



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

Master's Science in Engineering

**Estimating Risk Interdependency
Ratio for Construction Projects
using Risk Checklist**

by

Junyoung Kim

Department of Architecture & Architectural Engineering

The Graduate School

Seoul National University

February 2018

**Estimating Risk Interdependency
Ratio for Construction Projects
using Risk Checklist**

by

Junyoung Kim

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science in Engineering**

Seoul National University

2018

Estimating Risk Interdependency Ratio for Construction Projects using Risk Checklist

지도교수 이 현 수

이 논문을 공학석사 학위논문으로 제출함

2017년 12월

서울대학교 대학원

건축학과

김 준 영

김준영의 공학석사 학위논문을 인준함

2017年 12月

위 원 장 _____ 박 문 서 (인)

부 위 원 장 _____ 이 현 수 (인)

위 원 _____ 지 석 호 (인)

**Estimating Risk Interdependency
Ratio for Construction Projects
using Risk Checklist**

December, 2017

Approved by Dissertation Committee:

Moonseo Park

Hyun-Soo Lee

Seokho Chi

Abstract

Estimating Risk Interdependency Ratio for Construction Projects using Risk Checklist

Junyoung Kim
Department of Architecture
The Graduate School
Seoul National University

Risk Checklist is a method to systematically classify and organize the risks that have been experienced in the past, and to identify the risk factors that may be present in the future projects. Risk value assessment based on checklists plays a key role in risk management, and various risk assessment researches have been conducted to carry out this systematically.

Risk assessment during pre-construction phase is important due to the uncertainty of the risks that may exist in projects. Risk checklist is a method to systematically classify and organize the risks that have been experienced in the past, and to identify the risk factors that may be present in the future projects. In addition, risk value assessment based on checklists plays a key role in risk management, and various risk assessment researches have been

conducted to carry out this systematically. However, previous approaches have limitations in common, this is because risk values are evaluated individually in risk checklists, which ignore interdependencies among risk factors and neglect the emergence of co-occurrence of risks. Hence, when multiple risk factors co-occur, they cannot be far off from the conventional method of summing the total risk value to establish the risk response strategy. Most of risk factors are interdependent and may have multiple effects if occurred than expected. In particular, specific cause can be overlapped if multiple risks co-occur, and this may result in overestimation of the risk response for the future project.

Thus, the objective of this research is to propose a model to help decision makers to quantify the risk value reflecting the interdependency during the identification phase using existing risk checklist that is currently being practiced in actual construction projects. The proposed model will provide the guideline to support the prediction and identification of the interdependency of risks in practice. In addition, the better understanding and prediction of the exceeding risk response by co-occurring risks during the risk identification phase for decision makers.

Keyword : Risk Checklist, Risk Identification, Risk Co-occurrence, Risk Interdependency, Risk Value applied with Interdependency Ratio

Student Number : 2016-21071

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction	1
1.1. Research Background	1
1.2. Research Objective and Scope	7
1.3. Research Process	8
 Chapter 2. Previous Researches on Risk Management Practices .	10
2.1. Risk Management Practices	11
2.2. Definition of Risk Interdependency.....	16
2.3. Previous Researches on Risk Dependency Relationships.....	17
2.4. Methodology for Measuring the Interdependency Ratio	20
 Chapter 3. Risk Interdependency Ratio Model Development	22
3.1. Risk Interdependency Matrix	23
3.2. Review of Methods for Measuring Interdependency Ratio	25
3.3. Developing Risk Value applied with Interdependency Ratio (RVIR) Model	29
 Chapter 4. Applications of Risk Interdependency in Checklist....	33
4.1. Selection of Risks for Interdependency Matrix.....	33
4.2. Establishing Risk Interdependency Matrix through Structured Interview with Experts.....	35
4.3. Results and Discussions	40

Chapter 5. Conclusions	43
5.1. Summary	43
5.2. Contributions	45
5.3. Limitations and Further Study.....	46
 Bibliography.....	 47
 Appendix	 55
A. Evaluation results for Dependency Power	55
A.1. Design Change Risk Factors.....	55
A.2. Construction Method Change Risk Factors.....	66
 Abstract in Korean.....	 77

List of Tables

Table 2-1. Example of Risk Value Calculation.....	11
Table 2-2. Simple Tabular Calculation of Estimating Contingency	12
Table 3-1. Example of Risk Interdependency Matrix	24
Table 3-2. Review of methods for measuring Interdependency Ratio..	26
Table 4-1. Design Change and Construction Method Change Risk classification in Checklist of ‘L’ Construction Company	34
Table 4-2. Interdependency Matrix for Design Change Risks	37
Table 4-3. Interdependency Matrix for Method Change Risks	38

List of Figures

Figure 1-1. Procedures for creating a risk checklist in risk identification phase	3
Figure 1-2. Research Process	9
Figure 2-1. Process for Establishing Risk Response Strategy.....	14
Figure 2-2. Forward and backward dependency relationship	20
Figure 4-1. Interdependency Ratio of Design Change Risks	40
Figure 4-2. Interdependency Ratio of Construction Method Change Risks.....	40

Chapter 1. Introduction

This chapter presents the research background, objective, scope and process. In addition, at the end of this chapter, main research process is described with research procedure figure.

1.1. Research Background

Construction projects are exposed to numerous risks, since all of projects are unique and have different uncertainties in each projects (Mulcachy, 2003); there is no such project that is considered as risk-free (Tüysüz et al., 2006). If risks are not properly managed in the construction project, the risk factors that threatens the construction cannot be identified, which increases the possibility of schedule delay and cost overrun that may lead to the failure of a project (Chapman, 2001). In order to prevent such situation, it is essential to perform risk management before each project is implemented.

Risk checklists are widely used in the construction industry during the risk identification phase in construction risk management. Risk checklist is a method to classify and organize the risks that have been experienced in the past, and to identify the risk factors that may be present in the future projects (Eybopoosh et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2013). Risk checklists are also used as a basis for risk value, which represents the magnitude of the risk that is

measured (Kim, 2015), assessment at the risk identification phase, since risk checklists are relevant to risk planning and evaluation method that are regularly updated and verified to be applied to actual projects (Figure 1-1).




Figure 1-1. Procedures for creating a risk checklist during pre-construction phase

Risk value assessment based on checklist plays a key role in risk management, and various assessment researches have been conducted to carry out this systematically. However, such researches have limitations in common. This is because risk values are evaluated individually in risk checklists, which ignore interdependencies between risk factors and neglect the emergence of co-occurrence of risks (Yildiz et al., 2014).

The existence of risk interdependency is well recognized by risk management researchers and practitioners, and there are various researches about risk dependences. However, most of existing researches have suggested causal model of risk factors to express dependencies between each risks that lacks the degree of the mutual impact of each risk factor, which is defined as dependency power (Iyer et al., 2010). These kind of approaches may find out the cascading effect of risks, however, when multiple risks co-occur; existing models have limitation to use conventional method of summing the total risk value to establish the risk response strategy.

Most of risk factors are interdependent and may have multiple effects if occurred than expected. In particular, specific causes can be overlapped if multiple risks co-occur, and this may result in overestimation of the risk response for the future project (Yildiz et al., 2014). Overestimation of risk value during the risk identification phase leads to over-investment before the implementation of project, which increases the likelihood of cost overrun and opportunity losses (Teller et al., 2013). Therefore, systematic management of

the risks that may adversely affect the project in pre-construction phase is necessary (Kim et al., 2008).

