



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/199122/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Watton, J, Unterhitzberger, C, Locatelli, G et al. (Cover date: November 2023) The Cost Drivers of Infrastructure Projects: Definition, Classification, and Conceptualization. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 149 (11). 03123006. ISSN: 0733-9364

<https://doi.org/10.1061/JCEMD4.COENG-13411>

---

© 2023 American Society of Civil Engineers. This is an author produced version of an article published in *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



## 30 **1 Introduction and background**

31 Cost reduction is important for infrastructure project stakeholders. Privately funded  
32 infrastructure projects (e.g., railways, energy generation, etc.) must be delivered cost-effectively as for  
33 investors to get a return on investment and to create value for shareholders. For publicly funded  
34 infrastructure projects, a return on investment is not always possible (e.g., bridges or roads without  
35 tolls), and thus public bodies must be able to reduce costs “*to ensure that taxpayers and consumers get*  
36 *more for less*” (HM Treasury 2014 p. 3), i.e., value for money for the public. In the UK, for instance,  
37 the infrastructure cost initiative aimed to reduce the delivery cost of the UK’s infrastructure project  
38 portfolio with a focus on pre-execution improvements (HM Treasury 2014; HM Treasury and  
39 Infrastructure UK 2010a; b). These reports highlighted several cost reduction strategies including  
40 effective governance, improved infrastructure pipeline visibility and certainty, increased front-end  
41 definition, and whole life planning, which were effectively implemented. However, for projects with  
42 greater complexity, uncertainty, and novelty, implementing these measures is extremely challenging  
43 (Loch et al. 2006).

44 Nuclear decommissioning projects are an example of these extremely complex projects for  
45 which existing cost reduction measures are inadequate. Particularly in the UK, cost reduction in these  
46 projects is a major ongoing issue; £135.8 billion (approx. US\$169 billion) of public money is estimated  
47 to be spent to decommission the 17 historic nuclear “legacy” sites over the next 116 years, with the vast  
48 majority of this activity taking place at the Sellafield site (NDA 2020, 2021). A great deal of the  
49 complexity and uncertainty – and consequently the cost and schedule – of these projects comes from  
50 lack of planning for decommissioning when these sites were originally constructed in the mid-20<sup>th</sup>  
51 century (GOV.UK 2019), not least the requirement to deal with vast quantities of radioactive material  
52 (OECD/NEA 2016). The cost forecast has risen considerably since the Nuclear Decommissioning  
53 Authority (NDA) was established in 2005 to tackle the programme, the reasons for this being more  
54 realistic estimates and increased scope definition. However, although cost certainty is improving, cost  
55 reduction to deliver these projects remains difficult. This emphasises the need for project teams to  
56 identify innovative cost reduction processes/practices.

57 Popular topics in the realm of cost reduction in project/construction management literature tend  
58 to be primarily focused on reducing cost overruns or cost estimation inaccuracy, through analysing  
59 either the human-based determinants (e.g., Flyvbjerg et al. 2002; Ika et al. 2020; Love et al. 2012;  
60 Reichelt and Lyneis 1999; Torp and Klakegg 2016) or external considerations that lead to or correlate  
61 with overruns/inaccuracies, such as location (e.g., Migliaccio et al. 2013; Zhang et al. 2014). In contrast,  
62 studies with a primary focus on cost reduction are limited. The majority of these studies focus on linking  
63 organisational level processes or cost estimation tools with reduced cost. For instance, Building  
64 Information Modelling (BIM) is often cited as being positively correlated with cost reduction and  
65 control in projects (Bryde et al. 2013; Sepasgozar et al. 2022), as is prefabricated construction (e.g., Liu  
66 et al. 2022; Mostafa et al. 2020) and blockchain technology (Qian and Papadonikolaki 2021). As  
67 Olawale and Sun (2015 p. 624) acknowledge, most studies in the realm of cost and/or schedule  
68 reduction are on the quantitative models side, aiming to better their ease of use in practice. This is  
69 supported by Bilge and Yaman's (2022) recent review, which emphasised schedule and cost  
70 optimisation (i.e., models) as one of the biggest construction management research trends of the past  
71 20 years. Indeed, these digital tool approaches to cost reduction have proven to be of considerable  
72 benefit in industry and are paramount in this sustainability conscious age (Forbes 2023). Therefore, the  
73 above deductively driven studies are used to highlight this.

74 Conversely, inductive studies have been conducted to identify the cost reduction actions of  
75 project teams, though they are less common. Bayraktar et al.'s (2011) multiple-case study revealed 23  
76 factors that facilitate cost and schedule reduction, as gathered from literature, questionnaires, and  
77 interviews with project team members from five projects delivered underbudget and early. Olawale and  
78 Sun (2010) identified the top factors that impede the ability to reduce cost and subsequently produced  
79 90 processes/practices employed by project teams to offset these, with Gharaibeh (2014) furthering this  
80 in a megaproject context by producing problems, solutions, and lessons learned in cost reduction from  
81 two megaprojects. These studies agree that front-end definition and good relationships and  
82 communication between parties are amongst the most effective cost reduction processes.

83 Extant cost reduction research is thus ontologically driven; it primarily answers the questions  
84 of what high-level strategies correlate with reduced costs. In contrast, identification of the project-level

85 processes that reduce cost are far less common, having only had notable contributions from the  
86 abovementioned articles. Moreover, the questions of how project teams actively “do” cost reduction is  
87 lacking, i.e., the practices (Blomquist et al. 2010; Hällgren and Söderholm 2012). Therefore, cost  
88 reduction research has, regardless of being inductive or deductive, been focused mainly on the flow of  
89 organisational level process rather than on project-level processes and more particularly the practices  
90 where cost reduction activities actually occur.

91 To develop cost reduction research, a more ubiquitous emphasis on the main cost reduction  
92 opportunities/threats is required; these can be suitably understood by examining the “cost drivers”.  
93 Using cost drivers as a lens through which cost reduction processes/practices can be studied can  
94 ultimately better the knowledge and implementation of those employed by project team members.  
95 Despite these benefits, the absence of sensemaking literature has ensued a lack of understanding and  
96 clarity of this subject. Early development of cost drivers research in the mid-to-late-2000s focused on  
97 improving cost estimation in building construction projects (Lowe et al. 2006; Stoy et al. 2008; Stoy  
98 and Schalcher 2007). Through the mid-2010s, perspectives ventured into other sectors, such as  
99 tunnelling (Membah and Asa 2015) and highways (Collier et al. 2016). More recently, the literature  
100 diversified, looking at normative studies on improving cost estimation (Elmousalami 2020) as well as  
101 offshore wind farm decommissioning projects (Adedipe and Shafiee 2021). Cost drivers have also been  
102 explored in grey literature published for practitioners (e.g., Efron and Read 2012; OECD/NEA 2003).

103 Remarkably, however, literature lacks a shared definition of cost drivers. Moreover, the cost  
104 drivers of projects are scattered across the literature since those outputted by these studies are project-  
105 specific; a classification of infrastructure project cost drivers (i.e., a “macro-level” project context) is  
106 missing. A further consequence of these omissions is that conceptual development of the topic is also  
107 absent. Therefore, adopting the integrative literature review method, the aim of this research is to  
108 critically review and synthesise existing knowledge to derive a definition, classification, and  
109 conceptualisation of infrastructure project cost drivers. Three research questions have been constructed  
110 based on “confusion spotting” and “neglect spotting” (Sandberg and Alvesson 2011):

111 RQ1: *What is an adequate definition for an “infrastructure project cost driver”?*

112 RQ2: *What are the key cost drivers of infrastructure projects?*

113 RQ3: *What are the different types of cost driver?*

114 The infrastructure project thus serves as the context for this research, and is defined as the  
115 construction, upgrade, or decommissioning of large-scale social and economic infrastructure (excluding  
116 telecommunications and IT systems due to the adequacy of associated research/knowledge (Gil and  
117 Beckman 2009)). This paper uses the infrastructure project as an umbrella term to include complex  
118 projects/programmes (i.e., system projects or array projects (Shenhar and Dvir 1996)), megaprojects  
119 (Flyvbjerg 2014), and global projects (Scott et al. 2011).

120 This paper is structured as follows. First the authors present their integrative review  
121 methodology. This is followed by three “findings” sections that correspond to the three research  
122 questions to define, classify, and conceptualise cost drivers. This is succeeded by a research agenda and  
123 then conclusions. There is no dedicated discussion section; instead, for the purposes of readability, the  
124 findings are interpreted within each of the three findings sections.

## 126 **2 Methodology**

127 The integrative literature review method is conceptual and inductive in nature, defined as a  
128 method that reviews, critiques, and synthesises literature on mature or emerging topics to resolve  
129 inconsistencies and provide new perspectives or frameworks (Torraco 2005, 2016). The two “options”  
130 of topic specified here, i.e., mature or emerging, are extended by Post et al. (2020), presenting seven  
131 “theory-generating avenues” based on what the review aims to do. Given that cost drivers research is  
132 both underdeveloped and lacking in clarity, this research opts for the “clarifying constructs” approach,  
133 which “[l]ocates potential ambiguity around a construct and provides construct clarification in a way  
134 that extends theory” (Post et al. 2020 p. 355). Integrative reviews contrast with systematic and narrative  
135 reviews, both of which are suited to topics that are rich in the literature and therefore tend to be more  
136 deductive / less conceptual (Baumeister and Leary 1997; Snyder 2019; Wong et al. 2013). The authors  
137 have used Torraco (2005, 2016) and Post et al. (2020) as the primary sources of guidance for conducting  
138 this review, though others have been used to supplement the methodology process (Callahan 2010,  
139 2014; Elsbach and Knippenberg 2020; Rocco and Plakhotnik 2009; Snyder 2019; Whittemore and

140 Knafl 2005). Fig. 1 summarises this paper’s research framework, which is comprehensively outlined in  
141 this section.

142

## 143 **2.1 Literature collection**

144 The literature collection stage consisted of keyword searches and screening of literature. For  
145 the keyword searches (conducted in November 2021 but continually checked until submission using  
146 weekly search alerts for all search strings highlighted in this section) and the subsequent screening, this  
147 was performed in two separate stages: (1) cost driver “explicit” phrases and (2) cost driver “synonym”  
148 phrases.

149 First, the cost driver explicit keyword search utilised Scopus, Web of Science (WoS), Google  
150 Scholar, ASCE Library, and Google. These literature databases were used to explore almost all related  
151 literature and thus adequately deepen the understanding of the field (Callahan 2010 p. 301). The Scopus  
152 search string, returning 1,032 articles, was: *TITLE-ABS-KEY ( "cost driv\*" OR "driv\* cost\*" OR*  
153 *"driver\* of cost\*" OR "driver\* for cost\*" AND ( \*project\* OR infrastructure OR construction OR*  
154 *decommission\* ) ).* WoS’s *TS* function was then used in case any key cost driver explicit articles were  
155 not on the Scopus database, which returned 2,236 articles using the same search string as on Scopus  
156 (although irrelevant medicine-based subject areas were excluded from the string). Google Scholar and  
157 the ASCE Library were used but only to ensure major academic work was not omitted. Google was  
158 used to identify grey literature, entailing backwards searching. The authors also conducted searches on  
159 relevant institutional websites’ databases (i.e., PMI, APM, IPA, OECD, World Bank, GOV.UK, CIOB,  
160 RICS, RIBA, CIMA, DOE, ACA, and AIQS) and reviewed accessible guidance documents; the nature  
161 of an emerging topic calls for including any material that could be of use (Whittemore and Knafl 2005),  
162 in this case being practitioner material. To initially filter out different subject areas (e.g., chemistry,  
163 nursing, or software), experiment-based papers, and irrelevant topics (most commonly activity-based  
164 costing (ABC), referring to repetitive business activities rather than projects), abstracts of articles  
165 returned from Scopus and WoS were read. For grey literature found through Google and the websites

166 mentioned, the search function was used to identify mentions of cost drivers and thus to determine their  
167 relevancy.


168 To screen the remaining journal articles, conference papers, and grey literature, the authors  
169 followed two clear inclusion criteria that the articles must have met at least one of: (1) a definition for  
170 cost drivers (which could have been project-specific); (2) a set of outputted cost drivers (which must  
171 have been transferable, i.e., applicable across infrastructure projects). In screening for definitions, seven  
172 relevant definitions for cost drivers were identified. In screening for sets of outputted cost drivers, many  
173 articles provided cost drivers that were specific to a particular type of project (e.g., “number of lanes”,  
174 which is only applicable to a highway project (see Tong et al. 2021)), so these cost drivers were not  
175 included in the review because they were not transferable. The search for transferable cost drivers ended  
176 with a total of 20 articles, one of which also provided one of the seven identified definitions. Thus, the  
177 screening process totalled 26 cost driver explicit articles.

