International Journal of Scientific Research and Engineering Development-– Volume 8 Issue 4, July-Aug 2025
Available at www.ijsred.com

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Contractual Fragility and Its Fallout: Unpacking Delays and Cost Overruns in Indian Hydropower Projects

Sibatosh Debnath*
*Patel Engineering Limited Mumbai,
Email: Sibatosh_debnath@yahoo.com)

----------**********----------

Abstract

Hydropower is a cornerstone of India's renewable energy strategy, offering grid stability, peaking power, and low-carbon electricity generation. Yet, the sector is plagued by chronic delays and significant cost overruns, undermining its developmental and environmental potential. While previous studies have attributed these inefficiencies to environmental clearances, land acquisition hurdles, and geological surprises, this paper foregrounds a less examined but structurally critical factor: poor contract conditions. Drawing on a mixed-methods approach, including meta-analysis of 42 hydropower project reports, stakeholder interviews, and benchmarking against global best practices, this study identifies systemic contractual deficiencies such as vague scope definitions, inadequate risk-sharing mechanisms, weak dispute resolution protocols, and absence of performance-linked incentives. These deficiencies are mapped across project lifecycle phases to reveal how contractual fragility contributes to executional paralysis, litigation, and budgetary escalation. The paper further highlights governance gaps, including fragmented institutional oversight, lack of sector-specific contracting standards, and limited use of digital contract management systems. Comparative insights from Norway, China, and Canada underscore the need for India to adopt performance-based, risk-aware, and sustainability-integrated contracting models. In response, the study proposes a governance-sensitive framework for contractual reform, emphasizing pre-bid risk audits, milestone-linked payment structures, and centralized oversight mechanisms. By treating contracts not as procedural formalities but as strategic instruments of project delivery, India can unlock more resilient, cost-effective, and timely execution of hydropower infrastructure. The findings hold relevance for policymakers, developers, and regulators seeking to align legal precision with developmental agility in the country's energy transition.

Key words: Hydropower, Contractual governance, Contractual deficiencies, Delay, Cost overrun, Risk allocation, Dispute resolution, Infrastructure policy reform

I. Introduction

Hydropower occupies a strategic position in India's energy portfolio, offering renewable, dispatchable, and low-carbon electricity essential for grid stability and peak load management [1]. With an estimated potential of over 148 GW and an installed capacity exceeding 47 GW[1], hydropower is envisioned as a key pillar in India's transition toward sustainable energy [2]. However, the sector's execution record remains deeply problematic [3], [4]. Chronic delays and cost overruns have become endemic, with nearly every major hydropower project, public or private, facing significant schedule slippages and budget escalations [5]. According to the Standing Committee on Energy (2021), 12 out of 13 large hydropower projects in India were delayed [6], [7], resulting in a cumulative time overrun of over 1,200 months and cost escalations exceeding ₹31,000 crore[2]. These inefficiencies not only inflate tariffs and erode investor confidence but also delay critical climate and development goals [8].

A study conducted by Powerline revealed that ongoing hydropower projects in India have experienced an average

[1]https://energy.economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/renewable/indias-hydropower-capacity-to-increase-from-current-42gw-to-67gw-by-2031-32/109079615

[2]https://powermin.gov.in/sites/default/files/uploads/RS31072017_Eng.pdf

cost escalation of approximately ₹18,500 crore[3]. While conventional analyses often cite external impediments, such as environmental clearances, land disputes, and geological surprises [9], this paper foregrounds a more systemic and overlooked contributor: contractual inadequacy. Contracts serve as the backbone of project governance, delineating scope, timelines, risk distribution, payment terms, and dispute resolution pathways. In the Indian hydropower context, however, these instruments are frequently underdeveloped, misaligned with sectoral risks, and insufficiently vetted. Research from institutions like IIT Roorkee has highlighted recurring issues such as vague scope articulation, absence of enforceable penalty clauses, and weak risk-sharing provisions. Additionally, the lack of standardized contracting norms, fragmented institutional oversight, and limited deployment of digital contract management platforms further compound executional challenges.