The two most commonly used techniques to establish risk checklist are structured one-to-one interviews and brainstorming. While risk managers evaluate the risk value within the checklist, it becomes immense for the risk managers to trace the original causes of each risks (Iyer et al., 2010). In other words, instead of specializing in the foundation cause, risk managers regularly have a tendency to cease on assessing immediate preceding risks (Iyer et al., 2010).

According to previous researches, the risks arising from inadequate design changes and construction method changes in domestic construction are considered to be more important relatively than other construction related risks (Lee et al., 2008; Hwang et al., 2008). In addition, the structured interviews with the experts have confirmed that design changes and construction method changes are more risky among various risk factors. This is because assessment of such risks requires on-site condition such as regional environment, weather condition, etc., which is difficult to judge precisely during risk identification process. (Yoo et al., 2006; Lee et al., 2008). For this reason, the design change and construction method change risks occur more frequently than other risks, and existence of overlapping relationship of causes is higher than other risks factors.

However, since further breakdown of checklist during pre-construction

phase is virtually impractical, an appropriate method to quantify interdependency reflected design change and construction method change risks using checklist is essential.

1.2. Research Objective and Scope

The objective of this research is to propose a model to quantify the risk interdependency within existing risk checklist that is currently being practiced in construction projects. The proposed model will provide the guideline to support decision makers to determine more optimized response strategies for the co-occurrence of multiple risks in practice.

The scope of this research is focused within the design change and construction method change risks in checklist. Since the characteristics of each construction project are unique, it cannot be assumed that the risk of design change and construction method change is the most frequent risk in all project. However, those risks are considered as included in most of construction projects; therefore, they are intended to be the main subject of this research. In addition, the risk value may be decreased or increased if interdependency is applied; thus, this research focuses on the part where risk reduces by overlapping relationship when interdependency of risks is reflected.

1.3. Research Process

This research is focused on interdependency relationship among risks within checklist, which is used for risk assessment in pre-construction phase. First, current methods to identify risk dependency are reviewed including models from industries other than construction section. Second, reviewed methods and models are modified to develop the risk interdependency ratio model. Third, the compatibility of developed model and variable selection is performed through structured interview with experts. Thereafter, the results of the research is discussed.

The following diagram summarizes the process of the research (Figure 1-2):




Figure 1-2. Research Process

Chapter 2. Previous Researches on Risk Management Practices

This chapter presents the contents of method to measure risk value in current construction industry, preliminary studies on risk dependency relationships, definition of risk interdependency, and existing method to measure interdependency ratio in other industry.

2.1. Risk Management Practices

In order to develop a response strategy for each risk, the assessment of risks in risk identification phase is essential. When establishing the risk checklist, the risk value (RV) of each risk is measured as following:

$$RV = f(Probability, Impact) = P_i \times C_i \quad (2.1)$$

If such a risk factor occurs, the evaluated risk probability and impact are multiplied to determine whether it exceeds the risk tolerance level of the activity (Kim et al., 2010). This process helps decision makers to distinguish the level of risk. For example, high impact of risk does not always mean the level of risk is also high, if the probability of occurrence is negligible (Table 2-1).

Table 2-1. Example of Risk Value Calculation (PMBOK, 2000)

$\begin{matrix} C_i \\ P_i \end{matrix}$	Very Low 0.05	Low 0.1	Medium 0.2	High 0.4	Very High 0.8
0.9	0.045	0.090	0.180	0.360	0.720
0.7	0.035	0.070	0.140	0.280	0.560
0.5	0.025	0.050	0.100	0.200	0.400
0.3	0.015	0.030	0.060	0.120	0.240
0.1	0.005	0.010	0.020	0.040	0.080

Since the risk values are calculated independently for each risk factor, the countermeasures are also established independently. For example, if there are total of 20 risk factors, the 20 different risk values will be measured and summed up followed by the risk response strategy, which will also be equally summed up (Table 2-2)

Table 2-2. Simple Tabular Calculation of Estimating Contingency

Description of Risk Factor	Probability of Occurrence (%)	Estimated Cost of Consequence (\$)	Risk Value (\$)
Risk A	Probability P_i	Impact C_i	$RV = f(P_i \times C_i)$
Risk B	...	...	...
Risk C	...	...	...
...	...	...	...
Project Estimating Contingency based on:			$\sum P_i \times C_i$

A clear criterion should be established to assess the level of risk to determine the risk response strategy, which is defined as the risk threshold (RT). Risk threshold is based on comprehensive consideration of the management environment, organization, scale and form of project, and other external environment of the construction company concerned. Based on risk threshold, it is able to determine whether to establish a risk response strategy for each risk. If risk values are summed up from the existing risk checklist, it can be decided whether the risk tolerance is exceeded or not. In other words,

if the total of risk value falls below the risk threshold level, the project managers continue with the project at risk. This process can conserve time and cost in construction (Figure 2-1).



Figure 2-1. Process for Establishing Risk Response Strategy

However, applying risk interdependency can result in a change compared to the sum of previously measured risk value due to sequential or cyclical nature of interdependences. Thus, the risk response strategy should be established differently due to the interdependency between risks. If the risk factors are interdependent, the outcome of risk value will vary and be more efficient to establish optimized risk response strategy.

2.2. Definition of Risk Interdependency

Since evaluated risks in checklist are identified and managed independently, project managers often discount the interdependency relationship of risk factors while formulating risk response strategy. This is because it is difficult to recognize the complex interactions of impact that occur among the risks (Iyer et al., 2010). Practitioners defined risk dependency as an effect that can increase the probability of occurrence by cascading relationship of risks (Kwan et al., 2010 and Cavallo et al., 2014). In spite of that, this research focuses on overlapping relationship of risk causes to reduce the risk value rather than cascading effect.

The opinions investigated from the structured interviews with the 11 risk management experts concluded that the risk would reduce if risk interdependency were reflected. Most common reason for the decrease in risk value is that considering interdependency of risks is the evidence of better understanding and predicting the solution of risks, which will decrease the probability and impact of each risk. On account of the basic concept of risk management, which is a process for making better decisions under conditions of uncertainty remains (Nigel et al., 1996; Mulcachy, 2003), it is important to reduce the risks with better perception to decrease the overall cost of construction.

2.3. Previous Researches on Risk Dependency

Relationships

In this section, previous researches on risk dependency and assessment methods are overviewed and their limitations are discussed. In accordance with risk interdependency, there are notable researches that have conducted such subject with significant contribution.

Leu et al. (2003) have suggested the Bayesian-network based risk assessment model for steel construction projects. The suggested model provides the competence to calculate the risk probability based on their relationships in Bayesian-network.

Fu et al. (2012) has conducted research about change in risk assessment method with impact propagation based on Dependency Structure Matrix. The proposed model supports the prediction of change propagation of risks by establishing dependency relationship to avoid unnecessary redesigns.

Yildiz et al. (2013) proposed a knowledge-based risk-mapping tool for the assessment of risk that may lead to the cost overrun of international construction project. This tool allows risk managers to refer the risk histories and interrelationship of previous projects in order to estimate risks for future projects.

Iyer et al. (2010) suggested hierarchical structure analysis of public-private partnership risks based on interpretative structure modeling. Hierarchical

structure provides the interrelationships among risk factors to enable decision makers to assess risk in appropriate way.

Kwan et al. (2010) proposed methods to estimate the impact of risk by utilizing the dependency effect, and establishing risk response strategies based on the developed risk dependency relationship.

Eybopoosh et al., (2011) conducted research about developing the causal relationships among risk factors in order to determine the risk paths using structural equation modeling; this research considers the identification of a network of interactive risk paths.