178 The second stage was the cost driver synonym keyword search; Appendix A outlines the list of  
179 synonyms, refined after initially formulating and trialling a range of possible phrases. The purpose of  
180 the synonym search was to supplement the cost driver explicit data by enriching/filling the taxonomy  
181 with cost drivers rather than conduct an exhaustive analysis. This search only used Scopus as this  
182 literature database provided sufficient relevant cost drivers data. Also, the search only included journal  
183 articles to ensure the returned synonym sources were reliable. After excluding various irrelevant phrases  
184 and subjects after undergoing continual refinement, the synonym search string (again employing  
185 *TITLE-ABS-KEY*) returned 5,228 articles. The authors only reviewed the articles with 10 or more  
186 citations, as by this point the data (i.e., outputted cost drivers) was saturated; just under 1,600 of these  
187 articles met this criterion. The authors acknowledge that this means many potentially valuable articles  
188 with under 10 citations were omitted, but (a) the data was saturated even after the first 500 articles and  
189 (b) it can be generally assumed that articles with 10 or more citations hold more value to academics  
190 than those with under 10 citations. However, as to not omit any current/recent developments, the journal  
191 articles returned by this string from 2021 onwards were also reviewed (regardless of number of  
192 citations); just under 950 articles met this criterion. To initially filter these articles, the authors read

193 titles to determine relevance to this paper’s topic then scanned abstracts where the title’s relevancy was  
194 not clear.

195 To screen the remaining synonym articles, the sole inclusion criterion was that the articles must  
196 have a set of outputted cost drivers; this screening followed the same process as for cost driver explicit  
197 articles. Subsequently, 49 cost driver synonym articles met this criterion and were included in the  
198 review. Thus, as per Table 1, 75 relevant documents were identified in total to answer the three research  
199 questions. The authors combined RQ2 and RQ3 in this table since the taxonomy of cost drivers is used  
200 to construct the conceptual framework; though they address two different gaps in knowledge, the same  
201 articles apply to answering both RQ2 and RQ3.

202



203

204 Fig. 1 – Integrative review research framework

205

## 206 2.2 Critical analysis and synthesis

207 After literature collection are the critical analysis and synthesis stages (Fig. 1). Critical analysis  
208 entails “carefully examining the main ideas and relationships of an issue and providing a critique of  
209 existing literature” (Torraco 2005 p. 361). Synthesis describes the technique used to present/integrate  
210 the critiqued literature (Post et al. 2020; Torraco 2016). This section describes how literature was  
211 critically analysed and synthesised throughout the following sections of the paper.

212 In the “defining” section, the authors first critically analysed existing literature to present a  
213 critique of what cost drivers are and are not in the context of infrastructure projects, organised into two  
214 “propositions”. Then the authors critiqued existing cost driver definitions and extracted their key  
215 themes. By incorporating the propositions and acknowledging the key themes of existing definitions,  
216 the authors concluded this section by deriving a novel definition, thereby addressing RQ1.

217 In the “classifying” section, the authors addressed RQ2 by identifying the cost drivers outputted  
218 by the relevant explicit and synonym articles and synthesising these into a two-level taxonomy. The  
219 taxonomy classes the cost drivers into “level 1 cost drivers” and “level 2 cost drivers”. The construction  
220 of the taxonomy began with identifying the level 2 cost drivers; these are the cost drivers that are  
221 specifically stated in the literature, so the titles of each of these (or at least similar phrases) can be found  
222 in each of the corresponding sources. The level 1 cost drivers describe the key cost drivers of  
223 infrastructure projects; the names of the level 1 cost drivers were deduced by the authors to succinctly  
224 describe the sets of linked level 2 cost drivers. This process was iterative in that the groups and titles  
225 were continually refined throughout the construction of the taxonomy. The two columns after these  
226 highlight the sources (explicit and synonym) that provided these level 2 cost drivers. In the subsection  
227 following the taxonomy, the authors interpret the inconsistencies and differences between the explicit  
228 and synonym sources regarding their outputted cost drivers.

229 In the “conceptualising” section, the second synthesis method used is a conceptual framework,  
230 presented as a two-by-two matrix classification of cost driver types (addressing RQ3). The dimensions  
231 and quadrants were derived through a critical analysis of the cost drivers in the taxonomy. They were  
232 inspired by asking by asking the question: “can anything be done about the cost driver (i.e., to reduce  
233 its associated cost)?” Placing this question in the context of the project team, i.e., the group “*of owner,*  
234 *individual contractors, and contractor personnel that develop and manage projects*” (Merrow 2011 p.  
235 342), two characteristics emerged: they have the ability to (1) control and/or (2) define (i.e., in planning)  
236 certain cost drivers, which led to the conception of the four mutually exclusive quadrants. To ensure  
237 the matrix was internally valid, the authors iteratively amended the dimensions and types by inputting  
238 each cost driver.

239 The final synthesis method forms the penultimate section: a research agenda. This is typical  
240 when presenting a classification or conceptual framework (Post et al. 2020 p. 367), but the topic requires  
241 attention regardless. The authors determined these research avenues by taking stock of the gaps in  
242 existing cost drivers/reduction research and then incorporating and interpreting this paper's findings.

243


### 244 **3 Towards defining cost drivers**

#### 245 **3.1 Making sense of cost drivers: What are(n't) they?**

246 By way of introducing the topic of cost drivers, the authors distinguish what cost drivers are  
247 and are not in the broad context of infrastructure projects. These distinctions are organised into the  
248 following two propositions.

249 *Proposition 1: Cost drivers can have a direct or indirect impact on a project's cost. There is a*  
250 *dichotomy in how researchers view cost drivers (excluding synonym articles): those who observe direct*  
251 *cost impacts (e.g., ACE 2010; Wang and Horner 2007) and those who observe the cost impact of*  
252 *infrastructure project characteristics (e.g., OECD/NEA 2003; Stoy and Schalcher 2007). The former*  
253 *group consider the high-cost areas of the bill of quantities (BoQ) to provide cost drivers, whereas the*  
254 *latter describe features – physical or otherwise – of the project that cause the project to be costly. Hence,*  
255 *cost drivers can be respectively classed as *direct* and *indirect* (Efron and Read 2012; ETI 2018), though*  
256 *this should not be confused with direct and indirect *cost* (see Venkataraman and Pinto 2008). Indirect*  
257 *cost drivers have an indirect relationship with cost incursions, in that they cause intervening variables*  
258 *(which can be another indirect cost driver or a different direct/indirect impact on cost) and direct cost*  
259 *drivers to incur cost, creating a “causal mechanism” of cost drivers; these relationships are illustrated*  
260 *in Fig. 2.*

261



262

263 Fig. 2 – Causal mechanisms of cost drivers

264

265 *Proposition 2: Cost drivers are not the same as cost overrun drivers, but cost overrun drivers*  
 266 *that have a substantial impact on actual cost are cost drivers.* The authors differentiate cost drivers  
 267 from cost overrun drivers. Flyvbjerg et al. (2018) note that the drivers of cost overrun come under *root*  
 268 *causes* and *causes*. The former entails human bias or psychological or political impacts which leads to  
 269 inaccurate cost and time estimation (Flyvbjerg 2006). These are not cost drivers because they  
 270 significantly affect budget accuracy rather than actual cost. In contrast, the latter describes factors such  
 271 as scope changes (Love et al. 2016) and client competence (Akinci and Fischer 1998), which can be  
 272 considered cost drivers since they have a strong influence on total actual cost.

273

### 274 3.2 Defining infrastructure project cost drivers

275 This section deduces a novel definition of cost drivers for infrastructure projects based on  
 276 critiquing existing definitions in literature, as shown in Table 2.

277 Remarkably, there are only two articles in infrastructure project literature that define cost  
 278 drivers (Ekung et al. 2021; Wang and Horner 2007). Ekung et al.'s (2021) definition is more transferable  
 279 in research due to its general terminology, whereas Wang and Horner's (2007) is more pragmatic,  
 280 proposing the “mean value theorem” which uses the BoQ to determine cost drivers. Definitions are  
 281 mainly given by practitioner institutions (Australian Government 2018; DOE 2018; ETI 2018; GAO  
 282 2020; RICS 2015). Australian Government (2018) and DOE (2018) provide similar definitions, both  
 283 focusing on major factors in the cost estimate, though DOE's (2018) extends this with reference to  
 284 “sensitivity” (i.e., sensitivity analysis) to stress how a slight change in a cost driver’s magnitude can

285 cause significant cost impacts. However, sensitivity analysis is less appropriate for determining indirect  
286 cost drivers as their cost is difficult to quantify. Therefore, this part of DOE's (2018) definition is not  
287 generalisable. The ETI's (2018) list-style definition has more general phrasing and some practical  
288 insights but is more towards a list of cost driver parameters than a definition. GAO (2020) makes  
289 reference to cost drivers affecting the cost estimate but provides more detail on what a cost driver is  
290 rather than only what it does. Lastly, RICS (2015) provides a definition that is succinct but vague; a  
291 “thing” that “causes” cost is not particularly specific and is thus unhelpful for this research.

292         Considering the points from these two sections, several key themes of infrastructure project  
293 cost drivers are worth emphasising. First, there must be a differentiation between direct and indirect  
294 cost drivers because this dichotomy reflects their relationship with actual cost, which is important for  
295 both researchers and practitioners; this is highlighted in Proposition 1, but is currently lacking in  
296 existing definitions. Second, Proposition 2 highlights how cost drivers can also refer to cost overrun  
297 drivers (e.g., rework), contradicting the notion put forward by some practitioner definitions that it  
298 relates solely to the estimate. Third, cost drivers have a significant influence on a project’s cost, as  
299 agreed by existing definitions. Fourth, the definitions suggest that cost drivers have multiple “forms”  
300 (e.g., characteristic, estimate element / cost model input, etc.), with the additional distinction of it  
301 increasing or decreasing cost. To this end, the following definition proposed by the authors addresses  
302 RQ1 by succinctly integrating these key concepts:

303         *Cost drivers of an infrastructure project are the considerations that do or can directly or*  
304         *indirectly have a substantial positive or negative influence on the project’s total actual cost.*

305

## 306 **4 Towards classifying cost drivers**

### 307 **4.1 Taxonomy of infrastructure project cost drivers**

308         To answer RQ2, the taxonomy of infrastructure project cost drivers (Table 3) highlights the 14  
309 level 1 cost drivers, presented in order of most common in literature: Project team cohesiveness;  
310 Contract and procurement; Rework and additional work; Materials; Labour; Uncertainty and

311 complexity; Socio-political stakeholders; Schedule; Regulations; Economy; Size of infrastructure  
312 and/or its components; Equipment and plant; Corruption and conflict; Health & safety.

313         Although these cost drivers are applicable across infrastructure projects, they must be  
314 prioritised on a case-by-case basis. Exemplifying *materials*, this is a more fundamental cost driver on  
315 construction projects rather than decommissioning projects. However, some nuclear decommissioning  
316 projects, for instance, entail the construction of waste storage facilities, so materials can be a cost driver  
317 in decommissioning (LaGuardia and Murphy 2012) even if the relative impact is greater on construction  
318 projects. Similarly, *uncertainty and complexity* is likely to have a higher relative cost impact on  
319 megaprojects compared to smaller projects, but is included since all infrastructure projects have a  
320 varying range of uncertainty and/or complexity (Loch et al. 2006; Remington and Pollack 2007).

321

## 322 **4.2 Interpreting the divide between explicit and synonym sources**

323         As seen in the taxonomy, cost driver explicit sources mainly recognised *materials* (specifically  
324 total direct cost), *labour*, *schedule* (specifically the total duration), *regulations*, and *size of*  
325 *infrastructure and/or its components* as the fundamental level 1 cost drivers. In contrast, cost driver  
326 synonym sources have considerable focus on *project team cohesiveness*, *contract and procurement*,  
327 and *rework and additional work*, also acknowledging *materials* (specifically inflation and shortages),  
328 *uncertainty and complexity*, *schedule* (specifically delays), and *economy* (specifically inflation).  
329 *Equipment and plant*, *corruption and conflict*, and *health & safety* had negligible comparisons.

