EFFICACY OF ADJUDICATION AS A DISPUTE RESOLUTION MECHANISM: THE CASE OF ROAD PROJECTS IN SRI LANKA

Hasitha Ishara Palihawadana

(159165C)

Degree of Master of Science

Department of Building Economics

University of Moratuwa Sri Lanka

January 2020

EFFICACY OF ADJUDICATION AS A DISPUTE RESOLUTION MECHANISM: THE CASE OF ROAD PROJECTS IN SRI LANKA

Hasitha Ishara Palihawadana

(159165C)

Thesis/Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Master of Science in Construction Law and Dispute Resolution

Department of Building Economics

University of Moratuwa Sri Lanka

January 2020

DECLARATION, COPYRIGHT STATEMENT AND THE STATEMENT OF THE SUPERVISOR

I declare that this is my own work and this thesis/dissertation does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Further, I acknowledge the intellectual contribution of my research supervisor Dr. (Ms.) Sachie Ganathilaka for the successful completion of this research dissertation. I affirm that I will not make any publication from this research without the name(s) of my research supervisor(s) as contributing author(s) unless otherwise I have obtained written consent from my research supervisor(s).

Also, I hereby grant to University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis/dissertation, in whole or in part in print, electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature:

The supervisor/s should certify the thesis/dissertation with	the following declaration.
The above candidate has carried out research for hesis/Dissertation under my supervision.	the Masters/MPhil/PhD
Signature of the supervisor:	Date:

Date:

ABSTRACT

Disputes are unavoidable in construction projects due to their complex nature and could happen at any time. Unresolved disputes may prevent project from completing on time, within the budget and to the desired quality and lead ultimately to project failure. Arbitration has been used as the alternative dispute resolution mechanisms for many years in construction industry. However, over the years, since it is identified that even arbitration has become more time taking and disruptive to work progress, there was a necessity for a quicker dispute resolution mechanism, which helps to flow the work without getting disturbed.

Fulfilling the above need, adjudication has been introduced and incorporated to the construction contracts as interim means of resolving disputes. Although, many researchers and authors identified several steps in order to conduct adjudication successfully, in Sri Lankan context it is experienced that adjudication continuously fail in achieving its objectives.

Therefore, the study was focused on exploring how to enhance effectiveness of adjudication practice and identify the steps to be taken to adopting adjudication as an interim mechanism of dispute resolution in Sri Lankan context.

The study was conducted through a multiple case study. In-depth study was carried out on four selected cases, representing both adjudication successfully and unsuccessfully concluded cases. Case study results were discussed in relation to the steps identified through literature review.

Accordingly, (1) selecting dispute to adjudicate, (2) selecting adjudicators, (3) fair time to be fix, (4) establishing right to review and (5) establishing right to enforce and enforcement procedure of the adjudication process has been identified as failure points of conducting adjudication. Several issues as failure factors of adjudication has been identified in the aforesaid steps which are need to be address to achieve objectives of the adjudication. Identified failure factors were referred to three experts who involved in adjudication and got suggestions to overcome those failure facts.

It is concluded that, in order to achieve the objectives of the adjudication in Sri Lankan construction industry, it is required to adopt full-term/stand-by dispute adjudication board from the commencement of projects, while providing better contractual provision when drafting the contract and establish proper mechanisms by the regulating authorities where it is necessary to address the identified issues.

Key words: Adjudication, Interim dispute resolution mechanism, Road projects

DEDICATION

To those who love smooth running projects....

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to all, who encouraged and help me in many ways to complete this study successfully. Without their kind and generous assistance, this study would not have been completed successfully.

I would like to acknowledge with much appreciation, my supervisor, Dr. (Ms.) Sachie Ganathilaka, for the guidance and supervision given during this study and for the encouragement, which made the work a success.

Then my sincere thank goes to, Dr. (Ms.) Yasangika Sandanayake, Head of the Department, senior lecturers, lecturers and all other staff members of the Department of Building Economics for their guidance and immense support given towards the successful completion of this study.

A very special thanks goes to Mr. J. C. Jayakody, for his help in getting permission to access information and required documents.

Further, I would like to express my thanks to all the industry practitioners, who gave me an immense support to complete this research successfully by spending their valuable time and extending kind cooperation throughout the documentary review and the interviews conducted in case studies and expert interviews.

Last but not least, I would like to express my heartiest gratitude to my family members, friends and batch mates for their kind advices, support and encouragement given to me throughout the progress of this study until the successful completion of the work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION, COPYRIGHT STATEMENT AND THE STATEMENT OF
THE SUPERVISORi
ABSTRACTii
DEDICATIONiii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTSiv
LIST OF FIGURESix
LIST OF TABLESx
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONSxi
1. INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH1
1.1. Background
1.2. Problem statement
1.3. Aim
1.4. Objectives
1.5. Research methodology
1.6. Scope and limitations 6
1.7. Chapter breakdown6
2. CONSTRUCTION ADJUDICATION 8
2.1. Introduction
2.2. Construction Industry and road development projects
2.3. Construction disputes
2.4. ADR Methods in construction dispute resolution
2.5. Construction adjudication
2.5.1. Types of construction adjudication
2.6. Advantages and disadvantages of adjudication
2.7. Types of adjudication
2.8. Legal provisions for adjudication
2.9. Contractual provisions for adjudication
2.10 Adjudication process
2.11 Steps of a successful adjudication22