Cavallo et al. (2010) suggested a model of risk interdependency for disaster prevention strategies by networking approach. This approach address complex interdependent risk for unforeseen which may chain occur.

Teller et al. (2013) provided the evidences that new methodologies addressing the interaction of risks should be developed for the transparency of risk management.


The previous literatures mentioned above have made considerable contributions to risk assessment analysis. However, these approaches have similar limitations from quantitative and on-site workers' perspectives. Since these approaches are based on network relationship of risks, most of the researches have adopted the causal model to establish the dependency relationship of risks using binary format.

These type of approaches may neglect the change in impact of risk because

such format is not able to consider the quantitative aspect of estimating interdependency between risks that may affect the risk value.

2.4. Methodology for Measuring the Interdependency Ratio

Apart from the construction industry, method such as ‘Interregional Input-Output Mode’ is applied to measure the interdependency ratio of each factors in economics (Oosterhaven et al., 2014). In interregional input-output model, the power of backward dependency and the forward dependency of an industry are measured in order to estimate the interdependency ratio between industries. The backward dependency of the industry is the degree to which intermediate goods are purchased from other regions for the production activities, and the degree to which finished products are sold as intermediate



goods in other region is defined as forward dependency (Lee et al., 2006; Yoon et al., 2010).

Figure 2-2. Forward and backward dependency relationship

In order to establish risk interdependency relationship, it is necessary to distinguish the direction of dependency power (Figure 2-2). For instance, if R_a receives influence and R_c gives influence to R_b , then R_b has forward

dependency to R_a and backward dependency to R_c . At a given time, if risk impact is estimated appropriately, the foundation causes of R_b can be assumed to overlap with the causes of R_a and R_c . In addition, if R_b were judged to have no forward or backward dependencies to other risks, it can be evaluated independently.

Thus, in order to determine the amount of each risk effecting other factors, this research focuses on deriving the grade or number of the interdependence of the risks by evaluating the forward dependency power through expert's interview and measuring the backward dependency to establish the interdependency ratio.

Chapter 3. Risk Interdependency Ratio Model Development

In this chapter, proposed a model to quantify the risk value reflecting the interdependency, which is the object of this research. First, suggests method to establish the risk interdependency matrix and methods to measure interdependency ratio for interacting risk factors. Lastly, developing risk value applied with interdependency ratio (RVIR) model.

3.1. Risk Interdependency Matrix

The Reachability matrix is considered to be the most suitable representation method of the risk interdependency relationship, since it is a method of illustrating the effects of a set of items in a series (Iyer et al., 2010). This can be viewed as a visual representation of the interdependency among risk factors. Thus, interdependency relationships of risks is proposed in such matrix format for this research (Table 3-1).

In this Table 3-1, the interdependency among risk factors is expressed on a 5-point scale, where the risk factors of the forward dependency axis affect the risk factors of the backward dependency axis. For instance, if the 'Risk D' in the forward dependency axis is evaluated to have dependency power of '4' on the 'Risk A' on the backward dependency axis, the 'Risk A' on the backward dependency axis is judged to have a strong dependence on 'Risk D'.

Table 3-1. Example of Risk Interdependency Matrix

Risk Factors		Backward Dependency					
		Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E	Risk F
Forward Dependency	Risk A		0	0	0	0	0
	Risk B	0		0	0	0	0
	Risk C	4	0		1	2	5
	Risk D	4	3	0		2	0
	Risk E	1	0	0	0		0
	Risk F	1	1	0	0	0	

3.2. Review of Methods for Measuring Interdependency Ratio

In this section, methods were tested to validate their feasibility to derive the result value of this research. In order to evaluate the ratio of dependency power, methods are tested to validate their feasibility for deriving the result value of this research.

To elucidate the most feasible method for measuring Interdependency Ratio (IR) based on risk interdependency matrix, several methods that previous researches have conducted such as Dependency Structure Method (DSM), Influence Diagramming, Concept of Interdependency within an Organization, Interpretative Structural Modeling (ISM), Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), and Interregional Input-Output Model (IRIO) are reviewed (Table 3-2).

Methods for measuring Interdependency Ratio	Reviewed Items
--	----------------

Table 3-2. Review of methods for measuring Interdependency Ratio

		Dependency Representation	Quantification	Multiple Factors	Interdependency Ratio
1	Dependency Structure Method	☐		☐	
2	Influence Diagramming	☐	☐	☐	
3	Concept of Interdependency within an Organization	☐	☐		☐
4	Interpretative Structural Modeling	☐		☐	
5	Structural Equation Modeling	☐	☐	☐	
6	Interregional Input-Output Model		☐	☐	☐

According to the result of review in Table 3-2, Dependency Structure Matrix and Interpretative Structural Modeling have feasibility to represent the dependency relationship. However, it is difficult to quantify the dependency power among risk factors since both methods are based on binary format, which is used for establishing the level of relationship between factors in hierarchical form (Iyer et al., 2010). In contrast, Influence Diagramming and Structural Equation Modeling provides quantification of dependency power. Nonetheless, the feasibility to analyze the measurement of interdependency ratio are ineligible.

As a result of the review, the Concept of Interdependency within an Organization and the Interregional Input-Output model, which is a method used in other industries than the construction industry, are able to analyze both relationship and dependency power between factors. However, the Concept of Interdependency within an Organization method have limitations in that the more the number of factors, the more difficult it is to measure them. Interregional Input-Output model is able to measure dependency power between industries in large scale; however, this model also has limitations in that it is difficult to measure the influence of each factor on the extent of the derived interdependence.

Therefore, in this research, concept of interdependency within an organization and the interregional input-output model will be modified as appropriate method of measuring Interdependency Ratio among Risk Factors.

The validity of proposed model will be confirmed by measuring the Risk value applied with Interdependency Ratio using dependency value evaluated by structured interviews of experts.

3.3. Developing Risk Value applied with Interdependency Ratio (RVIR) Model

In this section, two models will be modified and checked if the modified model is applicable to the risk factors in construction industry.

Hong (1995) proposed a Concept of Interdependency within an Organization model, which is used to measure the interdependency ratio between the factors in particular division. With this method, the degree of dependence power of two divisions is constructed by using a matrix. The model is represented on Eq. (3.1) as follows

$$\text{Interdependency ratio of division } k = \frac{\sum a_{kj} + \sum a_{ik}}{2(\sum \sum a_{ij})} \quad (3.1)$$

whereas a_{ij} refers to the value of the exchange where each row and column in the matrix-type relationship data intersect, and $\sum a_{kj}$ and $\sum a_{ik}$ refers to the degree of dependency power of division k on the other division. Lastly, $\sum \sum a_{ij}$ refers to the sum of degrees of dependence of the entire network within the matrix.

This model can be used to compare forward-to-backward dependencies simultaneously between the two divisions. However, since this research considers the numerous risk factors instead of limited number of factors, the

model has to be modified in order to calculate the interdependency ratio, which can be defined as follows

$$A = \frac{\text{Total of Evaluated IR}}{\text{Number of Risk Factors} \times \text{Maximum IR}} \quad (3.2)$$

whereas *Total of Evaluated IR* refers to the sum of the evaluated dependency power by experts and *Number of Risk Factors* refers to the number of risk factors that are influencing the selected risk factor that is measured at a time.