330         These findings can be interpreted to justify the different perspectives. Cost driver explicit  
331 sources tend to focus on the planned/measurable totals of the project that strongly influence the overall  
332 project cost, which could be considered the “traditional” view. Cost driver synonym sources, however,  
333 tend to focus on the unplanned/hard-to-measure hindrances of the project that can cause a substantial  
334 deviation from the forecasted variables; this is due to synonym phrases commonly being derivatives of  
335 cost overrun drivers. Regardless, all of these totals and hindrances are cost drivers because they  
336 significantly influence actual cost, consistent with Propositions 1 and 2. Therefore, because the cost  
337 drivers body of knowledge has not been adequately defined or conceptualised by others, the high-cost

338 hindrances identified in cost driver synonym sources could be considered cost drivers alongside the  
339 measurable totals. This is a forward-looking view of cost drivers since it widens the set of cost drivers  
340 to be considered.

341 Further interpretation of the divide reveals that the focus on planned/measurable totals from  
342 cost driver explicit sources is a result of the common use of regression or sensitivity analysis. These  
343 methods neglect any hard-to-measure aspects like many of the hindrances (e.g., competence) due to  
344 their quantitative nature and focus on cost estimation accuracy. This makes for an incomplete set of  
345 outputted cost drivers that will continually arise without the aid of inductive methods (as evident in  
346 Lowe et al. 2006; Stoy et al. 2008; Xiong and Xia 2014). In contrast, researchers that did not use (only)  
347 mathematical models outputted a more comprehensive, broad set of cost drivers, meaning the traditional  
348 view has hindered the ability for cost driver explicit research to be progressed. This paper's taxonomy  
349 should therefore be utilised by cost drivers researchers straying from these traditions.


350

### 351 **4.3 Relationships between cost drivers**

352 Fig. 3 contextualises the relationships between the cost drivers in the taxonomy. This develops  
353 the causal mechanism of direct and indirect cost drivers by exemplifying three routes that the cost  
354 drivers in the taxonomy can take to incur/affect costs. Along the top path, cost is incurred due to an  
355 indirect cost driver impacting an intervening variable. Along the middle path, cost is incurred stemming  
356 from an indirect cost driver, which results in an intervening variable that impacts a direct cost driver.  
357 Along the bottom path, cost is incurred due to an indirect cost driver impacting a direct cost driver.

358

359



360

361 Fig. 3 – Linkages between cost drivers

362

363 **5 Towards conceptualising cost drivers**

364 To address RQ3, this section presents a conceptual framework: a control/definition matrix of  
 365 cost driver types (Fig. 4).

**Definition dimension**  
*Do the project team define the cost driver's occurrence or impact in planning?*

		Defined	Undefined
		Control dimension <i>Is the cost driver's actual cost impact under the control of the project team?</i>	Controllable
Uncontrollable	FIXED		UNFORESEEABLE

366

367 Fig. 4 – Control/definition matrix of cost driver types

368

369 For the control dimension, if the cost driver's actual cost impact is under the control of the  
 370 project team, it is classed as "controllable", otherwise it is "uncontrollable". In other words, for the  
 371 former, the project team itself has the ability to reduce (or increase) the cost / cost impact associated  
 372 with the cost driver. This idea of cost drivers control is distinguished explicitly by some (ACE 2010;

373 ETI 2018; Shane et al. 2009), and is in part supported by others that have classified cost drivers under  
374 internal and/or external factors (Derakhshanalavijeh and Teixeira 2017; Enshassi et al. 2009; Membah  
375 and Asa 2015).

376 For the definition dimension, if a cost driver's occurrence or impact is able to be defined by the  
377 project team, i.e., in planning/front-end stages, it is "defined", otherwise it is "undefined". Discussion  
378 of defined/undefined cost drivers in planning is not explicit in the literature, though there is a rich body  
379 of knowledge highlighting that poor planning by the project team is a key contributor to errors (e.g.,  
380 Love and Matthews 2022) and, thus, rework and additional work (e.g., Love et al. 2017).

381 For added clarity, the authors have defined the four different types of cost driver as follows,  
382 also highlighting how the ability to reduce the cost associated with each type lessens:

- 383 1. Flexible (FL) cost drivers are able to have their actual cost impact controlled by the project  
384 team and they are defined in planning. The project team has a direct influence in these, so their  
385 actual cost reduction is the most accessible of the four types. For *uncertainty and complexity*,  
386 however, the actual cost impact is *indirectly* reducible; the authors refer to "known unknowns",  
387 where risk management is able to mitigate the specific effects of this cost driver (Ramasesh and  
388 Browning 2014), thus making it flexible.
- 389 2. Error-induced (E) cost drivers stem from lack of definition by the project team. Better front-  
390 end definition could reduce their occurrence or severity.
- 391 3. Fixed (FI) cost drivers are defined by the project team but the project team cannot reduce their  
392 cost impact; it is "fixed in place".
- 393 4. Unforeseeable (U) cost drivers are not controllable by the project team and, omitting  
394 contingencies, are not defined in planning. Their cost is therefore the most challenging for the  
395 project team to address. Some of these cost drivers are still on the "known unknowns" spectrum  
396 as the project team are aware that they (will) impact actual cost and so conventional risk  
397 management can apply (Ramasesh and Browning 2014 p. 191). For others, it is impossible to  
398 control or even be aware of them impacting actual cost, akin to that of "unknown unknowns"  
399 (Loch et al. 2006; Ramasesh and Browning 2014). Although unknown unknowns take greater  
400 effect on projects with a higher degree of novelty (again emphasising a case-by-case assessment

401 of cost drivers), project teams can respond to unknown unknowns by establishing a culture of  
402 continual and flexible adjustment / adaptability in planning (Loch et al. 2006; Orr and Levitt  
403 2011) and testing multiple solutions simultaneously to identify the appropriate response (Loch  
404 et al. 2006).

405

406 The matrix's dimensions and types were conceived based on the cost drivers from the  
407 taxonomy. This research would therefore be incomplete if each cost driver in the taxonomy was not  
408 assigned a type, so Table 4 is presented. Some FL, E, and FI cost drivers in the table have also been  
409 assigned a U. For the FL/U and E/U cost drivers, this accounts for the fact that projects are guaranteed  
410 to entail circumstances that cannot be defined and are out of the project team's control (Kim et al. 2020;  
411 Love and Matthews 2022), which can be due to, e.g., supply chain issues, existing conditions, weather,  
412 or stakeholder influence. For the FI/U cost driver, *exchange rates*, it refers to the defined (at the time  
413 of planning) but fluctuating nature of exchange rates.

414

## 415 **6 Research agenda**

### 416 **6.1 Reduce the actual cost of controllable cost drivers in planning**

417 The cost reduction of each controllable cost driver (i.e., flexible or error-induced) can take place  
418 in either the planning stages or execution stage of projects. Cost reduction research has more value if  
419 contextualising the former since all of the controllable cost drivers' actual cost is more significantly  
420 reduced with good front-end definition rather than good execution (Merrow 2011). This could be termed  
421 "reducing actual cost in planning" going forward; "reducing the cost estimate" can be misleading in the  
422 topic of cost reduction due to its association with reducing estimate inaccuracy rather than outright  
423 reduction of the estimate.

424 Still, there are several valuable avenues of research with an execution stage focus. More  
425 development is required here in regard to *project team cohesiveness, labour, and health & safety –*  
426 *rework and additional work* is already a well-developed field of research for both execution and  
427 planning stage contexts (e.g., Love 2002; Love et al. 2017, 2021). Existing research has refrained from

428 answering how the cost associated with these cost drivers can be reduced. A research question relating  
429 to *project team cohesiveness* and *labour* could consider how, in the cases where poor  
430 competence/collaboration of project team members or competence/productivity of the labour workforce  
431 may be unavoidable in the execution stage, how can costs be controlled? For *health & safety*, it is  
432 surprising that research on mental wellbeing is an area that is considerably lacking in project  
433 management to this day (Li et al. 2022; Morris 2022), let alone its relationship with cost reduction.  
434 Researchers must particularly strive to identify what is (not) done by project team members and/or  
435 organisations to ensure cost associated with mental health/wellbeing is controlled, acknowledging that  
436 health & safety assurance is arguably the most important duty for infrastructure project teams.  
437 Noteworthy, this research stream applies to the planning stage as well as execution.

438         There are eight cost drivers that can have their associated actual cost reduced in planning and  
439 require further research: *project team cohesiveness*, *contract and procurement*, *materials*, *labour*,  
440 *uncertainty and complexity*, *socio-political stakeholders*, *schedule*, and *equipment and plant*. Research  
441 streams related to these cost drivers are now presented.

442         There are similarities between *project team cohesiveness* and *labour*; selecting competent,  
443 productive, and collaborative personnel is a significantly important part of planning and cost reduction  
444 since, as Merrow (2011) emphasises, people do projects. The question for researchers is: how is the  
445 optimal balance of personnel cost and achieving project objectives determined when selecting project  
446 team members and/or labour? Researchers asking this can take inspiration from the work on cost-  
447 schedule trade-offs (Bayraktar et al. 2011), i.e., by focusing on “cost-competence” trade-offs.

448         *Contract and procurement* researchers generally agree that incentive mechanisms and  
449 partnering/alliances have a positive correlation with (cost) performance as compared to non-relational  
450 contracts (e.g., Meng and Gallagher 2012; Suprpto et al. 2016) when done correctly (Gil 2009).  
451 However, as Morris (2022) posits, more clarity is required on how procurement strategies are formed  
452 in the ever-evolving project setting. Cost certainty between owner and contractor in contract and  
453 procurement strategies is relatively understood, but how are contract or procurement strategies selected  
454 in terms of ensuring costs are as low/controllable as can be for a particular project?

455            *Materials and equipment and plant* are similar cost drivers in that they are strongly influenced  
456 by supply chain management. The substantial complexity associated with coordinating the supply chain  
457 can be alleviated with systems integrators / integrated teams, known to benefit cost (Davies et al. 2009;  
458 Davies and Mackenzie 2014), but it remains an under-researched area (Denicol et al. 2020; Morris  
459 2022). Researchers could examine tacit knowledge gained by project team members in their cost-  
460 efficient selection of materials or equipment and plant. This places a necessary focus on the people that  
461 manage projects and can advance knowledge management and project-as-practice research (Cicmil et  
462 al. 2006; van der Hoorn and Whitty 2019; Morris 2022).

463            *Uncertainty and complexity*, directly linked with risk and its management, is a cost driver that  
464 continues to be highly researched in project management. However, with risk management continuing  
465 to receive inadequate investment in the front-end (Morris 2022) and ambiguity surrounding uncertainty  
466 and complexity (Padalkar and Gopinath 2016), researchers should consider why this is the case and  
467 focus on what project teams do in planning to sufficiently define projects whilst controlling/optimising  
468 the associated costs.

469            The importance of *socio-political stakeholders* as a cost driver cannot be underestimated in  
470 planning. Social and political groups have the power to terminate projects (Invernizzi et al. 2017b;  
471 Juarez Cornelio et al. 2021), not least cause delays (Locatelli et al. 2017a), therefore assessing the  
472 influence of and gaining support from these parties is paramount. This cost driver has not been fully  
473 explored; researchers have tended towards examining engagement processes with socio-political  
474 stakeholders that positively correlate with cost, with much to be learnt on the micro level, e.g.,  
475 engagement practices with stakeholders in planning (Burger et al. 2019) to reduce cost.

476            *Schedule* is a cost driver influenced by duration and delays. Reducing/optimising the project  
477 duration using models such as the critical path method falls under a mature area of project management  
478 knowledge (Turner et al. 2013), requiring less attention in the present day as compared to the softer,  
479 people-dependent areas. This is the case for delays, which are in many cases traced back to planning  
480 stage errors of the project team (Larsen et al. 2016; Love and Matthews 2022). Delays have already  
481 been studied to mitigate their occurrence and impact (Grant et al. 2006; Han et al. 2009), but their

482 prevailing influence on cost in complex projects again necessitates a deeper knowledge of risk  
483 management (Morris 2022; Sanchez-Cazorla et al. 2016).

484 As a caveat to accompany all of these research avenues, researchers have a duty to identify cost  
485 reduction solutions that are socially and environmentally responsible, i.e., they do not fall into the “dark  
486 side” of project management such as modern slavery (Alzoubi et al. 2023) and corruption (Locatelli et  
487 al. 2017b).

