), and technical committees (Airport Planning and Operations; and Infrastructure Resilience) at the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). He is a member of the management committee of COST Action TU1003 (The Effective Design and Delivery of Megaprojects in the European Union). He also serves at editorial boards for several international journals at ICE (*Engineering Sustainability*; *Infrastructure Asset Management*; *Management, Procurement and Law*; and *Waste and Resource Management*) and Elsevier (*International Journal of Project Management*). He is the Specialty Chief Editor on Construction Management for *Frontiers in Built Environment* published by EPFL in Switzerland. He is the Associate Editor for *Innovative Infrastructure Solutions* at Springer and *Frontiers in Built Environment* at EPFL. He has engaged in more than 30 research projects, worth over £5 million and has authored over 160 publications in construction engineering and management.

Stephen O. Ogunlana, BSc, PhD, is currently the Chair of Construction Project Management at the School of the Built Environment, Heriot-Watt University. Professor Ogunlana has an international reputation for research in the application of system dynamics simulation to construction projects

and organizations. He is the author of over 250 scholarly publications in top-tier journals and refereed conferences. He is also the editor of the book *Profitable Partnering for Construction Procurement* published by Taylor and Francis and *Training for Construction Industry Development* published by the CIB/AIT and co-editor of *Joint Ventures in Construction* (Thomas Telford) and *Public-Private Partnership in Infrastructure Development — Case Studies from Asia and Europe* (Bauhaus Universitat Weimar). His research work has been funded by the Canadian International Development Agency, European Union, Thai National Housing Authority, UNOCAL, Japanese Government, British Council etc. His works on leadership were awarded Emerald Literati Award for two consecutive years (2009 and 2010) for the most outstanding paper in the journal *Engineering Construction and Architectural Management*. Professor Ogunlana is the joint coordinator of CIB W107 Commission on Construction in Developing Economies and a member of the Editorial Board for over 10 internationally refereed academic journals including *Engineering Construction and Architectural Management*, the *International Journal of Financial Management of Property and Construction*, *International Journal of Energy Sector Management*, *International Journal of Construction Management*, *Journal of Engineering Development and Technology*, *Surveying and the Built Environment*, *Civil Engineering Dimensions* and *Akruti Journal of Infrastructure*. He has acted as external examiner for several top universities in the world.

Preface

This book provides technical details on a dynamic systems approach to megaproject risk analysis and simulation, and it is based on the authors' long-term research into megaproject management, multi-criteria decision making, and system dynamics. For the first time, the authors have attempted to find a technical solution to tackle overruns on cost and time in megaprojects, and this is based on a comprehensive set of risks associated with social, technical, economic, environmental and political (STEEP) issues in megaproject environment and a dynamic systems approach called SDANP. The approach is an integrated use of tools including analytic network process (ANP) and system dynamics (SD) for risks prioritization and simulation.

The new SDANP model is described in this book with a case study on the Edinburgh Tram Network (ETN) project, which was a live case project during the time of the authors' research into a dynamic systems approach to megaproject risk analysis and simulation. Through this experimental research, the SDANP model has provided interesting results on cost and time overruns with accuracy rates above 80%, respectively, for the ETN project over the time period between 2007 and 2013. The authors expect that this dynamic systems approach to megaproject risk analysis and simulation can be widely tested for the benefits of stakeholders in dealing with cost and time overruns in megaproject development.

Prince Boateng
Zhen Chen
Stephen O. Ogunlana

Foreword

As our journey into the uncertainties of the twenty-first century continues, of one thing we can be sure: megaprojects are viewed as increasingly important in creating solutions to societal problems. Megaprojects will provide the new power plants that will give us with green energy, they will deliver transport systems that work for all without increasing carbon emissions, they will provide us with the integrated hospitals and healthcare that we need and they will even delight us with cultural and sporting events! We remain optimistic that the huge complexities of megaprojects in people, capital and technology can be tamed and we can look forward to feeling the benefits of their successful implementations.

