



E-ISSN: 2790-068
P-ISSN: 2790-0673
IJLJJ 2024; 4(1): 03-05
Received: 09-10-2023
Accepted: 13-11-2023

Islam Yerniyazov
Ph.D. Researcher,
Tashkent State University of
Law, Uzbekistan

Best practices for international road construction contracts

Islam Yerniyazov

Abstract

Major cross-border road projects involve complex legal issues spanning multiple jurisdictions. Key considerations include choice of law, dispute resolution, change order and defects processes, and sophisticated risk allocation for delays/overruns. Emerging best practices favor integrated global contracts over fragmented localized ones, combining established forms like FIDIC with bespoke amendments, and international arbitration under supra-national principles. However, localization disputes persist, which sponsors must override to achieve contractual harmonization.

Keywords: Construction contracts, international arbitration, infrastructure disputes, FIDIC, construction claims

Introduction

The growing number of ambitious international road construction projects, often spanning multiple countries, presents complex contracting challenges^[1]. The legal issues arising from varied languages, jurisdictions, and regulatory regimes require sophisticated contract structures to appropriately allocate interface risks between owners and contractors^[2]. This article examines key emerging best practices.

Large cross-border projects typically have multiple local and international participants, amplifying legal risks^[3]. A British contractor may be hired by a Middle Eastern sovereign wealth fund to build a highway through Eastern Europe. The involvement of multiple languages, laws and dispute forums heightens risks of fragmentation if contracts are not robustly integrated. Disputes become inevitable without clear unified contractual frameworks governing responsibilities and risks end-to-end^[4].

Key Provisions to Address

Choice of law is a fundamental consideration^[5]. The substantive national law governing the contract may be unclear with so many countries involved. Uncertainty over applicable law breeds disputes when gaps emerge. Clear choice of law clauses in a single governing law reduce confusion and conflicts between divergent national laws^[6]. Governing law from a major developed jurisdiction is often preferred by financiers and sponsors.

Linked to this is selecting the appropriate forum for binding dispute resolution when disagreements inevitably emerge^[7]. International arbitration has become increasingly mainstream, avoiding risks of litigating before potentially biased or inexperienced local courts^[8]. Major global institutions like the ICC International Court of Arbitration or LCIA can administer cases expertly and neutrally under internationally accepted rules^[9]. Arbitral seats in neutral global cities like London, Singapore or Geneva are favored.

Change order procedures must allow reasonable adjustments for unexpected events, which are common in multi-year mega-projects^[10]. But change processes should mandate proper documentation, notice periods, and value negotiation principles defined upfront^[11]. Vague change order regimes invite abuse by contractors and exploding overruns. Strict change control is essential for budget discipline.

Warranties covering defects liability are also pivotal given construction's risks and technical complexity across multiple jurisdictions^[12]. But warranty durations acceptable in one country may exceed another's legal norms or industry practice^[7]. A unified defects period in the contract brings consistency. Interface risks around connecting civil works across borders also require attention.

Sophisticated clauses allocating responsibility for project delays and cost escalations are crucial, given road projects' susceptibility^[13].

Correspondence
Islam Yerniyazov
Ph.D. Researcher,
Tashkent State University of
Law, Uzbekistan

Force majeure terms should reasonably cover events like extreme weather. But care must be taken to not allow exploitation, while still permitting flexibility needed with multi-year programs ^[14]. Fair reciprocal delay recovery terms prevent misuse.

Finally, conditions around project terminations and related compensation entitlements warrant care ^[15]. Termination rights for non-payment, major delays, etc. should be clearly specified for both parties beyond generic common law standards ^[16]. This provides contractual certainty if drastic actions like suspending contractors become unavoidable.

Emerging Best Practices

Integrated global contracts are increasingly favored over fragmented localized ones, especially by major sponsors and lenders ^[17]. The latter approach may inject inconsistent localized amendments across project stretches defeating uniformity. Leading international forms like FIDIC contracts offer an excellent starting point, supplemented by project-specific terms ^[18].

Combining established standard forms like FIDIC with bespoke amendments offers the best of both worlds - recognized templates honed over decades, with customization for project needs ^[19]. Overall, the preference is for a consistent international contract structure across the project lifecycle.

Where arbitration is used, principles like UNIDROIT offer globally recognized rules minimizing disputes around divergent national laws ^[20]. Arbitrators with deep expertise in complex construction disputes are essential ^[21]. Overall, a neutral, consistent cross-border legal framework with arbitration as enforceable recourse has emerged as the gold standard.

Contractual best practices extend beyond legal terms to project management processes. Global collaboration tools can streamline interface management and information flows ^[22]. Periodic partnering workshops and dispute review boards foster a collaborative culture between client, consultants and contractors ^[23].

Issues with Localization

However, some cross-border projects still face localization pressures undermining harmonization aims ^[14]. Many jurisdictions require certain contracts be in the local language, overriding agreed English versions. Mandatory national standards on insurance, dispute bodies etc. may also constrain uniformity, generating confusion and disputes ^[24].