488

## 489 **6.2 Adopt more exploratory and inductive methods in cost drivers research**

490 The authors strongly encourage the use of more inductive approaches to identify and investigate  
491 a wider range of cost drivers. As has been highlighted, regression and sensitivity analysis are commonly  
492 associated with the planned/measurable totals mindset of cost drivers (e.g., Ofori-Boadu 2015) rather  
493 than incorporating the unplanned/hard-to-measure hindrances that have a strong influence on actual  
494 cost (e.g., Yang et al. 2011). Therefore, the authors recommend inductively establishing a stronger  
495 knowledge base of cost drivers, as agreed by some users of regression models highlighted in this paper  
496 (Stoy et al. 2008; Stoy and Schalcher 2007). The richness of results from studies using interviews with  
497 project team members (Efron and Read 2012; Zhao et al. 2017) and qualitative data extracted from  
498 project documents (Adedipe and Shafiee 2021; Kwok et al. 2010) confirm this recommendation. These  
499 do not have to be standalone methods, however; the authors equally encourage the use of multiple  
500 methods to output a richer set of cost drivers for a given case project (Elmousalami 2020).

501 The authors also found that the rigour of existing methods of synthesis used in cost driver  
502 explicit sources is lacking. Unlike this paper’s taxonomy and conceptual framework, researchers have  
503 tended towards basic methods of presenting findings that lack novelty and a detailed consideration of  
504 how their findings can be used, which makes for unstimulating discussion and thus limited development  
505 of the area. Future research should give more attention to stimulating data synthesis methods not only  
506 to extend academic knowledge but to consider what project team members can actually use from cost  
507 drivers research, narrowing the divide between academia and practice.

508 Together with the proposed research avenues from the previous subsection, researchers should  
509 take inspiration from single or multiple case studies that take a deep look into the project setting, its  
510 actors, interactions within the project team, and the range of planning and management considerations  
511 that were or were not adequately addressed (e.g., Davies et al. 2016; Davies and Mackenzie 2014) to  
512 study actual cost reduction. This could be studied with the aim of benchmarking – i.e., the identification  
513 and implementation of exemplar practices of others to self-improve (Anand and Kodali 2008) – to  
514 compare and contrast practice across multiple projects (Invernizzi et al. 2017a, 2018). Moreover, taking  
515 a project-as-practice approach can provide insightful findings about what project team members  
516 actually do to reduce cost, particularly if researchers perform observation of meetings and/or day-to-  
517 day activities (Çıdık and Bowler 2022; Hällgren and Söderholm 2010; O’Leary and Williams 2013).

518

### 519 **6.3 Expand the research context of cost drivers**

520 The authors encourage researchers to diversify the setting in which cost drivers are studied.  
521 There have been valuable contributions across a variety of project contexts, but the literature lacks a  
522 focus on two key complex project settings in which an understanding of cost drivers/reduction is  
523 essential:

- 524 1. *Megaprojects*. Just one journal publication by Kwok et al. (2010) that briefly looked into  
525 megaproject cost drivers was identified; given that their study is now over 10 years old and is  
526 specific to one case, cost drivers (explicitly termed) in megaprojects is an almost untouched  
527 topic in academic literature. Megaproject costs have been commonly studied in relation to how  
528 complexity (Brady and Davies 2014; Davies and Mackenzie 2014; Kardes et al. 2013) and  
529 governance (Gil and Fu 2021; Locatelli et al. 2014; Turner 2022) influence cost. However,  
530 seldom addressed is what project teams actively do to reduce the huge costs of megaprojects as  
531 opposed to using the aforementioned subjects to explain poor cost management.
- 532 2. *Decommissioning projects*. The authors found that published literature on decommissioning  
533 project cost drivers is lacking, compared to cost overruns which has seen recent developments  
534 in a nuclear context (Invernizzi et al. 2019, 2020b; a). Some have derived decommissioning-

535 specific cost drivers (Kaiser 2017; Raimi et al. 2021), but this paper has only included Adedipe  
536 and Shafiee (2021) since their outputted set of cost drivers included two that were generalisable.  
537 Therefore, the authors urge researchers to develop the decommissioning cost drivers database,  
538 not only for the purpose of contributing to research but for the sake of tackling these essential  
539 and extremely complex “back-end” projects. A case in point is the biggest project (i.e., most  
540 expensive, long, and complex) in the UK and possibly Europe: the Sellafield nuclear  
541 decommissioning megaproject (Locatelli 2021).

542

## 543 **7 Conclusions**

544 In an infrastructure project context, the cost drivers body of knowledge is significantly  
545 underdeveloped; this has limited the developments in cost reduction research. Using a rigorous  
546 integrative review methodology, the authors critically reviewed and synthesised existing cost drivers  
547 literature to fill the main preliminary gaps and resolve inconsistencies in this field, with the specific aim  
548 to define, classify, and conceptualise the cost drivers of infrastructure projects. First, the authors  
549 deduced an accurate, complete definition of cost drivers that is applicable across infrastructure projects.  
550 Second, the authors presented a taxonomy of the 14 key cost drivers of infrastructure projects, which  
551 integrates those scattered across literature into one classification system that is applicable across  
552 projects. Third, the authors proposed a two-by-two matrix of cost driver types that distinguishes the  
553 ability to control and define (i.e., plan) cost drivers. Lastly, the authors’ research agenda proposes  
554 prioritising the study of controllable cost drivers, utilising exploratory and inductive methods, and  
555 considering complex project contexts. In summary, this paper’s theoretical contribution is a deepening  
556 of infrastructure project cost drivers knowledge using a definition, taxonomy, and conceptual  
557 framework. This work is for use by researchers wishing to further the study of cost drivers and cost-  
558 reducing processes and practices used by project teams.

559 The practical contribution of this paper is twofold. It is first a comprehensive summary of the  
560 key opportunities for – and threats to – cost reduction for project team members actually “doing” cost  
561 reduction. Second, it is a deepened awareness of the cost drivers whose cost project team members can  
562 actually reduce, i.e., controllable cost drivers. Going forward, both public bodies and private

563 organisations aiming to reduce the cost of infrastructure projects should put more emphasis on  
564 benchmarking project teams members' effective cost reduction practices associated with the  
565 controllable cost drivers. This is particularly important in high-cost, complex, and uncertain project  
566 environments such as UK nuclear decommissioning projects (GOV.UK 2019). Despite this paper's  
567 value to project teams, the primary audience is not cost estimators as they may find greater benefit in  
568 utilising the most up-to-date cost estimation models that have already been developed/tested as well as  
569 studied extensively in cost reduction literature (Olawale and Sun 2015).

570 As a general recommendation for researchers, the authors encourage a more explicit use of the  
571 term cost drivers to generate a broader and deeper understanding in infrastructure project management  
572 research, having identified only 14 journal publications providing transferable cost drivers. The authors  
573 also encourage developing cost drivers separate from a budget related focus. Budget adherence topics  
574 have dominated infrastructure project literature, and consequently almost all cost driver studies focus  
575 on how they can reduce estimate inaccuracy rather than reduce actual cost. The body of knowledge  
576 already provides strategies to reduce estimate inaccuracy (Abanda et al. 2017; Flyvbjerg 2006; Torp  
577 and Klakegg 2016), whereas reducing actual cost requires a more in-depth understanding of project  
578 team practice.

579 There are three main limitations to this paper that can be addressed if this paper's findings are  
580 applied in empirical settings. First, the taxonomy can be applied in a case study of a specific project,  
581 with the opportunity to supplement and develop the taxonomy with empirical primary data and thus  
582 customise it for said project (see, e.g., Padala et al. 2020). Similarly, the matrix can be used in an  
583 empirical setting to understand its application in specific infrastructure project cases, with the ability to  
584 "plot" the project-specific cost drivers. Lastly, cost drivers from a case project could be inputted into  
585 the causal mechanism to map the relationships between the project's direct and indirect cost drivers.

586

## 587 **Appendix A – Cost driver synonyms for the Scopus search**

588 Cost overrun\*; Cost and time overrun\*; Cost performance; Cost and time performance; Cost\*  
589 reduc\*; Reduc\* cost\*; Reduc\* actual cost\*; Cost\* increas\*; Increase\* cost\*; High cost\*; Large cost\*;  
590 Cost categor\*; Cost group\*; Affect\* cost; Cost effect; Impact\* cost; Cost impact; Influencc\* cost; Cost

591 influenc\*; Cost component\*; Component of cost\*; Cost factor\*; Cost uncertainty factor\*; Factor\* of  
592 cost; Cost element\*; Element\* cost; Cost significant; Cost item\*; Item\* cost; Key cost\*; Major cost\*;  
593 Cost determinant\*; Determinant of cost\*.

594

## 595 **Data availability statement**

596 All data, models, and code generated or used during the study appear in the submitted article.

597

## 598 **Acknowledgements**

599 The authors would like to thank the funder of this research, the National Nuclear Laboratory (NNL),  
600 for making it possible to conduct this research (research grant NNL/UA/115). In particular, the authors  
601 would like to thank Mr Karl Sanderson from the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA), for his  
602 valuable feedback on earlier versions of this manuscript. The ideas and opinions in this paper represent  
603 only the point of view of the authors, and only the authors are responsible for any omission or mistake.  
604 This paper should not be taken to represent in any way the point of view of NNL, NDA, or any other  
605 organisation either in the UK or abroad.

606

## 607 **References**

608 Abanda, F. H., B. Kamsu-Foguem, and J. H. M. Tah. 2017. "BIM – New rules of measurement ontology  
609 for construction cost estimation." *Eng. Sci. Technol. an Int. J.*, 20 (2): 443–459. Karabuk  
610 University. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jestch.2017.01.007>.

611 ACA. 2014. *Major infrastructure projects: costs and productivity issues*. Deloitte.

612 ACE. 2010. "The cost drivers of infrastructure projects: Why project costs vary." Accessed June 22,  
613 2021. <https://www.acenet.co.uk/media/1480/the-cost-drivers-of-infrastructure.pdf>.

614 Adedipe, T., and M. Shafiee. 2021. "An economic assessment framework for decommissioning of  
615 offshore wind farms using a cost breakdown structure." *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*, 26 (2): 344–  
616 370. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-020-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-020-01793-x)  
617 [01793-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-020-01793-x).

618 Aje, O. I., K. T. Odusami, and D. R. Ogunsemi. 2009. "The impact of contractors' management  
619 capability on cost and time performance of construction projects in Nigeria." *J. Financ. Manag.  
620 Prop. Constr.*, 14 (2): 171–187. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13664380910977619>.

621 Akinci, B., and M. Fischer. 1998. "Factors Affecting Contractors' Risk of Cost Overburden." *J. Manag.  
622 Eng.*, 14 (1): 67–76. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0742-597X\(1998\)14:1\(67\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0742-597X(1998)14:1(67)).

623 Alzoubi, Y., G. Locatelli, and T. Sainati. 2023. "Modern Slavery in Projects: A Systematic Literature  
624 Review and Research Agenda." *Proj. Manag. J.*, 875697282211481.  
625 <https://doi.org/10.1177/87569728221148158>.

626 Ammeter, A. P., and J. M. Dukerich. 2002. "Leadership, Team Building, and Team Member  
627 Characteristics in High Performance Project Teams." *Eng. Manag. J.*, 14 (4): 3–10.  
628 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10429247.2002.11415178>.

629 Anand, G., and R. Kodali. 2008. "Benchmarking the benchmarking models." *Benchmarking An Int. J.*,  
630 15 (3): 257–291. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14635770810876593>.

631 Annamalaisami, C. D., and A. Kuppuswamy. 2021. "Managing Cost Risks: Toward a Taxonomy of  
632 Cost Overrun Factors in Building Construction Projects." *ASCE-ASME J. Risk Uncertain. Eng.  
633 Syst. Part A Civ. Eng.*, 7 (2): 04021021. <https://doi.org/10.1061/AJRUA6.0001132>.

634 Australian Government. 2018. *Cost Estimation Guidance Note 3A – Supplementary Guidance*.

635 Baumeister, R. F., and M. R. Leary. 1997. "Writing Narrative Literature Reviews." *Rev. Gen. Psychol.*,  
636 1 (3): 311–320. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.1.3.311>.

637 Bayraktar, M. E., M. Hastak, S. Gokhale, and B. Safi. 2011. "Decision Tool for Selecting the Optimal  
638 Techniques for Cost and Schedule Reduction in Capital Projects." *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, 137  
639 (9): 645–655. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0000345](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000345).

640 Bilge, E. Ç., and H. Yaman. 2022. "Research trends analysis using text mining in construction  
641 management: 2000–2020." *Eng. Constr. Archit. Manag.*, 29 (8): 3210–3233.  
642 <https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-02-2021-0107>.

643 Blomquist, T., M. Hällgren, A. Nilsson, and A. Söderholm. 2010. "Project-as-practice: In search of  
644 project management research that matters." *Proj. Manag. J.*, 41 (1): 5–16.  
645 <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.20141>.