However, at their heart, megaprojects pose a conundrum. Time after time (and despite their apparent benefits) we do not seem to be able to deliver them on time, to budget and actually producing the output functionality that we need. We only have vague ideas why some succeed and, where they fail, we discover worryingly psychological failings in their planning and design. Given their importance in facing twenty-first century challenges, we desperately need to undertake more research to help us deliver megaprojects more effectively and to insure that the results of that research are available to the widest possible population of stakeholders.

It is precisely this gap that Boateng, Chen and Ogunlana have aimed at with the work that they report upon in this book. They take one of the most clearly identified complexities in delivering megaproject, namely risk, and explore new ways of conceptualizing it and dealing with it. They employ a wide range of novel systems dynamics and frameworks to develop an understanding of risk in megaprojects. They provide interesting applications of techniques used elsewhere in simulation to megaprojects. They illustrate their work with an insightful case of the Edinburgh Tram Project, a megaproject which embodies both the huge benefits that megaprojects can bring and the significant issues that inhibit their delivery. Boateng, Chen and Ogunlana are to be congratulated for the zeal with which they have pursued their research objectives and their fervour to share the results of their endeavours with others.

This book provides a valuable addition to the work currently being undertaken by academics and practitioners alike in understanding megaproject design and delivery. It is through such committed work that we

really will be able to tame megaprojects and insure that they can reliably deliver the outcomes that society so desperately needs.

Professor Naomi Brookes, PhD DIC
Visiting Professor in Complex Project Management,
University of Leeds
Chair – MEGAPROJECT COST Action
C.E.O. – Projektlernen

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Introduction

Major stakeholders on megaprojects have been facing risks associated with social, technical, economic, environmental and political (STEEP) issues that may lead to significant cost and time overruns compared with initial budget and schedule estimates. Although much attention has been devoted to managing risks in megaproject delivery, results have not always been satisfactory in most cases across the world in the past. There have been increasing needs for advanced tools to support better risk assessment so as to inform decision-making in megaproject management. Regarding the complexity of megaprojects, and the great scope for risks and their interaction in mega construction and development projects, it has been widely accepted that quantitative approaches are necessary supplements in risk analysis process. However, there has been little attempt to apply sophisticated methods recommended by industry standards for risk analysis in megaproject practice. Through developing and using a dynamic systems approach over a four-year period, the authors of the book have developed a new tool that can significantly identify major project risk factors and provide predications on time and cost overruns with over 80% accuracy compared to real figures in one megaproject, that is the Edinburgh Tram Network (ETN) project. This book summarizes their research into megaproject risk analysis and simulation to inform both academic researchers and megaproject stakeholders who have interest in qualitative and quantitative risk analysis and simulation for megaprojects across the world.

This book covers all aspects of a real case study oriented research into megaproject risk analysis and simulation through a dynamic systems approach. A case study on the ETN project is used as an example of megaproject to develop a general technical framework called SDANP for STEEP risks analysis and simulation on megaprojects. An analytic network process (ANP) is adopted for risk quantification modelling, while a system dynamics (SD) (Brookes, 2015; Dimitriou, 2014; Flyvbjerg, 2014;

Flyvbjerg, Bruzelius, & Rothengatter, 2003; Mentis, 2015; Priemus, 2014; Renuka, Umarani, & Kamal, 2014; Spirikova, 2014; Van de Graaf & Sovacool, 2014) for risk simulation over time. Both the ANP and SD provide practical guides for the application of the dynamic systems approach in megaproject research and practice.

By providing crucial background information for those who want to understand the dynamics of risks over time and their assessment during the decision-making processes on large transport infrastructure projects (Hickman et al., 2015), this book can prove an important source of information for academics, researchers and students in the fields of transport, infrastructure, project management, management science, economic analysis (cost–benefit analysis), public policy, environmental policy and ethics. Practitioners, politicians and policy-makers involved in large transport infrastructure projects can also find this book to be a useful reference on risk analysis and simulation for megaproject management.