In the Interregional Input-Output Model, an initial value 'X' of specific division is sum of intermediate value 'Z' and final value 'Y' (Yoon et al., 2010; Oosterhaven et al., 2014). The basic structure of the formula is as follows

$$X = Z + Y, \quad X = \begin{bmatrix} X^L \\ X^M \end{bmatrix}, \quad Z = \begin{bmatrix} Z^{LL} & Z^{LM} \\ Z^{ML} & Z^{MM} \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y = \begin{bmatrix} Y^L \\ Y^M \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.3)$$

In the formula, variable 'Z' can be referred as the input ratio 'A' ($0 \leq A \leq 1$) of the intermediate value to the total output of the relevant parts 'X' (Lee et al., 1998 and Oosterhaven et al., 2014). Therefore, the formula can be relocated as follows.

$$X = AX + Y \quad (3.4)$$

For the purpose of calculating final value ‘Y’, the relocated formula must be modified as follows (Lee et al., 2006 and Trinh et al., 2008).

$$X = AX + Y \rightarrow Y = X - AX \rightarrow Y = X(1 - A) \quad (3.5)$$

In Eq. (3.5), it can be verified that the final value Y of a specific input with interregional interdependence between divisions is deducted by a factor of interdependency ratio (A, $0 \leq A \leq 1$) which is the input as intermediate value of initial value X. In other words, the larger the interdependence ratio inserted into the intermediate value, the smaller the scale of the final value. This is found to be similar logic of measuring the Residual Risk Value (RRV) in risk management.

In the risk management, the residual risk is defined as the remaining risk that is not completely removed after the execution of the countermeasure strategy, and the residual risk is represented as the numerical value of the Residual Risk Value (Grey et al., 1995).

$$RRV = RV(1 - ME) \quad (3.6)$$

In Eq. (3.6), Mitigation Efficiency (ME), which is the efficiency of the strategy that is, predicted when a risk response strategy is implemented (PMI, 2000). Thus, the greater the efficiency of the response strategy, the lower the residual risk from the existing risk. Since the logic of ME ($0 \leq ME \leq 1$) in Eq. (3.6) is similar to A ($0 \leq A \leq 1$) in Eq. (3.5), it can be replaced with ‘A’.

In this research, the risk interdependency should be deducted from the initial risk value (Initial RV) of the specific risk factor by the ratio that affects the other risk factors. Therefore, the draft formula for calculating the Risk Value applied with Interdependency Ratio (RVIR) by changing the mitigation efficiency (ME) to the interdependency ratio 'A' in the Residual Risk Value formula is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= X(1 - A) \\ RRV &= RV(1 - ME) \end{aligned} \rightarrow RVIR = Initial\ RV(1 - A) \quad (3.7)$$

Finally, substituting 'A' from the RVIR draft formula to interdependency ratio of numerous risk factors formula, Eq. (3.2), finalizes the model that calculates the Risk value applied with Interdependency Ratio (RVIR).

$$RVIR = Initial\ RV \left(1 - \frac{Total\ of\ Evaluated\ IR}{Number\ of\ Risk\ Factors * Maximum\ IR}\right) \quad (3.8)$$

RVIR = Risk Value applied with Interdependency Ratio
Initial RV = Risk Value that has calculated initially
IR = Interdependency Ratio

Chapter 4. Applications of Risk

Interdependency in Checklist

4.1. Selection of Risks for Interdependency Matr

ix

In this section, developed model from previous section is applied to risk interdependency matrix. The variables for the risk factor was selected from the risk checklist from 'L' Construction Company that is currently used in actual construction projects (Table 4-1). There are total of 15 risks in the checklist that is conducted for the research, 9 for design change risks and 6 for construction method change risks.

The listed risk factors are considered to be the core factor of specific risks in checklist. From this list, other specific risks are branched out to be assess in the activities when the project is implemented.

Table 4-1. Design Change and Construction Method Change Risk

Classification in Checklist of 'L' Construction Company

Major Classification	Minor Classification	Detailed Classification
Design Change Risks (Type A)	A-1	Discrepancies of site conditions and design
	A-2	Design Error
	A-3	Excessive Design
	A-4	Inaccurate specification
	A-5	Inadequate design criteria
	A-6	Delayed approval of design change
	A-7	Unclear responsibilities for design changes
	A-8	Insufficient design change budget
	A-9	Optimized cost calculation error for Design Change
Method Change Risks (Type B)	B-1	Inappropriate construction method selection
	B-2	Uncertainty due to special construction method
	B-3	Lack of feasibility review of public works
	B-4	Lack of experience in applying technology
	B-5	Failure of new technology prediction
	B-6	Increased construction complexity

4.2. Establishing Risk Interdependency Matrix through Structured Interview with Experts

In order to prepare for measuring Interdependency Ratio among risk factors, the weights of dependency power for each risk factor are evaluated from structured interview of experts.

The structured interview was performed with total of 11 experts. In order to evaluate the dependency power of each risk, the five selection criteria were established, which are:

- 1) Over 10 years of career in construction industry.
- 2) Position is higher than General Manager in CM.
- 3) Must have full understanding of each risk that are listed above.
- 4) Numerous field experience.
- 5) Currently employed in the construction industry.

Since risk management is a research that has subjective aspect, the selection criteria was formed particularly to obtain the most precise result. In addition, since established selection criteria is rigorous, the number of experts to be interviewed were limited.

The dependency power among risk value within the matrix is evaluated by the structured interviews with experts on a 5-point scale. Each of evaluated

weight on the matrix indicates both forward dependency and backward dependency power of each risk (Table 4-2 and Table 4-3).

Table 4-2. Interdependency Matrix for Design Change Risks

Design Change Risks (Type A)		Backward Dependency								
		A-1	A-2	A-3	A-4	A-5	A-6	A-7	A-8	A-9
Forward Dependency	A-1		3.50	2.11	1.56	1.67	1.83	1.61	1.67	1.22
	A-2	1.67		2.39	2.22	1.72	2.11	1.83	1.56	1.50
	A-3	1.00	2.28		1.89	1.56	1.89	1.78	1.67	1.67
	A-4	1.72	3.56	2.28		1.83	1.83	2.00	1.56	1.50
	A-5	1.22	3.44	2.78	2.39		1.94	2.11	1.56	1.50
	A-6	0.50	0.67	1.06	1.33	1.22		1.50	1.67	1.11
	A-7	0.78	1.33	1.00	1.78	2.22	2.33		1.67	1.22
	A-8	0.67	0.89	1.17	1.33	1.67	3.44	2.13		1.89
	A-9	0.44	1.67	1.00	1.33	1.22	2.83	2.44	2.56	


Table 4-3. Interdependency Matrix for Method Change Risks

Method Change Risks (Type B)		Backward Dependency					
		B-1	B-2	B-3	B-4	B-5	B-6
Forward Dependency	B-1		2.33	2.83	2.33	2.22	3.11
	B-2	3.06		2.67	2.39	2.28	2.00
	B-3	4.11	2.56		2.78	2.11	2.33
	B-4	3.78	2.33	3.44		2.61	2.28
	B-5	1.72	1.94	2.56	2.11		1.28
	B-6	2.44	2.22	3.06	2.00	1.39	

Since the risk value may vary depends on the characteristics of the project, this research proposed the result if interdependency ratio measurement for each risks only. Nevertheless, the result of interdependency ratio can be adopted to risk checklist once risk value is estimated for the project. Thus, the results were derived with two assumptions, which are: (1) if the risk value of each risk is fixed at 100, and (2) all of risks have co-occurred simultaneously.

4.3. Results and Discussions

The result of interdependency ratio calculation has shown that design change risks has average of 30.91% interdependency ratio (Figure 4-1) and method change risks has average of 41.25% interdependency ratio (Figure 4-



2).