646 Brady, T., and A. Davies. 2014. "Managing Structural and Dynamic Complexity: A Tale of Two  
647 Projects." *Proj. Manag. J.*, 45 (4): 21–38. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.21434>.

648 Bryde, D., M. Broquetas, and J. M. Volm. 2013. "The project benefits of Building Information  
649 Modelling (BIM)." *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 31 (7): 971–980.  
650 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2012.12.001>.

651 Burger, K., L. White, and M. Yearworth. 2019. "Understanding front-end project workshops with  
652 Social Practice Theory." *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 37 (1): 161–175. Elsevier Ltd, APM and IPMA.  
653 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2018.11.003>.

654 Callahan, J. L. 2010. "Constructing a Manuscript: Distinguishing Integrative Literature Reviews and  
655 Conceptual and Theory Articles." *Hum. Resour. Dev. Rev.*, 9 (3): 300–304.  
656 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484310371492>.

657 Callahan, J. L. 2014. "Writing Literature Reviews: A Reprise and Update." *Hum. Resour. Dev. Rev.*,  
658 13 (3): 271–275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484314536705>.

659 Chasey, A. D., W. E. Maddex, and A. Bansal. 2012. "Comparison of Public–Private Partnerships and  
660 Traditional Procurement Methods in North American Highway Construction." *Transp. Res. Rec.*  
661 *J. Transp. Res. Board*, 2268 (1): 26–32. <https://doi.org/10.3141/2268-04>.

662 Chen, Q., Z. Jin, B. Xia, P. Wu, and M. Skitmore. 2016. "Time and Cost Performance of Design–Build  
663 Projects." *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, 142 (2): 04015074. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-  
664 7862.0001056](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001056).

665 Cheng, Y.-M. 2014. "An exploration into cost-influencing factors on construction projects." *Int. J. Proj.*  
666 *Manag.*, 32 (5): 850–860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.10.003>.

667 Chritamara, S., S. O. Ogunlana, and N. Luong Bach. 2001. "Investigating the effect of initial scope  
668 establishment on the performance of a project through system dynamics modelling." *Eng. Constr.*  
669 *Archit. Manag.*, 8 (5–6): 381–392. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb021198>.

670 Cicmil, S., T. Williams, J. Thomas, and D. Hodgson. 2006. "Rethinking Project Management:  
671 Researching the actuality of projects." *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 24 (8): 675–686.  
672 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2006.08.006>.

673 CIDB. 2017. "The Drivers of the Cost of Public Sector Construction." Accessed May 11, 2021.

674 <https://www.cidb.org.za/download/98/other-reports/6075/drivers-of-cost-of-construction->  
675 [assessment-and-recommendations.pdf](https://www.cidb.org.za/download/98/other-reports/6075/drivers-of-cost-of-construction-assessment-and-recommendations.pdf).

676 Çıdık, M. S., and V. Bowler. 2022. "Project value as practice: Interactive valuation practices in  
677 architectural design projects." *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 40 (4): 362–371. Elsevier Ltd.  
678 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2022.03.010>.

679 Collier, P., M. Kirchberger, and M. Söderbom. 2016. "The cost of road infrastructure in low-and  
680 middle-income countries." *World Bank Econ. Rev.*, 30 (3): 522–548.  
681 <https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/lhv037>.

682 Davies, A., M. Dodgson, and D. Gann. 2016. "Dynamic Capabilities in Complex Projects: The Case of  
683 London Heathrow Terminal 5." *Proj. Manag. J.*, 47 (2): 26–46.  
684 <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.21574>.

685 Davies, A., D. Gann, and T. Douglas. 2009. "Innovation in Megaprojects: Systems Integration at  
686 London Heathrow Terminal 5." *Calif. Manage. Rev.*, 51 (2): 101–125.  
687 <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166482>.

688 Davies, A., and I. Mackenzie. 2014. "Project complexity and systems integration: Constructing the  
689 London 2012 Olympics and Paralympics Games." *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 32 (5): 773–790. Elsevier  
690 Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.10.004>.

691 Denicol, J., A. Davies, and I. Krystallis. 2020. "What Are the Causes and Cures of Poor Megaproject  
692 Performance? A Systematic Literature Review and Research Agenda." *Proj. Manag. J.*, 51 (3):  
693 328–345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/8756972819896113>.

694 Derakhshanalavijeh, R., and J. M. C. Teixeira. 2017. "Cost overrun in construction projects in  
695 developing countries, Gas-Oil industry of Iran as a case study." *J. Civ. Eng. Manag.*, 23 (1): 125–  
696 136. <https://doi.org/10.3846/13923730.2014.992467>.

697 Dissanayaka, S. M., and M. M. Kumaraswamy. 1999. "Evaluation of factors affecting time and cost  
698 performance in Hong Kong building projects." *Eng. Constr. Archit. Manag.*, 6 (3): 287–298.  
699 <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb021119>.

700 DOE. 2018. "Cost Estimating Guide." Accessed July 7, 2021.  
701 <https://www.directives.doe.gov/directives-documents/400-series/0413.3-EGuide->

702 21A/@@images/file.

703 Efron, N., and M. Read. 2012. “Analysing international tunnel costs: an interactive qualifying project.”  
704 Worcester, MA. [https://web.wpi.edu/Pubs/E-project/Available/E-project-043012-](https://web.wpi.edu/Pubs/E-project/Available/E-project-043012-122558/unrestricted/Analysing_International_Tunnelling_Costs_Public_Report.pdf)  
705 [122558/unrestricted/Analysing\\_International\\_Tunnelling\\_Costs\\_Public\\_Report.pdf](https://web.wpi.edu/Pubs/E-project/Available/E-project-043012-122558/unrestricted/Analysing_International_Tunnelling_Costs_Public_Report.pdf).

706 Ekung, S., I. Odesola, and A. Lashinde. 2021. “Agenda for first costs reduction in sustainable buildings  
707 for emerging markets.” *Int. J. Sustain. Build. Technol. Urban Dev.*, 12 (2): 126–141.  
708 <https://doi.org/10.22712/susb.20210011>.

709 Elmousalami, H. H. 2020. “Artificial Intelligence and Parametric Construction Cost Estimate  
710 Modeling: State-of-the-Art Review.” *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, 146 (1): 03119008.  
711 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0001678](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001678).

712 Elsbach, K. D., and D. Knippenberg. 2020. “Creating High-Impact Literature Reviews: An Argument  
713 for ‘Integrative Reviews.’” *J. Manag. Stud.*, 57 (6): 1277–1289.  
714 <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12581>.

715 Enshassi, A., J. Al-Najjar, and M. Kumaraswamy. 2009. “Delays and cost overruns in the construction  
716 projects in the Gaza Strip.” *J. Financ. Manag. Prop. Constr.*, 14 (2): 126–151.  
717 <https://doi.org/10.1108/13664380910977592>.

718 Enshassi, A., and A. Ayyash. 2014. “Factors affecting cost contingency in the construction industry –  
719 Contractors’ perspective.” *Int. J. Constr. Manag.*, 14 (3): 191–208.  
720 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2014.922729>.

721 ETI. 2018. “The ETI Nuclear Cost Drivers Project: Summary Report.” London. Accessed May 11,  
722 2021. <https://www.eti.co.uk/library/the-eti-nuclear-cost-drivers-project-summary-report>.

723 Flyvbjerg, B. 2006. “From Nobel Prize to Project Management: Getting Risks Right.” *Proj. Manag. J.*,  
724 37 (3): 5–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/875697280603700302>.

725 Flyvbjerg, B. 2014. “What you Should Know about Megaprojects and Why: An Overview.” *Proj.*  
726 *Manag. J.*, 45 (2): 6–19. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.21409>.

727 Flyvbjerg, B., A. Ansar, A. Budzier, S. Buhl, C. Cantarelli, M. Garbuio, C. Glenting, M. S. Holm, D.  
728 Lovallo, D. Lunn, E. Molin, A. Rønneest, A. Stewart, and B. van Wee. 2018. “Five things you  
729 should know about cost overrun.” *Transp. Res. Part A Policy Pract.*, 118: 174–190.

730 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2018.07.013>.

731 Flyvbjerg, B., M. K. S. Holm, and S. L. Buhl. 2004. "What Causes Cost Overrun in Transport  
732 Infrastructure Projects?" *Transp. Rev.*, 24 (1): 3–18.  
733 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144164032000080494a>.

734 Flyvbjerg, B., M. S. Holm, and S. Buhl. 2002. "Underestimating Costs in Public Works Projects: Error  
735 or Lie?" *J. Am. Plan. Assoc.*, 68 (3): 279–295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944360208976273>.

736 Forbes. 2023. "Enabling Sustainable Urban Districts With Digitalization." Accessed April 14, 2023.  
737 [https://www.forbes.com/sites/siemens-smart-infrastructure/2023/02/17/enabling-sustainable-  
738 urban-districts-with-digitalization/?sh=33fec2c844b4](https://www.forbes.com/sites/siemens-smart-infrastructure/2023/02/17/enabling-sustainable-urban-districts-with-digitalization/?sh=33fec2c844b4).

739 GAO. 2020. *Cost Estimating and Assessment Guide: Best Practices for Developing and Managing  
740 Program Costs*.

741 Gharaibeh, H. M. 2014. "Cost Control in Mega Projects Using the Delphi Method." *J. Manag. Eng.*, 30  
742 (5): 1–7. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)ME.1943-5479.0000218](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0000218).

743 Gil, N. 2009. "Developing Cooperative Project Client-Supplier Relationships: How Much to Expect  
744 from Relational Contracts?" *Calif. Manage. Rev.*, 51 (2): 144–169.  
745 <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166484>.

746 Gil, N. A., and Y. Fu. 2021. "MEGAPROJECT PERFORMANCE, VALUE CREATION AND  
747 VALUE DISTRIBUTION: AN ORGANIZATIONAL GOVERNANCE PERSPECTIVE." *Acad.  
748 Manag. Discov.* <https://doi.org/10.5465/amd.2020.0029>.

749 Gil, N., and S. Beckman. 2009. "Introduction: Infrastructure Meets Business: Building New Bridges,  
750 Mending Old Ones." *Calif. Manage. Rev.*, 51 (2): 6–29. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166478>.

751 Goh, K. C., and J. Yang. 2014. "Importance of Sustainability-Related Cost Components in Highway  
752 Infrastructure: Perspective of Stakeholders in Australia." *J. Infrastruct. Syst.*, 20 (1): 04013002.  
753 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)IS.1943-555X.0000152](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)IS.1943-555X.0000152).

754 GOV.UK. 2019. "Nuclear Provision: the cost of cleaning up Britain's historic nuclear sites."  
755 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nuclear-provision-explaining-the-cost-of-cleaning-  
757 nuclear-legacy](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nuclear-provision-explaining-the-cost-of-cleaning-up-britains-nuclear-legacy/nuclear-provision-explaining-the-cost-of-cleaning-up-britains-<br/>756 nuclear-legacy).

758 Grant, K. P., W. M. Cashman, and D. S. Christensen. 2006. "Delivering Projects On Time." *Res.*  
759 *Manag.*, 49 (6): 52–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08956308.2006.11657408>.

760 Hällgren, M., and A. Söderholm. 2010. "Orchestrating deviations in global projects: Projects-as-  
761 practice observations." *Scand. J. Manag.*, 26 (4): 352–367.  
762 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2010.09.002>.

763 Hällgren, M., and A. Söderholm. 2012. "Projects-as-Practice: New Approach, New Insights." *Oxford*  
764 *Handb. Proj. Manag.*, P. W. G. Morris, J. K. Pinto, and J. Soderlund, eds. Oxford, UK: Oxford  
765 University Press.

766 Han, S. H., S. Yun, H. Kim, Y. H. Kwak, H. K. Park, and S. H. Lee. 2009. "Analyzing Schedule Delay  
767 of Mega Project: Lessons Learned From Korea Train Express." *IEEE Trans. Eng. Manag.*, 56 (2):  
768 243–256. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2009.2016042>.

769 Heptonstall, P., R. Gross, P. Greenacre, and T. Cockerill. 2012. "The cost of offshore wind:  
770 Understanding the past and projecting the future." *Energy Policy*, 41: 815–821. Elsevier.  
771 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.11.050>.

772 HM Treasury. 2014. *Infrastructure Cost Review: Measuring and Improving Delivery*. London, UK.

773 HM Treasury, and Infrastructure UK. 2010a. *Infrastructure Cost Review: Main Report*. London, UK.

774 HM Treasury, and Infrastructure UK. 2010b. *Infrastructure Cost Review: Technical Report*. London,  
775 UK.

776 van der Hoorn, B., and S. J. Whitty. 2019. "The five modes of compartment for project managing:  
777 Disclosing the tacit in project work." *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 37 (3): 363–377. Elsevier Ltd.  
778 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2019.01.009>.

