

**INVESTIGATION OF CRITICAL SUCCESS  
FACTORS (CSFs) FOR THE DEPLOYMENT OF  
CONSTRUCTION RISK MANAGEMENT  
PRACTICES IN SRI LANKA**

BY

Atham Lebbe Mohamed Risath

Supervised by

Dr. Chandana Sriwardana

“This dissertation was submitted to the Department of Civil Engineering of the University of Moratuwa in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Master of Science in Construction Project Management”

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

August 2018

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
Front page	i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	v
List of Figures	vii
Aknowledgment	viii
Declaration	ix
Abbreviations	x
Abstract	xi
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Aim	4
1.3. Objectives	4
1.4. Scope and Limitation	4
1.5. Structure of the report	5
1.6. Deliverables	5
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	
<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	7
2.1 Introduction to Risk Management	7
2.2 Risk Definition	8
2.3 Project Risk Management	9
2.3.1 Plan Risk Management	11
2.3.2 Risk Identification	12
2.3.3 Risk Assessment	14
2.3.4 Risk Response Development	16
2.3.5 Risk Response Control	16
2.4 Risk Management in Construction Industry	17
2.4.1 Introduction	17

2.4.2	History of Construction Risk management	18
2.4.3	Risk Management Challenges in Construction Industry	23
2.4.4	Critical Success Factors for Implementing Risk Management Systems	25
2.5	Construction Industry in Sri Lanka	30
2.6	Construction Risk Management in Sri Lanka	31
2.7	Summary	32
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>		
<b>METHODOLOGY</b>		
3.1	Introduction	34
3.2	Survey Method	34
3.3	Delphi Technique	35
3.4	Selection of Delphi expert panel	36
3.5	Design of Delphi Survey	36
3.5.1	Delphi Round One	37
3.5.2	Delphi Round Two	40
3.5.3	Delphi Round Three	40
3.6	The analytical Hierarchy Process-AHP	40
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>		
<b>RESULTS AND ANALYSIS</b>		
4.1	Introduction	43
4.2	Delphi Round One	43
4.2.1	Current status of the use of Risk management techniques	45
4.2.1.1	Risk identification techniques	45
4.2.1.2	Risk analysis techniques	46
4.2.1.3	Risk response techniques	46
4.2.1.4	Risk monitoring technique	47
4.2.2	Barriers to the adoption, usage, and implementation of risk management systems	47
4.2.3	Critical Success Factors (CSFs) for implementing risk management systems	49

4.3 Delphi Round Two	50
4.3.1 Current status of the use of risk management techniques	51
4.3.1.1 Risk identification techniques	51
4.3.1.2 Risk analysis techniques	52
4.3.1.3 Risk response techniques	53
4.3.1.4 Risk monitoring technique	54
4.3.2 Barriers to the adoption, usage, and implementation of risk management systems	55
4.3.3 Critical Success Factors (CSFs) for implementing risk management systems	57
4.4 Delphi Round Three	60
4.4.1 Critical Success Factors (CSFs) for implementing risk management systems	63
4.4.2 Comparison of CSFs with other developing countries	62
<b>CHAPTER 5</b>	
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	65
<b>REFERENCES</b>	68
<b>APPENDIXES</b>	73
Annex-A	74
Annex-B	82
Annex-C	87
Annex-D	91

## LIST OF TABLES

	<b>Page</b>
Table 1: Definitions to risk	9
Table 2: Summary of previous studies on barriers to risk management practices	23
Table 3: Summary of identified CSFs in developing countries	29
Table 4: AHP relative scores	42
Table 5: Ratings of risk identification techniques in round one	45
Table 6: Ratings of risk analysis techniques in round one	46
Table 7: Ratings of risk response techniques in round one	46
Table 8: Ratings of risk response techniques in round one	47
Table 9: Ratings of barriers to the adoption, usage, and implementation of risk management systems in round one	48
Table 10: Ratings of Critical Success Factors (CSFs) for implementing risk management systems in round one	49
Table 11: Ratings of risk identification techniques in round two	51
Table 12: Comparison of risk identification techniques between round one and round two	52
Table 13: Ratings of risk analysis techniques in round two	52
Table 14: Comparison of risk analysis techniques between round and round two	53
Table 15: Ratings of risk response techniques in round two	53
Table 16: Comparison of risk response techniques between round and round two	54
Table 17: Ratings of risk monitoring techniques in round two	54