Figure 4-1. Interdependency Ratio of Design Change Risks




Figure 4-2. Interdependency Ratio of Construction Method Change Risks

The results show relatively high interdependency ratio, because the calculation is based on co-occurrence of all risks. For example, if only A-1 occurs during the project, A-1 should not consider interdependency since there are no other risks that have occurred to affect A-1. Therefore, risk value estimated previously remains constant. In case of co-occurrence between A-1 and A-2, the analysis shows the average of 5.74% of interdependency ratio between two out of nine risks for Type A, which means risk values do not change drastically. Other case, such as co-occurrence between B-1 and B-3, the analysis presents the average of 11.57% of interdependency ratio between two, out of six risks for Type B. This can be presumed as they have more detailed cause of risk are overlapping. In summary, decision makers can

examine the change in risk interdependency by certain risks that they assume to co-occur.

In risk response perspective, the result of interdependency ratio calculation can be the indication to overlapping relationship of response strategy. For instance of present result, A-6 (Delayed approval of design change) risk has shown the highest interdependency ratio of 40.49% in design change risks and B-1 (Inappropriate construction method selection) for 50.37%. This kind of high ratio refers to that if other risks within the classification is responded; the risk can be mitigated to a certain degree. Although the remaining risk value cannot be neglected, it is appropriate indication to compress response strategy on such risks. In contrary situation, such as the least amount of interdependency ratio of 17.78% for A-1 (Discrepancies of site conditions and design), it can be considered to be the most independent risk that does not affect to other risks much. Thus, such risks are necessary to be managed separately, which also mean as respective establishment of response strategy.

The result may not determine the exact level of risks. Nonetheless, the result of interdependency ratio can be referred during the decision making process during pre-construction phase. Nevertheless, this process can help decision makers to understand the interdependency relationship among selected risk factors under conditions of uncertainty remains.

Chapter 5. Conclusions

5.1. Summary

Construction projects always contain a certain degree of uncertainties. To mitigate the risks in projects, checklist method is used to identify the risks during the pre-construction phase. However, current risk checklists have limitation that identified risks were evaluated individually, which neglects the influence of interdependency and co-occurrence. Thus, the approaches were made to support the assessment process of reflecting the dependency relationship of risks.

The existing methods can be used to distinguish the dependency relationship between each risk factors with causal model or binary format. However, the proposed model in this research has several advantages compared to other models. First, suggested method has specialty on deriving interdependency ratio of each risks. This is because it is important in risk management to presume the multiple effects that co-occurring risks can damage the project overall. Since existing models conducts the risk paths regarding cascading effects, it is difficult to detect the overlapping relationship for causes of occurrence. Secondly, the improvements on existing checklists were expected to made depends on the characteristics of company. Since risk checklist is updated by past data from previous projects, the

decision makers can weigh dependency power on each factor differently each time. In addition, calculated interdependency ratio by proposed model grants guideline for decision makers to set the risk response priority. For example, the risk with highest interdependency ratio in specific breakdown structure indicates that if other risks that affects the risk are managed, it can be responded simultaneously to a degree. In contrast, the risk with least amount of interdependency ratio indicates that it does not interact with other risks; therefore, decision makers can recognize that it is needed to be managed or responded independently than other risks.

5.2. Contributions

The proposed model is competent to find the overlapping impact of multiple risks; therefore, it can help decision makers to establish risk response strategy with better understanding of co-occurring risks. For instance, decision makers can combine multiple strategies, which was individually evaluated, to single strategy to respond multiple risks concurrently.

The implication of proposed model is that project managers should acknowledge the importance of risk interdependency and co-occurrence. The inadequate consideration of risk co-occurrence or overlooking risk interdependency would cause an increase in budget during pre-construction phase, therefore adversely affects the overall benefits of the project.

5.3. Limitations and Further Study

This research limited the scope within design change and construction method change risks in checklist, the future researches will have to expand the scope of research by analyzing interdependency ratio of other risk factors in a construction project. However, since the environment and characteristics of construction project is diverse and complicated it may be virtually impossible to analyze the interdependency ratio of all potential risks in the construction project. Yet, the research will develop the scope of risks that are frequently encountered in construction projects or the major risk factors of a specific project in the future. Lastly, the present research only conducted the cases where the risk decreases due to the effect of interdependency; thus, future research will also should include the case of increase in risk by the degree of interdependency.

Bibliography

Akintoye, A. S., & MacLeod, M. J. (1997). Risk analysis and management in construction. *International journal of project management*, 15(1), 31-38.

Aminbakhsh, S., Gunduz, M., & Sonmez, R. (2013). Safety risk assessment using analytic hierarchy process (AHP) during planning and budgeting of construction projects. *Journal of safety research*, 46, 99-105.

Carr, V., & Tah, J. H. M. (2001). A fuzzy approach to construction project risk assessment and analysis: construction project risk management system. *Advances in engineering software*, 32(10), 847-857.

Chapman, R. J. (2001). The controlling influences on effective risk identification and assessment for construction design management. *International Journal of Project Management*, 19(3), 147-160.

Dikmen, I., Birgonul, M. T., & Arikan, A. E. (2004, September). A critical review of risk management support tools. In *20th Annual ARCOM Conference* (Vol. 2, pp. 1145-1154). Heriot-Watt University Edinburgh, UK.

Eyμποosh, M., Dikmen, I., & Talat Birgonul, M. (2011). Identification of risk paths in international construction projects using structural equation modeling. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 137(12), 1164-1175.

Fu, Y., Li, M., & Chen, F. (2012). Impact propagation and risk assessment of requirement changes for software development projects based on design structure matrix. *International Journal of Project Management*, 30(3), 363-373.

Grey, Stephen. (1995). "Practical Risk Assessment for Project Managemet." ICL, UK: John Wiley & Sons

Hillson, D. (2003). Using a risk breakdown structure in project management. *Journal of Facilities management*, 2(1), 85-97.

Hong, G. (1995). 組織內 相互依存性の 構成概念과 測定方式에 관한 研究.

Hong, G. (1999). 勸力統制理論에 입각한 環境-戰略-構造의 相互關聯性 研究.

Iyer, K. C., & Sagheer, M. (2009). Hierarchical structuring of PPP risks using interpretative structural modeling. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 136(2), 151-159.

Kim, S. G. (2015). Risk Value Calculation Method for Moderate Risk Concentration Type at Qualitative Risk Analysis Phase. *Korean Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 16(2), 38-45.

Lee, C. (1998). 지역간 산업연관모형에 관한 연구”, 대구경북개발연구, 대구경북개발연구원

Lee, E., & Bu, S., (2006). 지역경제의 상호의존관계 분석방법에 대한 고찰. *Quarterly National Accounts*, 4th edition, 126-164.

Leu, S. S., & Chang, C. M. (2013). Bayesian-network-based safety risk assessment for steel construction projects. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 54, 122-133.

Liu, H. T., & Tsai, Y. L. (2012). A fuzzy risk assessment approach for occupational hazards in the construction industry. *Safety science*, 50(4), 1067-1078.

Mulcahy, R. (2003). "Risk Management: Tricks of the Trade® for Project Managers." MN: RMC Publications

Mustafa, M. A., & Al-Bahar, J. F. (1991). Project risk assessment using the analytic hierarchy process. *IEEE transactions on engineering management*, 38(1), 46-52.