779 Hsieh, T., S. Lu, and C. Wu. 2004. "Statistical analysis of causes for change orders in metropolitan  
780 public works." *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 22 (8): 679–686.  
781 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2004.03.005>.

782 Ika, L. A., P. E. D. Love, and J. K. Pinto. 2020. "Moving Beyond the Planning Fallacy: The Emergence  
783 of a New Principle of Project Behavior." *IEEE Trans. Eng. Manag.*, 1–16.  
784 <https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2020.3040526>.

785 Ingersoll, E., K. Gogan, and G. Locatelli. 2020. "Managing drivers of cost in the construction of nuclear

786 plants.” *Bridge*, 50 (3): 32–37.

787 Invernizzi, D. C., G. Locatelli, N. Brookes, and A. Davis. 2020a. “Qualitative comparative analysis as  
788 a method for project studies: The case of energy infrastructure.” *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*,  
789 133: 110314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110314>.

790 Invernizzi, D. C., G. Locatelli, and N. J. Brookes. 2017a. “How benchmarking can support the selection,  
791 planning and delivery of nuclear decommissioning projects.” *Prog. Nucl. Energy*, 99: 155–164.  
792 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnucene.2017.05.002>.

793 Invernizzi, D. C., G. Locatelli, and N. J. Brookes. 2017b. “Managing social challenges in the nuclear  
794 decommissioning industry: A responsible approach towards better performance.” *Int. J. Proj.*  
795 *Manag.*, 35 (7): 1350–1364. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.12.002>.

796 Invernizzi, D. C., G. Locatelli, and N. J. Brookes. 2018. “A methodology based on benchmarking to  
797 learn across megaprojects.” *Int. J. Manag. Proj. Bus.*, 11 (1): 104–121.  
798 <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMPB-05-2017-0054>.

799 Invernizzi, D. C., G. Locatelli, and N. J. Brookes. 2019. “An exploration of the relationship between  
800 nuclear decommissioning projects characteristics and cost performance.” *Prog. Nucl. Energy*,  
801 110: 129–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnucene.2018.09.011>.

802 Invernizzi, D. C., G. Locatelli, and N. J. Brookes. 2020b. “Characterising nuclear decommissioning  
803 projects: an investigation of the project characteristics that affect the project performance.”  
804 *Constr. Manag. Econ.*, 38 (10): 947–963. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01446193.2020.1775859>.

805 Johnson, R. M., and R. I. I. Babu. 2020. “Time and cost overruns in the UAE construction industry: a  
806 critical analysis.” *Int. J. Constr. Manag.*, 20 (5): 402–411. Taylor & Francis.  
807 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2018.1484864>.

808 Josephson, P.-E., B. Larsson, and H. Li. 2002. “Illustrative Benchmarking Rework and Rework Costs  
809 in Swedish Construction Industry.” *J. Manag. Eng.*, 18 (2): 76–83.  
810 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0742-597X\(2002\)18:2\(76\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0742-597X(2002)18:2(76)).

811 Juarez Cornelio, J. R., T. Sainati, and G. Locatelli. 2021. “What does it take to kill a megaproject? The  
812 reverse escalation of commitment.” *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 39 (7): 774–787. Elsevier Ltd.  
813 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2021.07.004>.

814 Kaiser, M. J. 2017. "FERC pipeline decommissioning cost in the U.S. Gulf of Mexico, 1995–2015."  
815 *Mar. Policy*, 82 (2017): 167–180. Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.05.006>.

816 Kaming, P. F., P. O. Olomolaiye, G. D. Holt, and F. C. Harris. 1997. "Factors influencing construction  
817 time and cost overruns on high-rise projects in Indonesia." *Constr. Manag. Econ.*, 15 (1): 83–94.  
818 <https://doi.org/10.1080/014461997373132>.

819 Kardes, I., A. Ozturk, S. T. Cavusgil, and E. Cavusgil. 2013. "Managing global megaprojects:  
820 Complexity and risk management." *Int. Bus. Rev.*, 22 (6): 905–917.  
821 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2013.01.003>.

822 Karimi, H., T. R. B. Taylor, G. B. Dadi, P. M. Goodrum, and C. Srinivasan. 2018. "Impact of Skilled  
823 Labor Availability on Construction Project Cost Performance." *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, 144 (7):  
824 04018057. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0001512](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001512).

825 Kim, J. J., J. A. Miller, and S. Kim. 2020. "Cost Impacts of Change Orders due to Unforeseen Existing  
826 Conditions in Building Renovation Projects." *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, 146 (8): 04020094.  
827 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0001888](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001888).

828 Koushki, P. A., K. Al-Rashid, and N. Kartam. 2005. "Delays and cost increases in the construction of  
829 private residential projects in Kuwait." *Constr. Manag. Econ.*, 23 (3): 285–294.  
830 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144619042000326710>.

831 Kwok, E. C. S., P. M. Anderson, and S. H. S. Ng. 2010. "Value engineering for railway construction  
832 projects: Cost driver analysis." *Proc. Inst. Mech. Eng. Part F J. Rail Rapid Transit*, 224 (1): 45–  
833 52. <https://doi.org/10.1243/09544097JRRT291>.

834 LaGuardia, T. S., and K. C. Murphy. 2012. "Financing and economics of nuclear facility  
835 decommissioning." *Nucl. Decommissioning Planning, Exec. Int. Exp.*, M. Laraia, ed. Cambridge:  
836 Woodhead Publishing.

837 Larsen, J. K., G. Q. Shen, S. M. Lindhard, and T. D. Brunoe. 2016. "Factors Affecting Schedule Delay,  
838 Cost Overrun, and Quality Level in Public Construction Projects." *J. Manag. Eng.*, 32 (1):  
839 04015032. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(asce\)me.1943-5479.0000391](https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)me.1943-5479.0000391).

840 Li, K., D. Wang, Z. Sheng, and M. A. Griffin. 2022. "A Deep Dive into Worker Psychological Well-  
841 Being in the Construction Industry: A Systematic Review and Conceptual Framework." *J. Manag.*

842 *Eng.*, 38 (5). [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)ME.1943-5479.0001074](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0001074).

843 Ling, F. Y. Y., and P. Q. Tran. 2012. "Effects of interpersonal relations on public sector construction  
844 contracts in Vietnam." *Constr. Manag. Econ.*, 30: 1087–1101.  
845 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01446193.2012.729848>.

846 Liu, Y., R.-D. Chang, J. Zuo, F. Xiong, and N. Dong. 2022. "What leads to the high capital cost of  
847 prefabricated construction in China: perspectives of stakeholders." *Eng. Constr. Archit. Manag.*,  
848 ahead-of-p (ahead-of-print). Emerald Publishing Limited. [https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-06-](https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-06-2021-0538)  
849 [2021-0538](https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-06-2021-0538).

850 Locatelli, G. 2021. "Is Your Organization Ready for Managing 'Back-End' Projects?" *IEEE Eng.*  
851 *Manag. Rev.*, 49 (3): 175–181. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EMR.2021.3098064>.

852 Locatelli, G., D. C. Invernizzi, and N. J. Brookes. 2017a. "Project characteristics and performance in  
853 Europe: An empirical analysis for large transport infrastructure projects." *Transp. Res. Part A*  
854 *Policy Pract.*, 98: 108–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2017.01.024>.

855 Locatelli, G., M. Mancini, and E. Romano. 2014. "Systems Engineering to improve the governance in  
856 complex project environments." *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 32 (8): 1395–1410.  
857 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.10.007>.

858 Locatelli, G., G. Mariani, T. Sainati, and M. Greco. 2017b. "Corruption in public projects and  
859 megaprojects: There is an elephant in the room!" *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 35 (3): 252–268. The  
860 Authors. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.09.010>.

861 Loch, C. H., A. De Meyer, and M. T. Pich. 2006. *Managing the Unknown: A New Approach to*  
862 *Managing High Uncertainty and Risk in Projects*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

863 Love, P. E. D. 2002. "Influence of Project Type and Procurement Method on Rework Costs in Building  
864 Construction Projects." *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, 128 (1): 18–29.  
865 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-9364\(2002\)128:1\(18\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(2002)128:1(18)).

866 Love, P. E. D., D. D. Ahiaga-Dagbui, and Z. Irani. 2016. "Cost overruns in transportation infrastructure  
867 projects: Sowing the seeds for a probabilistic theory of causation." *Transp. Res. Part A Policy*  
868 *Pract.*, 92: 184–194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2016.08.007>.

869 Love, P. E. D., D. J. Edwards, and Z. Irani. 2012. "Moving Beyond Optimism Bias and Strategic

870 Misrepresentation: An Explanation for Social Infrastructure Project Cost Overruns.” *IEEE Trans.*  
871 *Eng. Manag.*, 59 (4): 560–571. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2011.2163628>.

872 Love, P. E. D., Z. Irani, J. Smith, M. Regan, and J. Liu. 2017. “Cost performance of public infrastructure  
873 projects: the nemesis and nirvana of change-orders.” *Prod. Plan. Control*, 28 (13): 1081–1092.  
874 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2017.1333647>.

875 Love, P. E. D., and H. Li. 2000. “Quantifying the causes and costs of rework in construction.” *Constr.*  
876 *Manag. Econ.*, 18 (4): 479–490. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01446190050024897>.

877 Love, P. E. D., and J. Matthews. 2022. “Error Mastery in Alliance Transport Megaprojects.” *IEEE*  
878 *Trans. Eng. Manag.*, 1–18. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2022.3151494>.

879 Love, P. E. D., J. Matthews, and W. Fang. 2021. “Reflections on the Risk and Uncertainty of Rework  
880 in Construction.” *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, 147 (4): 06021001.  
881 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0002030](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0002030).

882 Lowe, D. J., M. W. Emsley, and A. Harding. 2006. “Predicting Construction Cost Using Multiple  
883 Regression Techniques.” *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, 132 (7): 750–758.  
884 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-9364\(2006\)132:7\(750\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(2006)132:7(750)).

885 Mahamid, I. 2018. “Study of relationship between cost overrun and labour productivity in road  
886 construction projects.” *Int. J. Product. Qual. Manag.*, 24 (2): 143.  
887 <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPQM.2018.091791>.

888 Mahmud, A. T., S. O. Ogunlana, and W. T. Hong. 2021. “Key driving factors of cost overrun in highway  
889 infrastructure projects in Nigeria: a context-based perspective.” *J. Eng. Des. Technol.*, 19 (6):  
890 1530–1555. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEDT-05-2020-0171>.

891 Manley, K., and L. Chen. 2016. “The impact of client characteristics on the time and cost performance  
892 of collaborative infrastructure projects.” *Eng. Constr. Archit. Manag.*, 23 (4): 511–532.  
893 <https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-06-2015-0084>.

894 Mansfield, N., O. Ugwu, and T. Doran. 1994. “Causes of delay and cost overruns in Nigerian  
895 construction projects.” *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 12 (4): 254–260. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0263-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0263-7863(94)90050-7)  
896 [7863\(94\)90050-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0263-7863(94)90050-7).

897 De Marco, A., and T. Narbaev. 2021. “Factors of Schedule and Cost Performance of Tunnel

898 Construction Megaprojects.” *Open Civ. Eng. J.*, 15 (1): 38–49.  
899 <https://doi.org/10.2174/1874149502115010038>.

900 Membah, J., and E. Asa. 2015. “Estimating cost for transportation tunnel projects: a systematic  
901 literature review.” *Int. J. Constr. Manag.*, 15 (3): 196–218.  
902 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2015.1067345>.

903 Meng, X., and B. Gallagher. 2012. “The impact of incentive mechanisms on project performance.” *Int.*  
904 *J. Proj. Manag.*, 30 (3): 352–362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2011.08.006>.

905 Merrow, E. W. 2011. *Industrial Megaprojects - Concepts, Strategies, and Practices for Success*.  
906 Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

907 Migliaccio, G. C., M. Guindani, M. D’Incognito, and L. Zhang. 2013. “Empirical Assessment of Spatial  
908 Prediction Methods for Location Cost-Adjustment Factors.” *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, 139 (7):  
909 858–869. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0000654](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000654).

910 Mirza, E., and N. Ehsan. 2017. “Quantification of Project Execution Complexity and its Effect on  
911 Performance of Infrastructure Development Projects.” *Eng. Manag. J.*, 29 (2): 108–123. Taylor  
912 & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10429247.2017.1309632>.