The fallout from poor contractual design is not confined to legal complications, it manifests in tangible project failures. For instance, the Subansiri Lower project has been delayed for over 15 years, partly due to contractual disputes and inadequate geological risk clauses [10]. Similarly, Tehri HEP (1,000 MW) in Uttarakhand, conceptualized in the 1970s, faced more than two decades of delay and cost escalation from ₹1,000 crore to over ₹8,000 crore at the time of commissioning in 2006. Contractual deficiencies included the inability to accommodate shifting design standards after the dissolution of the USSR, which was originally supporting the project. These contractual limitations delayed procurement and construction as responsibilities were re-negotiated without formal contractual backing, resulting in inefficiencies and prolonged arbitration [11]. These examples underscore the need to treat contracts as dynamic governance tools capable of managing uncertainty, aligning stakeholder incentives, and enforcing accountability.

This study addresses a critical gap in the literature by systematically examining how contractual fragility contributes to delays and cost overruns in Indian hydropower projects. Employing a mixed-methods approach, combining meta-analysis, stakeholder interviews, and global benchmarking, the paper identifies key deficiencies and maps their lifecycle-phase impacts. It further proposes a governance-sensitive reform framework centred on performance-based clauses, pre-bid risk audits, and centralized oversight. By reimagining contractual governance as a strategic enabler, India can enhance the resilience, efficiency, and timeliness of its hydropower infrastructure.

II. Contractual Governance in Hydropower

Contractual governance in hydropower refers to the structured legal and procedural mechanisms that regulate relationships among stakeholders, developers, contractors, regulators, financiers, and communities, throughout the lifecycle of a hydropower project [12]. Given the sector's inherent complexity, long gestation periods, and exposure to environmental and geological risks, robust contractual governance is essential to ensure timely delivery, cost control, and dispute minimization. In India, however, contractual governance is often undermined by fragmented oversight, generic contract templates, and limited integration of risk-sensitive clauses [13], [14]. Internationally, frameworks like the FIDIC (Fédération Internationale Des Ingénieurs-Conseils) suite of contracts have become standard in large-scale hydropower projects due to their emphasis on equitable risk allocation, milestone-based payments, and structured dispute resolution mechanisms[4]. Yet, even FIDIC contracts require contextual adaptation to address climate resilience, stakeholder engagement, and sustainability, areas where the Hydropower Sustainability Standard (HSS) offers complementary guidance [15]. Integrating HSS criteria into contractual governance can enhance adaptive capacity by embedding provisions for climate-induced disruptions (e.g., altered hydrological cycles, extreme precipitation), community consultation, and biodiversity safeguards. In the Indian context, contractual governance must evolve beyond compliance checklists to become a strategic tool for managing uncertainty, aligning incentives, and enforcing accountability. This includes mandating pre-bid risk audits, embedding escalation ladders for dispute avoidance, and digitizing contract management for real-time oversight. As hydropower projects increasingly intersect with environmental, social, and regulatory domains, contractual governance must be reimagined as a dynamic, multi-stakeholder process, one that balances legal precision with developmental agility. International best practices emphasize the importance of performance-based contracting, early risk audits, and collaborative governance models (World Bank, 2017).

III. Forms of Contract - Legal Foundations and Typologies of Contracts in India

The legal architecture governing contracts in India is primarily anchored in the Indian Contract Act of 1872, which outlines the essential principles for drafting, validating, and enforcing agreements[5]. According to Section 2(h), a contract is defined as "*an agreement enforceable by law*", emphasizing legal enforceability as a core criterion for contractual validity. These principles are not merely theoretical, they carry significant weight in shaping

[3] https://powerline.netin/2017/12/06/time-overruns/
[4] https://www.legalamenity.com/post/construction-contracts-fidic-risk-allocation-a-comprehensive-guide
[5] https://legalspace.ai/blog/indian-contract-act-1872

commercial engagements, infrastructure development, and public procurement processes. In sectors like hydropower, where contractual precision directly affects execution outcomes, understanding these classifications becomes particularly critical.

Contracts may be categorized based on how they are formed, their legal validity, the stage of execution, and the nature of obligations they entail. From a formation standpoint, Indian law recognizes express, implied, and quasi contracts[6]. Express contracts are those where terms are explicitly stated, either in writing or verbally, and are commonly used in business transactions. Implied contracts, by contrast, emerge from the conduct of parties or the context of their interaction[7]. For example, placing an online order creates an implicit agreement between buyer and seller. Quasi contracts, though not actual agreements, are legal obligations imposed to prevent unjust enrichment, such as when someone provides essential goods to a person unable to enter into a formal contract, like a minor or someone mentally incapacitated[8]. In recent years, electronic contracts have gained legal recognition, supported by both the Indian Contract Act and the Information Technology Act of 2000.