Table 18:	Comparison of risk monitoring techniques between Round one and round two	55
Table 19:	Ratings of barriers to the adoption, usage, and implementation of risk management systems in round two	56
Table 20:	Comparison of the ratings of barriers to the adoption, usage, and implementation of risk management in round one and round two	56
Table 21:	Ratings of CSFs for implementing risk management systems in round two	57
Table 22:	Comparison of the ratings of CSFs for implementing risk management systems in round one and round two	62
Table 23:	Ratings of CSFs in round three using AHP	62
Table 24:	Comparison of the research findings between current study and previous studies	63

## LIST OF FIGURES

	<b>Page</b>
Figure 1: Risk Management Process adopted from Gray & Larson (2008)	10
Figure 2: Project Risk Management Overview adopted from PMI, 2013	11
Figure 3: Risk identification process adopted from PMI, 2013	12
Figure 4: Knowledge map of risk sources adopted from Renuka, et al., 2014	13
Figure 5: Process of qualitative risk assessment adopted from PMI, 2013	14
Figure 6: Process of quantitative risk analysis adopted from PMI, 2013	15
Figure 7: Research method used by Zhao, et al., 2013	26
Figure 8: Experience details of the Delphi panel	44
Figure 9: Weighted geometric mean of participants	61
Figure 10: Comparison matrix	61

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Chandana Siriwardana, a Senior Lecturer of the Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa for his guidance and support throughout this research. His knowledge and experience were the source of inspiration to make this thesis a reality. Without his constant support, this research would never have been possible and successful. I would also like to especially thank my family for letting me occupied with the many of works required to conduct this research.

I extend my thankfulness to the M.Sc. Course Coordinators Prof. Asoka Perera and Dr. Lesly Ekanayake for their support and guidance provided all the way through the programme. I would also like to extend my gratitude to all the academic and nonacademic staff from the Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa for their guidance and support in effectively completing the studies.

Finally, I wish to express my thanks to the members of the Delphi panel who were very supportive in providing the essential primary data and feedbacks for this research.

I hope that the findings of this research will be beneficial to Construction Project Management discipline and it will deliver insights for further examination in and around the topic.

## DECLARATION

I certify that this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any university to the best of my knowledge and believe it does not contain any material previously published, written or orally communicated by another person or myself except where due reference is made in the text. I also hereby give consent for my dissertation, if accepted, to be made available for photocopying and for inter library loans, and for the title and summary to be available to outside organizations.

.....  
Signature of Candidate

.....  
Date

The above particulars are correct, to the best of my knowledge.

.....  
Signature of Supervisor

.....  
Date

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

IRMS	: Implementation of Risk Management Systems
RMS	: Risk Management Systems
CSF	: Critical Success Factor
AHP	: Analytical Hierarchy Process
PMI	: Project Management Institute
PMBOK	: Project Management Body of Knowledge

## ABSTRACT

Risk is an uncertain occurrence that, if befalls, has direct and indirect effects on project objectives. In particular, construction projects in developing countries are likely to face wide range of uncertainties. Risk management is a positive approach to control the level of risk. The evidence available for the effective implementation of risk management practices in developing countries is very little. The existing studies on risk management in developing countries have generally concentrated on identifying and evaluating risks rather than applying risk management systems. This research was aimed to answer the question “how the risk management practices could be promoted and enhanced in Sri Lankan construction industry?” The study applied Delphi technique and the study was conducted in three different rounds. The Delphi panel was comprised of fifteen construction industry experts with vast experience and knowledge to make judgments on risk management systems. The findings of the study reasonably disclose that the construction professionals in Sri Lanka are not conscious enough of the available sophisticated techniques for construction risk management. It is also established that the cost incurred for implementing risk management systems, poor awareness of risk management systems among construction professionals, and unavailability of risk management consultants or experts in the country are the major barriers for implementing risk management systems. The study further explored that ‘Including the costs within project’s budgets for IRMS’ and ‘Request for Implementation of Risk Management Systems (IRMS) on projects by clients and end users’ are considered as exceedingly imperative Critical Success Factors (CSFs). In the meantime ‘Attempting to deliver projects systematically on time and within project’s budget’, ‘Inclusion of risk management systems in engineering education and training modules of construction practitioners’, and ‘Awareness of risk management systems among stakeholders’ are regarded as important CSFs for IRMS. The study also revealed that a substantial alignment is not found between the current findings of the research and the previous findings of similar studies in developing world with regard to CSFs.

**Key Words:** Risk, Construction, Critical Success Factor, Risk Management Systems, IRMS