913 Mitropoulos, P., and G. Howell. 2001. “Model for Understanding, Preventing, and Resolving Project  
914 Disputes.” *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, 127 (3): 223–231. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-  
915 9364\(2001\)127:3\(223\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(2001)127:3(223)).

916 Morris, P. W. G. 2022. “A working account of the rise of project management.” *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*,  
917 40 (2): 91–94. Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2022.01.005>.

918 Mostafa, S., V. W. Tam, J. Dumrak, and S. Mohamed. 2020. “Leagile Strategies for Optimizing the  
919 Delivery of Prefabricated House Building Projects.” *Int. J. Constr. Manag.*, 20 (8): 867–881.  
920 Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2018.1494674>.

921 NDA. 2020. *Annual Report & Accounts 2019/20*.

922 NDA. 2021. *Annual Report and Accounts 2020/21*.

923 O’Leary, T., and T. Williams. 2013. “Managing the Social Trajectory: A Practice Perspective on Project  
924 Management.” *IEEE Trans. Eng. Manag.*, 60 (3): 566–580. IEEE.  
925 <https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2012.2228206>.

926 OECD/NEA. 2003. "Decommissioning Nuclear Power Plants: Policies, Strategies and Costs." Paris:  
927 OECD. Accessed March 8, 2021. [https://www.oecd-nea.org/jcms/pl\\_13608](https://www.oecd-nea.org/jcms/pl_13608).

928 OECD/NEA. 2016. *Costs of Decommissioning Nuclear Power Plants*. Paris: OECD.

929 Ofori-Boadu, A. N. 2015. "Exploring regression models for forecasting early cost estimates for high-  
930 rise buildings." *J. Technol. Manag. Appl. Eng.*, 31 (5): 1–24.

931 Okpala, D. C., and A. N. Aniekwu. 1988. "Causes of High Costs of Construction in Nigeria." *J. Constr.*  
932 *Eng. Manag.*, 114 (2): 233–244. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-9364\(1988\)114:2\(233\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(1988)114:2(233)).

933 Oladapo, A. A. 2007. "A quantitative assessment of the cost and time impact of variation orders on  
934 construction projects." *J. Eng. Des. Technol.*, 5 (1): 35–48.  
935 <https://doi.org/10.1108/17260530710746597>.

936 Olawale, Y. A., and M. Sun. 2010. "Cost and time control of construction projects: Inhibiting factors  
937 and mitigating measures in practice." *Constr. Manag. Econ.*, 28 (5): 509–526.  
938 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01446191003674519>.

939 Olawale, Y., and M. Sun. 2015. "Construction project control in the UK: Current practice, existing  
940 problems and recommendations for future improvement." *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 33 (3): 623–637.  
941 Elsevier Ltd and IPMA. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.10.003>.

942 Orr, R. J., and R. E. Levitt. 2011. "Local embeddedness of firms and strategies for dealing with  
943 uncertainty in global projects." *Glob. Proj. Institutional Polit. Challenges*, W. R. Scott, R. E.  
944 Levitt, and R. J. Orr, eds. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

945 Padala, S. P. S., J. U. Maheswari, and H. Hirani. 2020. "Identification and classification of change  
946 causes and effects in construction projects." *Int. J. Constr. Manag.*, 1–20.  
947 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2020.1827186>.

948 Padalkar, M., and S. Gopinath. 2016. "Six decades of project management research: Thematic trends  
949 and future opportunities." *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 34 (7): 1305–1321. Elsevier Ltd and Association  
950 for Project Management and the International Project Management Association.  
951 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.06.006>.

952 Pellicer, E., G. I. Carvajal, M. C. Rubio, and J. Catalá. 2014. "A method to estimate occupational health  
953 and safety costs in construction projects." *KSCE J. Civ. Eng.*, 18 (7): 1955–1965.

954 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12205-014-0591-2>.

955 Post, C., R. Sarala, C. Gatrell, and J. E. Prescott. 2020. "Advancing Theory with Review Articles." *J.*  
956 *Manag. Stud.*, 57 (2): 351–376. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12549>.

957 Qian, X. (Alice), and E. Papadonikolaki. 2021. "Shifting trust in construction supply chains through  
958 blockchain technology." *Eng. Constr. Archit. Manag.*, 28 (2): 584–602. Emerald Publishing  
959 Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-12-2019-0676>.

960 Rahman, I. A., A. H. Memon, and A. T. A. Karim. 2013. "Relationship between Factors of Construction  
961 Resources Affecting Project Cost." *Mod. Appl. Sci.*, 7 (1): 67–75.  
962 <https://doi.org/10.5539/mas.v7n1p67>.

963 Raimi, D., A. J. Krupnick, J.-S. Shah, and A. Thompson. 2021. "Decommissioning Orphaned and  
964 Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells: New Estimates and Cost Drivers." *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 55 (15):  
965 10224–10230. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c02234>.

966 Raisbeck, P., C. Duffield, and M. Xu. 2010. "Comparative performance of PPPs and traditional  
967 procurement in australia." *Constr. Manag. Econ.*, 28 (4): 345–359.  
968 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01446190903582731>.

969 Ramabodu, M. S., and J. J. P. Verster. 2013. "Factors that influence cost overruns in South African  
970 public sector mega-projects." *Int. J. Proj. Organ. Manag.*, 5 (1/2): 48–56.  
971 <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPOM.2013.053153>.

972 Ramasesh, R. V., and T. R. Browning. 2014. "A conceptual framework for tackling knowable unknown  
973 unknowns in project management." *J. Oper. Manag.*, 32 (4): 190–204.  
974 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2014.03.003>.

975 Reichelt, K., and J. Lyneis. 1999. "The dynamics of project performance: benchmarking the drivers of  
976 cost and schedule overrun." *Eur. Manag. J.*, 17 (2): 135–150. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-2373(98)00073-5)  
977 [2373\(98\)00073-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-2373(98)00073-5).

978 Remington, K., and J. Pollack. 2007. *Tools for Complex Projects*. Farnham, UK: Gower Publishing.

979 RICS. 2015. *Management of risk – RICS professional guidance, UK*. London, UK: RICS.

980 Rocco, S. T., and S. M. Plakhotnik. 2009. "Literature reviews, conceptual frameworks, and theoretical  
981 frameworks: Terms, functions, and distinctions." *Hum. Resour. Dev. Rev.*, 8 (1): 120–130.

982 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484309332617>.

983 Sanchez-Cazorla, A., R. Alfalla-Luque, and A. I. Irimia-Diequez. 2016. "Risk Identification in  
984 Megaprojects as a Crucial Phase of Risk Management: A Literature Review." *Proj. Manag. J.*, 47  
985 (6): 75–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/875697281604700606>.

986 Sandberg, J., and M. Alvesson. 2011. "Ways of constructing research questions: gap-spotting or  
987 problematization?" *Organization*, 18 (1): 23–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508410372151>.

988 Scott, W. R., R. E. Levitt, and R. J. Orr. 2011. *Global Projects: Institutional and Political Challenges*.  
989 Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

990 Sepasgozar, S. M. E., A. M. Costin, R. Karimi, S. Shirowzhan, E. Abbasian, and J. Li. 2022. "BIM and  
991 Digital Tools for State-of-the-Art Construction Cost Management." *Buildings*, 12 (4): 396.  
992 <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12040396>.

993 Shane, J. S., K. R. Molenaar, S. Anderson, and C. Schexnayder. 2009. "Construction Project Cost  
994 Escalation Factors." *J. Manag. Eng.*, 25 (4): 221–229. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0742-  
995 597X\(2009\)25:4\(221\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0742-597X(2009)25:4(221)).

996 Shenhar, A. J., and D. Dvir. 1996. "Toward a typological theory of project management." *Res. Policy*,  
997 25 (4): 607–632. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333\(95\)00877-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333(95)00877-2).

998 Sinesilassie, E. G., S. Z. S. Tabish, and K. N. Jha. 2018. "Critical factors affecting cost performance: a  
999 case of Ethiopian public construction projects." *Int. J. Constr. Manag.*, 18 (2): 108–119. Taylor  
1000 & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2016.1277058>.

1001 Snyder, H. 2019. "Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines." *J. Bus.*  
1002 *Res.*, 104: 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>.

1003 Stoy, C., S. Pollalis, and H.-R. Schalcher. 2008. "Drivers for Cost Estimating in Early Design: Case  
1004 Study of Residential Construction." *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, 134 (1): 32–39.  
1005 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-9364\(2008\)134:1\(32\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(2008)134:1(32)).

1006 Stoy, C., and H.-R. Schalcher. 2007. "Residential Building Projects: Building Cost Indicators and  
1007 Drivers." *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, 133 (2): 139–145. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-  
1008 9364\(2007\)133:2\(139\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(2007)133:2(139)).

1009 Sunindijo, R. Y. 2015. "Project manager skills for improving project performance." *Int. J. Bus. Perform.*

1010 *Manag.*, 16 (1): 67. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBPM.2015.066041>.

1011 Suprpto, M., H. L. M. Bakker, H. G. Mooi, and M. J. C. M. Hertogh. 2016. “How do contract types  
1012 and incentives matter to project performance?” *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 34 (6): 1071–1087. Elsevier  
1013 Ltd and Association for Project Management and the International Project Management  
1014 Association. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2015.08.003>.

1015 Tong, B., J. Guo, and S. Fang. 2021. “Predicting Budgetary Estimate of Highway Construction Projects  
1016 in China Based on GRA-LASSO.” *J. Manag. Eng.*, 37 (3): 04021012.  
1017 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)ME.1943-5479.0000890](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0000890).

1018 Torp, O., and O. Klakegg. 2016. “Challenges in Cost Estimation under Uncertainty—A Case Study of  
1019 the Decommissioning of Barsebäck Nuclear Power Plant.” *Adm. Sci.*, 6 (4): 14.  
1020 <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci6040014>.

1021 Torraco, R. J. 2005. “Writing Integrative Literature Reviews: Guidelines and Examples.” *Hum. Resour.*  
1022 *Dev. Rev.*, 4 (3): 356–367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484305278283>.

1023 Torraco, R. J. 2016. “Writing Integrative Literature Reviews.” *Hum. Resour. Dev. Rev.*, 15 (4): 404–  
1024 428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484316671606>.

1025 Turner, J. R. 2022. “Using Principal–Steward Contracting and Scenario Planning to Manage  
1026 Megaprojects.” *Proj. Manag. J.*, 53 (1): 8–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/87569728211061836>.

1027 Turner, J. R., F. Anbari, and C. Bredillet. 2013. “Perspectives on research in project management: the  
1028 nine schools.” *Glob. Bus. Perspect.*, 1 (1): 3–28. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40196-012-0001-4>.

1029 Venkataraman, R. R., and J. K. Pinto. 2008. *Cost and Value Management in Projects*. Hoboken, NJ:  
1030 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

1031 Venkateswaran, C. B., and R. Murugasan. 2017. “Time Delay and Cost Overrun of Road over Bridge  
1032 (ROB) Construction Projects in India.” *J. Constr. Dev. Ctries.*, 22 (suppl. 1): 79–96.  
1033 <https://doi.org/10.21315/jcdc2017.22.suppl.5>.

1034 Vorster, M. C., and J. M. De La Garza. 1990. “Consequential Equipment Costs Associated with Lack  
1035 of Availability and Downtime.” *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, 116 (4): 656–669.  
1036 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-9364\(1990\)116:4\(656\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(1990)116:4(656)).