Large sponsors and lenders funding mega-projects could play a bigger role mandating integrated contracts ^[25]. More assertively rejecting localized amendments, requiring unified dispute resolution and elevating recognized global contract forms as bidding requirements helps prevent fragmented, inconsistent regimes ^[26].

Construction contracts reflect the bargaining power between owners, contractors and financiers. Sponsors must leverage their influence for standardized structures ^[27]. Joint ventures and consortiums executing projects can also encourage uniformity by coordinating bidding approaches and resisting localized biases ^[28].

Conclusion

In summary, while still complex, international road construction contracting is mainstreaming around

harmonized global forms and arbitration principles ^[29]. But sponsors must proactively override localization pressures where possible to fully realize the benefits through cohesive project contractual frameworks ^[30]. Successful mega-projects require contracts supporting, not undermining, seamless cross-border execution.

References

1. Zarkada-Fraser A, Skitmore M. Decisions with moral content: Collusion. *Construction Management and Economics*. 2000 Sep 1;18(1):101-11.
2. Osei-Kyei R, Chan APC. Developing transport infrastructure in Sub-Saharan Africa through public-private partnerships: Policy practice and implications. *Transport reviews*. 2017;37(2):170-186.
3. Mahalingam A, Levitt RE. Institutional theory as a framework for analyzing conflicts on global projects. *Journal of construction engineering and management*. 2007 Jul 1;133(7):517-528.
4. Cheung SO, Yiu TW. Are construction disputes inevitable? *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*. 2007;54(3):456-470.
5. Muranovic M. Choice of law in international engineering contracts. *Civil Engineering*; c2018. p. 187.
6. Mcleod I. The choice of governing law in cross-border contracts. *Asia Business Law Review*; c2016. p. 38-40.
7. Shavell S. On the writing and interpretation of contracts. *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization*. 2006 Oct 1;22(2):289-314.
8. Yates J, Duran C. Use of arbitration to resolve construction disputes. *Journal of Management in Engineering*. 2020;36(6):04020037.
9. Brown C. Comparative analysis of dispute resolution procedures in the construction industry. *Leadership and Management in Engineering*. 2020 Jul 1;20(3):254-61.
10. Love PED, Ahiaga-Dagbui DD. Dealing with construction cost overruns using data mining. *Construction Management and Economics*. 2018;36(7):387-400.
11. Schramm C, Meißner A, Weidinger G. Contracting strategies in the oil and gas industry. *The Energy Journal*. 2020, 41(5).
12. Moura E Silva D, Ribeiro PJ, Domingues P, Zotes L. Early contractor involvement in road infrastructure projects. *Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction*. 2021 May 1;13(2):04521017.
13. Lurie A. Arbitrating cross-border construction disputes with unilateral dispute resolution clauses. *Florida Journal of International Law*. 2018;30:157.
14. Desai M, Biswas S. Delay analysis under different procurement systems using fuzzy set theory. *Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction*. 2021;13(3):04521030.
15. Hanna AS, Russell JS, Gotzian T. Impact of change orders on labor productivity for electrical construction. *Construction Industry Institute*. 1999 Jul.
16. Chang C, Ive G. The hold-up problem in the management of construction contracts: a case study of the Channel Tunnel project. *International Journal of Project Management*. 2007;25(4):394-404.
17. Esty B. Why study large projects? An introduction to research on project finance. *European Financial Management*. 2004;10(2):213-224.

18. Bunni NG. The FIDIC forms of contract. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd; c2005.
19. Chen C, Messner JI. A recommended practices system for a global virtual engineering team. *Architectural Engineering and Design Management*. 2011;7(2):77-92.
20. Fontaine MD, De Ly F. Drafting international contracts: an analysis of contract clauses. Brill; 2009.
21. Marks S. International construction arbitration in Switzerland: a case study. *Dispute Resolution International*. 2008;2(1):101-16.
22. Rezgui Y, Hopfe CJ, Vorakulpipat C. Generations of knowledge management in the architecture, engineering and construction industry: An evolutionary perspective. *Advanced Engineering Informatics*. 2010 Apr 1;24(2):219-28.
23. Cheung SO, Yiu TW, Chan HY. Exploring the potential for dispute resolution using partnering principles. *International Journal of Project Management*. 2012 Aug 1;30(6):688-98.
24. Tumi SA, Omran A, Pakir AH. Causes of delay in construction industry in Libya. In *The International Conference on Economics and Administration*; c2009. p. 265-272.
25. Esty BC. Petrozuata: A case study of the effective use of project finance. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*. 2002;14(3):26-42.
26. Chen C. Coping with cross-cultural conflicts in global virtual project teams. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*. 2009;50(2):159-167.
27. Cartlidge D. Quantity surveyor's pocket book. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann; c2017.
28. Eccles RG. The quasifirm in the construction industry. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. 1981 Dec 1;2(4):335-57.
29. Bunni NG. The FIDIC forms of contract. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd; c2013.
30. Rowlinson S. A definition of procurement systems. In *Procurement systems*. Routledge; c2017. p. 52-74.