Oosterhaven, J., & Hewings, G. J. (2014). Interregional input–output models. In *Handbook of regional science* (pp. 875-901). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Park, H. J. (2014). A Study on the Optimum Method Selection Using Matrix Analysis. *Journal of the Korea Institute of Information and Communication Engineering*, 18(4), 913-919.

Quashem, R. (2015). Design structure matrix: Models, applications and data exchange format (Doctoral dissertation, University of Lethbridge (Canada)).

Tah, J. H. M., & Carr, V. (2001). Knowledge-based approach to construction project risk management. *Journal of computing in civil engineering*, 15(3), 170-177.

Trinh, B., Secretario, F. T., Kwangmun, K., & Giang, P. H. (2000). *Economic-environmental impact analysis based on a bi-region interregional IO model for Vietnam*. Working Paper.

Tüysüz, F., & Kahraman, C. (2006). Project risk evaluation using a fuzzy analytic hierarchy process: an application to information technology projects. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 21(6), 559-584.

Tworek, P. (2010). Methods of risk identification in companies' investment projects. In *5th International Scientific Conference "Managing and Modelling of Financial Risks"*, VŠB-Technická Univerzita Ostrava, 8th-9th September, Ostrava.

Wideman, R. Max. (1992). "Project and Program Risk Management: a guide to managing project risks and opportunities." Newtown Square, PA: Project Management Institute

Yildiz, A. E., Dikmen, I., Birgonul, M. T., Ercoskun, K., & Alten, S. (2014). A knowledge-based risk mapping tool for cost estimation of international construction projects. *Automation in Construction*, 43, 144-155.

Yoon, K., & Oh, D. (2010). Analysis of Regional Interdependence in Dongnam Economic Region for Suggesting Interregional Cooperation in Fields of Industry. *Journal of the Korean Urban Administration Association*, 23(3), 303-322.

Zhou, L., Vasconcelos, A., & Nunes, M. (2008). Supporting decision making in risk management through an evidence-based information systems project risk checklist. *Information management & computer security*, 16(2), 166-186.

Badenhorst, K. P., & Eloff, J. H. (1994). TOPM: a formal approach to the optimization of information technology risk management. *Computers & Security*, 13(5), 411-435.

Aritua, B., Smith, N. J., & Bower, D. (2009). Construction client multi-projects—A complex adaptive systems perspective. *International Journal of Project Management*, 27(1), 72-79.

Kim, J., & Kim, Y. (2010). Analysis of risk transfer among financial regions using CoVaR. *Social Sciences Research Institute*, 23, 75-103.

Kwan, T. W., & Leung, H. K. (2011). A risk management methodology for project risk dependencies. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 37(5), 635-648.

Teller, J., & Kock, A. (2013). An empirical investigation on how portfolio risk management influences project portfolio success. *International Journal of Project Management*, 31(6), 817-829.

Cavallo, A., & Ireland, V. (2014). Preparing for complex interdependent risks: a system of systems approach to building disaster resilience. *International journal of disaster risk reduction*, 9, 181-193.

Bernardi, M., Gayraud, G., & Petrella, L. (2015). Bayesian tail risk interdependence using quantile regression. *Bayesian Analysis*, 10(3), 553-603.

Zhang, Y. (2016). Selecting risk response strategies considering project risk interdependence. *International Journal of Project Management*, 34(5), 819-830.

National Research Council. (1996). *Understanding risk: Informing decisions in a democratic society*. National Academies Press.

Lee, M., Park, B., & Im, K. (2008). A Study on the Estimation of Change Orders Impact for the Public Construction. *Journal of the Korean Society of Civil Engineers*, 28(3D): 363-369.

Kim, K., Kim, K., Lee, Y., & Kim, J., (2008). A Research about Influence of Risk Factors in Relation to Construction Cost Increase and Schedule Delay on the Reinforced Concrete Construction. *Journal of the Architectural Institute of Korea Planning & Design*, 24(5): 165-172.

Hwang, J., & Lee, C., (2004). A Risk Management Method Using Fuzzy Theory for Early Construction Stage. *Korean Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 5(2): 136-143.

Yoo, I., Choi, S., Cho, T., Koo, B., & Yoon, Y., (2006). The Risk Analysis of Construction Method for Field Work. *Journal of the Korean Society for Railway*, 20-31.

Appendix

A. Evaluation results for Dependency Power

A.1. Design Change Risk Factors

설계변경 위험요인 (Type A)		영향을 받음								
		현장조건 과 설계 불일치	설 계 오 류	과다 한 설계	부정확 한 시방	설계기 준 미비	설계변 경 승인 지연	설계변 경 책임 불명확	설계변 경 예산반 영 미흡	설계변 경 적정비 용 산출 오류
영향 을 줄	현장조건 과 설계 불일치		4	3	3	2	2	1	1	1
	설계 오류	1		1	3	2	1	1	1	1
	과다한 설계	1	1		2	2	1	1	2	1
	부정확한 시방	3	3	2		1	1	2	1	1
	설계기준 미비	3	3	2	3		2	2	2	1
	설계변경 승인 지연	1	1	1	1	1		1	3	1
	설계변경 책임 불명확	2	2	1	2	2	1		2	2
	설계변경 예산반영 미흡	3	2	1	1	2	2	2		1
	설계변경 적정비용 산출 오류	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	

설계변경 위험요인 (Type A)		영향을 받음								
		현장조건 과 설계 불일치	설 계 오 류	과다 한 설계	부정확 한 시방	설계기 준 미비	설계변 경 승인 지연	설계변 경 책임 불명확	설계변 경 예산반 영 미흡	설계변 경 적정비 용 산출 오류
영향 을 줄	현장조건 과 설계 불일치		5	3	3	1	4	4	3	3
	설계 오류	2.5		2.5	3	1	4	4	3	4
	과다한 설계	0	1		1	1	3	4	3	3
	부정확한 시방	2.5	4	2.5		1	2.5	4	4	4
	설계기준 미비	1	3	3	2.5		2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
	설계변경 승인 지연	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
	설계변경 책임 불명확	0	0	0	0	0	3		0	0
	설계변경 예산반영 미흡	0	0	0	0	0	3	0		1
	설계변경 적정비용 산출 오류	0	4	1	1	0	4	3	3	

설계변경 위험요인 (Type A)		영향을 받음								
		현장조건 과 설계 불일치	설 계 오 류	과다 한 설계	부정확 한 시방	설계기 준 미비	설계변 경 승인 지연	설계변 경 책임 불명확	설계변 경 예산반 영 미흡	설계변 경 적정비 용 산출 오류
영향 을 줄	현장조건 과 설계 불일치		4	3	2	0	0	2	2	2
	설계 오류	0		3	3	1	2	2	2	2
	과다한 설계	0	3		3	1	4	2	2	2
	부정확한 시방	0	2	2		1	3	2	2	2
	설계기준 미비	0	3	3	3		0	1	1	1
	설계변경 승인 지연	0	0	0	0	0		0	1	1
	설계변경 책임 불명확	0	0	0	0	0	1		1	1
	설계변경 예산반영 미흡	0	1	1	1	0	1			2
	설계변경 적정비용 산출 오류	0	2	2	1	0	3	2	2	