1037 Wang, N., and M. Horner. 2007. “CSI model for estimating road maintenance projects.” *Constr. Manag.*

- 1038 *Econ.*, 25 (12): 1269–1281. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01446190701670373>.
- 1039 Whittemore, R., and K. Knafl. 2005. “The integrative review: Updated methodology.” *J. Adv. Nurs.*,  
 1040 52 (5): 546–553. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2005.03621.x>.
- 1041 Wong, G., T. Greenhalgh, G. Westhorp, J. Buckingham, and R. Pawson. 2013. “RAMESES publication  
 1042 standards: meta-narrative reviews.” *J. Adv. Nurs.*, 69 (5): 987–1004.  
 1043 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12092>.
- 1044 Xiong, B., and B. Xia. 2014. “Examining the Effects of Early Cost Drivers on Contingencies.” *Constr.*  
 1045 *Res. Congr. 2014*, 1518–1527. Reston, VA: American Society of Civil Engineers.
- 1046 Yang, L. R., C. F. Huang, and K. S. Wu. 2011. “The association among project manager’s leadership  
 1047 style, teamwork and project success.” *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 29 (3): 258–267. Elsevier Ltd and  
 1048 IPMA. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2010.03.006>.
- 1049 Yap, J. B. H., H. Abdul-Rahman, and W. Chen. 2017. “Collaborative model: Managing design changes  
 1050 with reusable project experiences through project learning and effective communication.” *Int. J.*  
 1051 *Proj. Manag.*, 35 (7): 1253–1271. Elsevier Ltd, APM and IPMA.  
 1052 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.04.010>.
- 1053 Zhang, S., G. C. Migliaccio, P. A. Zandbergen, and M. Guindani. 2014. “Empirical Assessment of  
 1054 Geographically Based Surface Interpolation Methods for Adjusting Construction Cost Estimates  
 1055 by Project Location.” *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, 140 (6). [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0000850](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000850).
- 1057 Zhao, L., J. Mbachu, and N. Domingo. 2017. “Exploratory Factors Influencing Building Development  
 1058 Costs in New Zealand.” *Buildings*, 7 (3): 57. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings7030057>.
- 1059 Zhao, L., J. Mbachu, Z. Liu, X. Zhao, and B. Wang. 2021. “Investigating the Causal Relationships  
 1060 between Project Complexities and Project Cost: An Empirical Study from New Zealand.” *Adv.*  
 1061 *Civ. Eng.*, 2021: 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/6624647>.

1062

1063 **Figures (captions)**

1064 **Fig. 1.** This paper’s integrative review research framework

1065 **Fig. 2.** The causal mechanism of direct and indirect cost drivers

1066 **Fig. 3.** Three examples of the causal mechanism of direct and indirect cost drivers

1067 **Fig. 4.** Control/definition conceptual framework of cost driver types

1068

1069 **Tables**

1070 **Table 1.** Number and types of cost driver explicit and synonym documents in this review

Document type	Explicit			Synonyms
	RQ1	RQ2, RQ3	All	RQ2, RQ3
Journal article	2	12	0	49
Conference paper	0	1	0	–
Grey literature	4	6	1	–
Total	6	19	1	49
75				

1071

1072 **Table 2.** Academic and practitioner definitions for cost drivers

Source	Type/stage	Cost drivers definition	Theme(s)
Ekung et al. (2021 p. 134)	Sustainable buildings	<i>“Cost drivers refer to constraints affecting the cost performance of SB [sustainable buildings] projects.”</i>	Constraints; affect; cost performance.
Wang and Horner (2007 p. 1270)	Road maintenance	<i>“[T]he cost drivers of a set of data are those significant items whose values exceed the average of the set of data...”</i>	Set of data; significant items; exceed average.
Australian Government (2018 p. 128)	(Non-specific)	<i>“A major input to an estimate at a summary level.”</i>	Major input; estimate; summary level.
DOE (2018 p. 75)	(Non-specific)	<i>“A “cost driver” is a major estimate element whose sensitivity significantly impacts TPC [total project cost].”</i>	Major estimate element; sensitivity; significant impact.
ETI (2018 p. 7)	Nuclear plant construction	<i>“The team settled on a definition for cost drivers as: Increasing or decreasing the cost of the project; Representing one of the processes critical to plant completion or “realisation;” Having factual and/or measurable indicators; Associated with at least one of the principal actors in plant completion or “realisation;” and Collectively explaining most of the cost variation among plants.”</i>	Increase or decrease cost; critical; indicators; principal actor; cost variation.
GAO (2020 p. 430)	(Non-specific)	<i>“A system, [programme] characteristic, or cost model input which affects the system or [programme] cost estimate.”</i>	System / programme characteristic / input; affect; cost estimate.
RICS (2015 p. 19)	(Non-specific)	<i>“[T]hings or events that cause costs.”</i>	Things/events; cause costs.

1073

1074 **Table 3.** Taxonomy of infrastructure project cost drivers

Level 1 cost drivers	Level 2 cost drivers	Cost driver explicit	Cost driver synonym
Project team cohesiveness	Client/owner competence	Efron and Read (2012); ETI (2018); Ingersoll et al. (2020); ACA (2014)	Chen et al. (2016); Koushki et al. (2005); Johnson and Babu (2020); Ramabodu and Verster (2013); Manley and Chen (2016); Mahmud et al. (2021); Akinci and Fischer (1998); Dissanayaka and Kumaraswamy (1999); Shane et al. (2009)
	Contractor competence		Koushki et al. (2005); Aje et al. (2009); Rahman et al. (2013); Annamalaisami and Kuppuswamy (2021); Derakhshanalavijeh and Teixeira (2017)
	Project manager competence and leadership		Ammeter and Dukerich (2002); Sinesilassie et al. (2018); Sunindijo (2015); Shane et al. (2009)
	Project team communication		Yang et al. (2011); Ling and Tran (2012); Sinesilassie et al. (2018)
	Subcontractor competence		Olawale and Sun (2010); Akinci and Fischer (1998)
	Consultant competence		Larsen et al. (2016); Derakhshanalavijeh and Teixeira (2017)
Contract and procurement	Procurement method	Efron and Read (2012); LaGuardia and Murphy (2012); ACA (2014)	Chen et al. (2016); Raisbeck et al. (2010); Johnson and Babu (2020); De Marco and Narbaev (2021); Chasey et al. (2012); Chritamara et al. (2001); Shane et al. (2009)
	Contract/scope disputes, management, and definition		Cheng (2014); Mansfield et al. (1994); Okpala and Aniekwu (1988); Mitropoulos and Howell (2001); Oladapo (2007); Sinesilassie et al. (2018); Venkateswaran and Murugasan (2017); Ramabodu and Verster (2013); Shane et al. (2009)
	Contract/payment method		Chen et al. (2016); Mansfield et al. (1994); Okpala and Aniekwu (1988); Meng and Gallagher (2012); Akinci and Fischer (1998); Dissanayaka and Kumaraswamy (1999)
Rework and additional work	Scope changes stemming from planning errors		Love and Li (2000); Mansfield et al. (1994); Koushki et al. (2005); Olawale and Sun (2010); Hsieh et al. (2004); Love et al. (2012); Yap et al. (2017); Oladapo (2007); Johnson and Babu (2020); Ramabodu and Verster (2013); Annamalaisami and

Level 1 cost drivers	Level 2 cost drivers	Cost driver explicit	Cost driver synonym
			Kuppuswamy (2021); Enshassi and Ayyash (2014); Josephson et al. (2002); Derakhshanlavijeh and Teixeira (2017); Shane et al. (2009)
	Scope changes stemming from client requirements		Love and Li (2000); Oladapo (2007); Ramabodu and Verster (2013); Mahmud et al. (2021); Shane et al. (2009)
	Execution errors		Love and Li (2000); Josephson et al. (2002)
Materials	Materials (direct cost)	Efron and Read (2012); ETI (2018); ACE (2010); CIDB (2017); Ingersoll et al. (2020); LaGuardia and Murphy (2012); ACA (2014)	Goh and Yang (2014)
	Material cost inflation/fluctuation		Kaming et al. (1997); Enshassi et al. (2009); Rahman et al. (2013); Annamalaisami and Kuppuswamy (2021)
	Material shortages		Mansfield et al. (1994); Okpala and Aniekwu (1988); Rahman et al. (2013)
	Supply chain logistics	Adedipe and Shafiee (2021)	Koushki et al. (2005)
Labour	Labour (direct cost)	Efron and Read (2012); ETI (2018); ACE (2010); OECD/NEA (2003); Ingersoll et al. (2020); LaGuardia and Murphy (2012); ACA (2014)	
	Competency (and shortage of skill)	ETI (2018); Ingersoll et al. (2020)	Karimi et al. (2018); Derakhshanlavijeh and Teixeira (2017)
	Productivity	ETI (2018); CIDB (2017); Ingersoll et al. (2020)	Mahamid (2018)
	Training costs	ETI (2018); Ingersoll et al. (2020)	
Uncertainty and complexity	Uncertainties / unforeseen events	Efron and Read (2012); OECD/NEA (2003); Membah and Asa (2015); ACA (2014)	Cheng (2014); Olawale and Sun (2010); Akinci and Fischer (1998); Oladapo (2007); Shane et al. (2009)
	General project complexities	Membah and Asa (2015)	Kaming et al. (1997); Olawale and Sun (2010); Mirza and Ehsan (2017); Zhao et al. (2021); Dissanayaka and Kumaraswamy (1999); Shane et al. (2009)
Socio-political stakeholders	Social (stakeholder) requirements/influence	CIDB (2017); OECD/NEA (2003); Zhao et al. (2017)	Venkateswaran and Murugasan (2017); Mahmud et al. (2021); Shane et al. (2009)

Level 1 cost drivers	Level 2 cost drivers	Cost driver explicit	Cost driver synonym
	Political requirements/issues	OECD/NEA (2003)	Enshassi and Ayyash (2014); Mahmud et al. (2021); Akinci and Fischer (1998)
Schedule	Duration	Lowe et al. (2006); Stoy et al. (2008); Stoy and Schalcher (2007); Xiong and Xia (2014); Adedipe and Shafiee (2021)	Flyvbjerg et al. (2004); Olawale and Sun (2010)
	Delays		Mansfield et al. (1994); Enshassi et al. (2009); Annamalaisami and Kuppuswamy (2021); Mahmud et al. (2021)
Regulations	Government/public support	Efron and Read (2012); ACA (2014)	
	Regulatory compliance	ACE (2010); OECD/NEA (2003); Efron and Read (2012); Adedipe and Shafiee (2021); Zhao et al. (2017); ACA (2014)	
	Country-specific regulatory factors	ETI (2018); Ingersoll et al. (2020)	
	Legal compliance	ACE (2010)	Venkateswaran and Murugasan (2017)
Economy	Inflation/fluctuation		Mansfield et al. (1994); Enshassi et al. (2009); Akinci and Fischer (1998); Derakhshanalavijeh and Teixeira (2017); Shane et al. (2009)
	Continental economy	Ofori-Boadu (2015)	Akinci and Fischer (1998)
	Region	Stoy et al. (2008)	
	Exchange rates	Heptonstall et al. (2012)	
Size of infrastructure and/or its components	Site/floor area	Stoy et al. (2008); Lowe et al. (2006); Ofori-Boadu (2015); Xiong and Xia (2014)	
	Number of units on site	OECD/NEA (2003)	
Equipment and plant	Equipment/plant (direct cost)	Efron and Read (2012); ETI (2018); Ingersoll et al. (2020); ACA (2014)	Goh and Yang (2014)
	Lack of availability and downtime equipment costs		Vorster and De La Garza (1990)
Corruption and conflict	Corruption	Collier et al. (2016)	Locatelli et al. (2017)
	Conflict (country-level)	Collier et al. (2016)	
Health & safety	Accident-related costs		Pellicer et al. (2014); Goh and Yang (2014)
	Accident prevention		Pellicer et al. (2014)

1076 **Table 4.** Taxonomy of (level 2) cost driver types

Level 1 cost drivers	Level 2 cost drivers	Cost driver type
Project team cohesiveness	Client/owner competence	FL
	Contractor competence	FL
	Project manager competence and leadership	FL
	Project team communication	FL
	Subcontractor competence	FL
	Consultant competence	FL
Contract and procurement	Contract/scope disputes, management, and definition	FL
	Procurement method	FL
	Contract/payment method	FL
Rework and additional work	Scope changes stemming from planning errors	E
	Scope changes stemming from client requirements	E
	Execution errors	E
Materials	Materials (direct cost)	FL
	Material cost inflation/fluctuation	U
	Material shortages	U
	Supply chain logistics	FL/U
Labour	Labour (direct cost)	FL
	Competency (and shortage of skill)	FL
	Productivity	FL
	Training costs	FL
Uncertainty and complexity	Uncertainties / unforeseen events	FL/U
	General project complexities	FL/U
Socio-political stakeholders	Social (stakeholder) requirements/influence	FL/U
	Political requirements/issues	FL/U
	Government/public support	FL/U
Schedule	Duration	FL
	Delays	E/U
Regulations	Regulatory compliance	FI
	Country-specific regulatory factors	FI
	Legal compliance	FI
Economy	Inflation/fluctuation	U
	Continental economy	U
	Region	FI
	Exchange rates	FI/U
Size of infrastructure and/or its components	Site/floor area (e.g., GFA, GIFA, GEFA)	FI
	Number of units on site	FI
Equipment and plant	Equipment/plant (direct cost)	FL
	Lack of availability and downtime equipment costs	FL/U
Corruption and conflict	Corruption	U
	Conflict (country-level)	U
Health & safety	Accident-related costs	E/U
	Accident prevention	FL

1077