	2.11.1.	Step 1: Establishing right to adjudicate	. 23
	2.11.2.	Step 2: Selecting dispute to adjudicate	. 25
	2.11.3	Step 3: Selecting adjudicators	. 26
	2.11.4.	Step 4: Appointment of adjudicators	. 27
	2.11.5	Step 5: Fair time to be fix	. 27
	2.11.6	Step 6: Permitting balanced between parties	. 28
	2.11.7	Step 7: Giving powers to the adjudicators	. 29
	2.11.8.	Step 8: Correction of errors	. 29
	2.11.9	Step 9: Establishing right to review	. 30
	2.11.10	0. Step 10: Establishing right to enforce and enforcement procedure	. 31
	2.12. Su	mmary	. 32
3.	RESI	EARCH METHODOLOGY	. 34
	3.1. Res	earch philosophy	. 34
	3.2. Res	earch approach	. 35
	3.3. Res	earch strategy	. 35
	3.3.1.	Case selection	. 36
	3.3.2.	Expert Interviews	. 37
	3.3.3.	Unit of analysis	. 37
	3.4. Res	earch techniques	. 37
	3.4.1.	Data collection techniques.	. 37
	3.4.2.	Data analysis technique	. 38
	3.5. Res	earch Process	. 39
	3.6. Sun	nmary	. 40
4.	DAT	A ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH FINDINGS	. 41
	4.1. Sele	ected cases	. 41
	4.1.1.	Case profile	. 41
	4.2. Fine	dings from case study analysis	. 48
	4.2.1.	Step 1: Establishing right to adjudicate	. 48
	4.2.2.	Step 2: Selecting dispute to adjudicate	. 50
	4.2.3.	Step 3: Selecting adjudicators	. 53
	4.2.4.	Step 4: Appointment of adjudicators	. 56

4.2.5. Step 5: Fair time to be fix	58
4.2.6. Step 6: Permitting balance between the parties	60
4.2.7. Step 7: Giving powers to the adjudicators	61
4.2.8. Step 8: Correction of errors	62
4.2.9. Step 9: Establishing right to review	63
4.2.10. Step 10: Establishing right to enforce and enforcement process.	edure 65
4.3. Summary of case study findings	69
4.4. Expert interviews	74
4.5. Content analysis of expert interviews	74
4.5.1. Selecting dispute to adjudicate	74
4.5.2. Selecting adjudicators	75
4.5.3. Fair time to be fix	75
4.5.4. Establishing right to review	76
4.5.5. Establishing right to enforce and enforcement procedure	76
4.5.6. Other recommendations (if any)	77
4.6. Summary of expert interviews	78
4.7. Summary	79
5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	90
5.1. Summary of the study	90
5.2. Conclusion	91
5.3. Recommendations	94
5.3.1. Recommendations to the construction industry	94
5.3.2. Construction industry practitioners	95
5.4. Contribution to the knowledge	95
5.5. Scope and limitations of the research	95
5.6. Further research directions	95
REFERENCES	97
APPENDICES	107
APPENDIX A: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	107
APPENDIX B: GUIDELINE TO DOCUMENT REVIEW	109
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW GUIDELINE - CASE STUDY	110

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEV	GUIDELINE - EXPERT	SURVEY 111	-
APPENDIX E: TERMS ANI	DEFINITIONS	112)

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1: Research process	39
Figure 4.1: Contribute to adjudication	68

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Stages vs steps	23
Table 4.1: Project details of selected cases	42
Table 4.2: Dispute, adjudication process and final resolution	43
Table 4.3: Success factors of establishing right to adjudicate	49
Table 4.4: Success factors in selecting dispute to adjudicate	50
Table 4.5: Issues in selecting dispute to adjudicate	52
Table 4.6: Action taken to overcome issues in selecting dispute to adjudicate	53
Table 4.7: Issues in selecting an adjudicator	55
Table 4.8: Factors of appointment of an adjudicator	57
Table 4.9: Issues in fair time to be fix	59
Table 4.10: Action taken to overcome issues in fair time to be fix	60
Table 4.11: Factors of permitting balanced between the parties	61
Table 4.12: Factors of giving powers to the adjudicators	62
Table 4.13: Factors of selecting an adjudicator	64
Table 4.14: Factors of selecting an adjudicator	66
Table 4.15: Failure factors in selected cases	70
Table 4.16: Details of the expert	74
Table 4.17: Expert suggestions to overcome identified issues	78
Table 4.18: Theory verses research findings	80

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAA - American Arbitration Association

ADR - Alternative Dispute Resolution

ANA - Authorised Nominating Authorities

BCISPA - Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act

CBSL - Central Bank of Sri Lanka [

CIDA - Construction Industry Development Authority

CPD - Continuous Professional Development

CUBATG - Construction Umbrella Bodies Adjudication Task Group

DAB - Dispute Adjudication Board

DAAB - Dispute Avoidance/ Adjudication Board

DB - Dispute Board

EOT - Extension of Time

FIDIC - Federation Internationale Des Ingenieurs Conseils

GDP - Gross Domestic Product

HGCRA - Housing Grants Construction and Regeneration Act

ICTAD - Institute for Construction Training and Development

MDB - Multilateral Development Bank

MFP - Ministry of Finance Planning

NOD - Notice of Dissatisfaction

RDA - Road Development Authority

UK - United Kingdom