설계변경 위험요인 (Type A)		영향을 받음								
		현장조건 과 설계 불일치	설 계 오 류	과다 한 설계	부정확 한 시방	설계기 준 미비	설계변 경 승인 지연	설계변 경 책임 불명확	설계변 경 예산반 영 미흡	설계변 경 적정비 용 산출 오류
영향 을 줄	현장조건 과 설계 불일치		1	2	0	0	1	2	4	3
	설계 오류	3		5	0	0	1	2	3	2
	과다한 설계	3	3		0	0	1	1	3	3
	부정확한 시방	0	5	1		4	3	3	3	3
	설계기준 미비	0	2	3	5		4	4	3	3
	설계변경 승인 지연	0	0	0	0	0		3	3	3
	설계변경 책임 불명확	0	3	2	2	4	5		4	3
	설계변경 예산반영 미흡	0	1	1	0	0	5	5		4
	설계변경 적정비용 산출 오류	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	

설계변경 위험요인 (Type A)		영향을 받음								
		현장조건 과 설계 불일치	설 계 오 류	과다 한 설계	부정확 한 시방	설계기 준 미비	설계변 경 승인 지연	설계변 경 책임 불명확	설계변 경 예산반 영 미흡	설계변 경 적정비 용 산출 오류
영향 을 줄	현장조건 과 설계 불일치		3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	설계 오류	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	과다한 설계	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
	부정확한 시방	0	2	2		0	0	0	0	0
	설계기준 미비	0	4	3	0		3	2	0	0
	설계변경 승인 지연	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
	설계변경 책임 불명확	0	2	0	2	2	2		0	0
	설계변경 예산반영 미흡	0	0	0	2	2	1	0		0
	설계변경 적정비용 산출 오류	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	

설계변경 위험요인 (Type A)		영향을 받음								
		현장조건 과 설계 불일치	설 계 오 류	과다 한 설계	부정확 한 시방	설계기 준 미비	설계변 경 승인 지연	설계변 경 책임 불명확	설계변 경 예산반 영 미흡	설계변 경 적정비 용 산출 오류
영향 을 줄	현장조건 과 설계 불일치		3	1	2	4	5	2.5	1	1
	설계 오류	2		2	3	2.5	4	5	2	1
	과다한 설계	2	4		1	3	2.5	5	2	3
	부정확한 시방	3	5	2		2.5	2	4	1	2.5
	설계기준 미비	5	4	2	3		1	2.5	2	3
	설계변경 승인 지연	2.5	1	3	5	4		2	3	2
	설계변경 책임 불명확	4	2	2.5	5	2	2		3	1
	설계변경 예산반영 미흡	3	1	2.5	3	4	5	2		1
	설계변경 적정비용 산출 오류	1	5	1	3	4	2.5	2	1	

설계변경 위험요인 (Type A)		영향을 받음								
		현장조건 과 설계 불일치	설계 오류	과다 한 설계	부정확 한 시방	설계기 준 미비	설계변 경 승인 지연	설계변 경 책임 불명확	설계변 경 예산반 영 미흡	설계변 경 적정비 용 산출 오류
영향 을 줄	현장조건 과 설계 불일치		2. 5	3	4	5	2	1	1	0
	설계 오류	2.5		3	4	5	2	2.5	0	1
	과다한 설계	3	2. 5		5	4	3	2	1	1
	부정확한 시방	3	5	4		3	2.5	2	1	1
	설계기준 미비	2	4	5	4		2	2	1	1
	설계변경 승인 지연	1	1	3	4	5		2.5	1	1
	설계변경 책임 불명확	1	1	1	4	5	3		1	1
	설계변경 예산반영 미흡	0	2	2.5	3	4	5	4		3
	설계변경 적정비용 산출 오류	1	1	2	2.5	2	4	5	3	

설계변경 위험요인 (Type A)		영향을 받음								
		현장조건 과 설계 불일치	설 계 오 류	과다 한 설계	부정확 한 시방	설계기 준 미비	설계변 경 승인 지연	설계변 경 책임 불명확	설계변 경 예산반 영 미흡	설계변 경 적정비 용 산출 오류
영향 을 줄	현장조건 과 설계 불일치		4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	설계 오류	3		0	0	0	2	0	1	0
	과다한 설계	0	2		0	0	0	0	0	0
	부정확한 시방	2	2	0		1	0	0	0	0
	설계기준 미비	0	3	0	0		0	0	0	0
	설계변경 승인 지연	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
	설계변경 책임 불명확	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
	설계변경 예산반영 미흡	0	0	0	0	0	5	0		0
	설계변경 적정비용 산출 오류	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	

설계변경 위험요인 (Type A)		영향을 받음								
		현장조건 과 설계 불일치	설 계 오 류	과다 한 설계	부정확 한 시방	설계기 준 미비	설계변 경 승인 지연	설계변 경 책임 불명확	설계변 경 예산반 영 미흡	설계변 경 적정비 용 산출 오류
영향 을 줄	현장조건 과 설계 불일치		5	4	0	3	2.5	2	2	1
	설계 오류	1		5	4	4	3	0	2	2.5
	과다한 설계	0	4		5	3	2.5	1	2	2
	부정확한 시방	2	4	5		3	2.5	1	2	0
	설계기준 미비	0	5	4	1		3	3	2.5	2
	설계변경 승인 지연	0	3	2.5	2	1		5	4	2
	설계변경 책임 불명확	0	2	2.5	1	5	4		4	3
	설계변경 예산반영 미흡	0	1	2.5	2	3	4	4		5
	설계변경 적정비용 산출 오류	0	1	2	2.5	3	4	5	4	

설계변경 위험요인 (Type A)		영향을 받음								
		현장조건 과 설계 불일치	설 계 오 류	과다 한 설계	부정확 한 시방	설계기 준 미비	설계변 경 승인 지연	설계변 경 책임 불명확	설계변 경 예산반 영 미흡	설계변 경 적정비 용 산출 오류
영향 을 줄	현장조건 과 설계 불일치		4	2	2	3	2	4	3	3
	설계 오류	4		1	2	2	2	2	2	2
	과다한 설계	2	1		2	2	2	3	2	2
	부정확한 시방	2	2	2		2	3	2	2	2
	설계기준 미비	3	2	3	2		2	2	3	2
	설계변경 승인 지연	2	2	3	2	2		2	2	2
	설계변경 책임 불명확	4	3	2	2	2	2		3	2
	설계변경 예산반영 미흡	4	3	2	2	3	3	2		3
	설계변경 적정비용 산출 오류	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	

설계변경 위험요인 (Type A)		영향을 받음								
		현장조건 과 설계 불일치	설 계 오 류	과다 한 설계	부정확 한 시방	설계기 준 미비	설계변 경 승인 지연	설계변 경 책임 불명확	설계변 경 예산반 영 미흡	설계변 경 적정비 용 산출 오류
영향 을 줄	현장조건 과 설계 불일치		3	1	2	0	2	3	2	5
	설계 오류			2	2	0	2	5	3	2
	과다한 설계	5	3		4	1	2	1	2	5
	부정확한 시방	1	5	3		1	2	0	1	4
	설계기준 미비	1	3	4	2		4	2	4	5
	설계변경 승인 지연	0	0	0	0	0		1	0	1
	설계변경 책임 불명확	0	0	0	0	0	5		3	0
	설계변경 예산반영 미흡	0	2	1	3	0	4	2		2
	설계변경 적정비용 산출 오류	0	3	0	1	0	2	1	4	

A.2. Construction Method Change Risk Factors

공법변경 위험요인 (Type B)		영향을 받음					
		부적절한 공법선정	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	공법타당성 검토 부족	공법적용 기술경험 부족	신기술 예측 실패	공사 복잡성 증가
영향을 줌	부적절한 공법선정		3	4	3	2	2
	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	2		3	3	2	2
	공법타당성 검토 부족	4	2		3	2	1
	공법적용 기술경험 부족	3	2	3		2	1
	신기술 예측 실패	1	2	2	3		2
	공사 복잡성 증가	3	3	4	3	1	