1.2. The Problem with Megaprojects

1.2.1. Megaproject Risks

Flyvbjerg, Skamris Holm, and Buhl (2003) found that 258 highway and rail projects (\$90 billion worth) in 20 countries did not perform well on budgets as estimated, and about 90% of these projects suffered cost overruns, with the average rail project costing 45% more than what were projected, while it was over 20% in average for highway projects. Based on a continuous research, Flyvbjerg et al. (2003) underscored that cost overrun has not decreased over 70 years in the 20th century and seems to be a global phenomenon, which can also be attested on many megaprojects. For example, the Pusan and Muckho harbour project suffered significant cost overruns in the mid-1970s and relied on an extra \$75 million loan for it to complete (2003), and the Big Dig project was estimated at a cost of \$2.6 billion but was completed at a cost of \$14.6 billion, additionally completion was delayed from 2002 to 2005 (2003). These projects have made the learned society and the public acutely aware of the problems of project delay and cost overruns in megaprojects. In addition, these technical problems also indicate clearly that construction cost estimating on major infrastructure projects has not improved in accuracy in the past more than half century, and the magnitude of underestimated project costs has been almost in the same order according to Flyvbjerg, Holm, and Buhl (2002) and Salling and Leleur (2015). It has been identified by Flyvbjerg et al. (2002) that the main possible reason for cost and time overruns in many megaprojects across the

world was to simplify the marginalization of risks during feasibility studies by undependably assuming what the World Bank calls the ‘Everything Goes According to Plan’ (EGAP) principle. There have been increasing needs for new ideas and techniques (Davies, MacAulay, DeBarro, & Thurston, 2014; Flyvbjerg et al., 2002; Kwak, Walewski, Sleeper, & Sadatsafavi, 2014) in order to tackle all risks associated with those significant problems for making the right decisions (Mentis, 2015) on both business and project towards successful megaprojects.

Evidence gleaned through research worldwide suggests that large and complex infrastructure projects such as airport, bridge and highway are usually money pits where funds are simply ‘swallowed up’ without delivering sufficient returns. These problems are as a result of unbalanced subjective beliefs and information in assessing risks and uncertainties, and taking corrective actions to effectively control and manage the identified risks at the right time (Brookes, 2015; Dimitriou, 2014; Flyvbjerg, 2014; Flyvbjerg et al., 2003; Mentis, 2015; Priemus, 2014; Renuka et al., 2014; Spirkova, 2014; Van de Graaf & Sovacool, 2014). Flyvbjerg, (2014) further asserts that the track record of megaprojects under his study was terrible during developmental phases and reflected many credibility problems especially on transportation megaprojects. Proost et al. (2014) and Salling and Leleur (2015) emphasised that costs for transportation megaprojects were often grossly underestimated while traffic is often overestimated, and the perceived failure of the project was subject to a public enquiry, which concluded that the planned budget and schedule were hardly realistic although some of the cost increases were justified spending indeed. In reality, significant wastes were caused by design delays, over-optimistic programming and uncertain authority at the construction and development stages of megaprojects.

The construction industry, like many other industries is a free-enterprise system, and has sizeable risks built into its structure and project based processes (Ball, 2014; Fulford & Standing, 2014; Guo, Chang-Richards, Wilkinson, & Li, 2014). From the initiation to the closing stages, construction process especially that for megaprojects is complex and characterized by a number of uncertainties and interactions (Brookes, 2015) that can negatively influence the project delivery in many ways (Brookes, 2015; Dimitriou, 2014; Flyvbjerg, 2014; Flyvbjerg et al., 2003; Mentis, 2015; Priemus, 2014; Renuka et al., 2014; Spirkova, 2014; Van de Graaf & Sovacool, 2014). For example, uncertainties about changes in weather conditions (Mentis, 2015), sub-contractor delays (Diab & Nassar, 2012; Eizakshiri, Chan, & Emsley, 2015), community resistance (Jordhus-Lier, 2015), political interferences (Kennedy, 2015) and unpredictable site conditions (Adam, Josephson, & Lindahl, 2014; Boateng, Chen, & Ogunlana, 2012) can compromise the completion of megaproject development on time