공법변경 위험요인 (Type B)		영향을 받음					
		부적절한 공법선정	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	공법타당성 검토 부족	공법적용 기술경험 부족	신기술 예측 실패	공사 복잡성 증가
영향을 줌	부적절한 공법선정		2.5	3	1	2	5
	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	2.5		0	0	2.5	2.5
	공법타당성 검토 부족	5	3		2.5	2.5	3
	공법적용 기술경험 부족	5	3	3		3	4
	신기술 예측 실패	2.5	2.5	2	2		1
	공사 복잡성 증가	2.5	3	2.5	1	1	

공법변경 위험요인 (Type B)		영향을 받음					
		부적절한 공법선정	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	공법타당성 검토 부족	공법적용 기술경험 부족	신기술 예측 실패	공사 복잡성 증가
영향을 줌	부적절한 공법선정		4	3	2	4	4
	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	4		3	3	4	4
	공법타당성 검토 부족	4	3		3	3	3
	공법적용 기술경험 부족	4	3	3		3	3
	신기술 예측 실패	0	0	0	0		0
	공사 복잡성 증가	2	3	2	2	3	

공법변경 위험요인 (Type B)		영향을 받음					
		부적절한 공법선정	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	공법타당성 검토 부족	공법적용 기술경험 부족	신기술 예측 실패	공사 복잡성 증가
영향을 줌	부적절한 공법선정		5	3	3	2	5
	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	5		4	4	3	3
	공법타당성 검토 부족	5	4		4	2	4
	공법적용 기술경험 부족	5	4	5		4	3
	신기술 예측 실패	3	3	4	1		2
	공사 복잡성 증가	3	2	3	1	1	

공법변경 위험요인 (Type B)		영향을 받음					
		부적절한 공법선정	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	공법타당성 검토 부족	공법적용 기술경험 부족	신기술 예측 실패	공사 복잡성 증가
영향을 줌	부적절한 공법선정		0	0	0	0	2
	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	2		0	0	2	2
	공법타당성 검토 부족	4	0		0	3	3
	공법적용 기술경험 부족	2	0	4		3	2
	신기술 예측 실패	2	0	3	0		2
	공사 복잡성 증가	2	0	0	0	0	

공법변경 위험요인 (Type B)		영향을 받음					
		부적절한 공법선정	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	공법타당성 검토 부족	공법적용 기술경험 부족	신기술 예측 실패	공사 복잡성 증가
영향을 줌	부적절한 공법선정		3	2.5	4	5	1
	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	3		5	2.5	4	1
	공법타당성 검토 부족	5	4		2.5	3	2
	공법적용 기술경험 부족	4	2	1		5	2.5
	신기술 예측 실패	3	4	2	5		1
	공사 복잡성 증가	3	5	2	4	2.5	

공법변경 위험요인 (Type B)		영향을 받음					
		부적절한 공법선정	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	공법타당성 검토 부족	공법적용 기술경험 부족	신기술 예측 실패	공사 복잡성 증가
영향을 줌	부적절한 공법선정		2.5	5	4	2	3
	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	4		5	3	1	2.5
	공법타당성 검토 부족	3	4		5	2.5	3
	공법적용 기술경험 부족	3	4	5		2.5	3
	신기술 예측 실패	2	3	5	4		2.5
	공사 복잡성 증가	2.5	3	5	4	2	

공법변경 위험요인 (Type B)		영향을 받음					
		부적절한 공법선정	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	공법타당성 검토 부족	공법적용 기술경험 부족	신기술 예측 실패	공사 복잡성 증가
영향을 줌	부적절한 공법선정		0	0	0	0	4
	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	0		0	3	0	0
	공법타당성 검토 부족	3	0		0	0	0
	공법적용 기술경험 부족	3	0	3		0	0
	신기술 예측 실패	0	0	0	0		0
	공사 복잡성 증가	0	0	4	0	0	

공법변경 위험요인 (Type B)		영향을 받음					
		부적절한 공법선정	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	공법타당성 검토 부족	공법적용 기술경험 부족	신기술 예측 실패	공사 복잡성 증가
영향을 줌	부적절한 공법선정		1	5	4	3	2
	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	5		4	3	2	1
	공법타당성 검토 부족	4	3		5	1	2
	공법적용 기술경험 부족	5	3	4		1	2
	신기술 예측 실패	2	3	5	4		1
	공사 복잡성 증가	4	1	5	3	2	

공법변경 위험요인 (Type B)		영향을 받음					
		부적절한 공법선정	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	공법타당성 검토 부족	공법적용 기술경험 부족	신기술 예측 실패	공사 복잡성 증가
영향을 줄	부적절한 공법선정		2	2	3	2	4
	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	2		2	2	3	3
	공법타당성 검토 부족	2	2		2	2	3
	공법적용 기술경험 부족	3	3	2		2	3
	신기술 예측 실패	2	3	3	2		3
	공사 복잡성 증가	4	3	2	3	3	

공법변경 위험요인 (Type B)		영향을 받음					
		부적절한 공법선정	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	공법타당성 검토 부족	공법적용 기술경험 부족	신기술 예측 실패	공사 복잡성 증가
영향을 줌	부적절한 공법선정		1	5	2	4	3
	특수공법 적용상 불확실성	1		3	4	5	3
	공법타당성 검토 부족	5	3		3	0	0
	공법적용 기술경험 부족	3	0	4		3	2
	신기술 예측 실패	0	0	0	2		4
	공사 복잡성 증가	1	0	0	0	0	

국 문 초 록

건설 프로젝트에 존재할 수 있는 위험의 불확실성으로 인해 시공전단계에서 수행되는 위험 평가는 중요하다. 위험 체크리스트는 과거에 경험했던 위험을 체계적으로 분류 및 구성하여 향후 프로젝트에 나타날 수 있는 위험요소를 인식하기 위해 사용되는 방법이다. 위험 체크리스트를 기반으로 시행되는 위험도 산정 및 평가는 위험관리에서 핵심적인 역할을 수행하며, 이를 체계적으로 수행하기 위해 다양한 위험 평가 연구가 수행되었다.

그러나 이러한 선행연구에는 공통적인 한계점이 있는데, 이는 위험 체크리스트에서 평가된 위험도가 위험요인간의 상호의존성을 배제하여 개별적으로 평가되었기 때문이다. 따라서, 여러 위험요인이 동시에 발생하였을 경우, 위험 대응 전략을 수립하기 위해 총 위험도를 합산하는 기존 방법과 크게 다르지 않다. 대부분의 위험요인은 상호 의존적이며, 기존의 예상보다 프로젝트에 많은 영향을 미칠 수 있다. 특히, 여러 위험이 동시에 발생할 경우 상세 원인이 중복이 될 수 있으며, 이로 인해 향후 프로젝트에 대한 위험 대응이 과대 평가가 될 수 있다.

본 연구에서는 실제 건설 프로젝트에서 사용되는 기존 위험

체크리스트를 기반으로 하여 위험인식단계(Risk Identification Phase)에서 위험 요인 간 상호의존성을 반영한 위험도를 정량화하는 모형을 제안한다. 제안된 모형은 의사 결정자가 위험을 인식하는 단계에서 동시에 발생하는 위험에 대한 이해와 예측에 도움을 줄 수 있다.

키워드: 위험체크리스트, 위험인식단계, 위험동시발생, 위험 상호의존성, 상호의존비율을 반영한 위험도 도출

학 번: 2016-21071