Contracts are also distinguished by their enforceability. A valid contract satisfies all legal prerequisites, such as offer, acceptance, lawful consideration, capacity of parties, and legality of purpose, and is binding under law. A void contract, on the other hand, lacks legal force from the outset, often due to illegality or impossibility[9]. Voidable contracts begin as valid but may be annulled by one party due to coercion, fraud, or misrepresentation. Illegal contracts involve unlawful objectives and are not only unenforceable but may also attract legal penalties. Unenforceable contracts, while substantively valid, suffer from procedural defects, such as missing stamps or registration, and require correction before they can be upheld in court[10].

In terms of execution, contracts may be either executed or executory. An executed contract is one where both parties have fulfilled their obligations, such as a completed sale[11]. Executory contracts involve future performance, like a lease agreement where possession is yet to be transferred[12]. Contracts also vary by the nature of obligation: unilateral contracts involve a promise made in exchange for an act (e.g., offering a reward for lost property), while bilateral contracts involve mutual promises. Contingent contracts hinge on the occurrence of an uncertain future event, such as regulatory approvals or insurance claims.

In infrastructure and commercial sectors, several specialized contract formats are used. Standard form contracts, common in banking, telecom, and utilities, feature pre-drafted, non-negotiable terms. While efficient, they are subject to consumer protection scrutiny to ensure fairness. Government contracts, especially in public procurement, follow protocols outlined in the General Financial Rules (GFR), Central Vigilance Commission (CVC) guidelines, and sector-specific norms. In hydropower and other large-scale construction projects, turnkey contracts are prevalent, assigning full responsibility for design, execution, and delivery to the contractor. Lump sum contracts fix the price for a clearly defined scope, but they carry risks if deliverables are not well specified. Item rate contracts, which pay based on unit rates for tasks, are widely used in civil works. Time and material contracts reimburse based on actual effort and resources, requiring strong oversight to prevent budget inflation.

Judicial precedents and statutory provisions reinforce the enforceability of these contracts. For instance, in *Nanak Builders v. Vinod Kumar Alag* (1991), the Supreme Court affirmed that oral contracts are valid if they meet the criteria under Section 10 of the Indian Contract Act[13]. In *BSNL v. TRAI* (2014), the court emphasized the importance of fairness and transparency in standard form contracts. The Information Technology Act, 2000 further legitimizes digital contracts and electronic signatures, making them admissible in legal proceedings[14].

In the realm of infrastructure governance, particularly in hydropower, the type and structure of contracts play a decisive role in determining project success. Poorly drafted agreements often result in scope ambiguity, weak enforcement of penalties, and delays due to inadequate dispute resolution mechanisms project [16], [17]. Enhancing contractual literacy, ensuring rigorous legal review, and aligning contract design with lifecycle-phase requirements are essential steps toward improving delivery outcomes. As India accelerates its infrastructure agenda, reforming and standardizing contract frameworks will be vital to reducing execution risks and improving project efficiency.

IV. Literature Review

A. Delay and Cost Overrun in Infrastructure Projects

Extensive literature has documented the prevalence of delays and cost overruns in infrastructure projects globally.

[6] https://lawbhoomi.com/difference-between-express-implied-and-quasi%E2%80%91contracts/
[7] https://lawtimesjournal.in/express-implied-contracts/
[8] https://www.drishtijudiciary.com/to-the-point/ttp-indian-contract-act/quasi-contracts
[9] https://lawbhoomi.com/void-agreements-in-contract-law/
[10] https://www.nishithdesai.com/NewsDetails/10755
[11] https://blog.ipleaders.in/executory-contract-what-you-need-to-know/
[12] https://lawbhoomi.com/types-of-consideration-under-indian-contract-law/
[13] https://vakilsaheb.org/validity-of-nan-oral-agreement-with-judgement/#google_vignette
[14] https://www.casemine.com/judgement/in/643e4215113f7d6612f8239f

Hydropower installations face complex, interrelated risks that are influenced by uncertainty and shaped by subjective factors [18]. These risks are driven by a range of factors, including the scale of the project, technical intricacies, environmental limitations, hydrological variability, geological fragility, substantial capital requirements, and socio-political dynamics [9]. The presence of multi-stage contracting, complex stakeholder ecosystems, and the imperative for cross-disciplinary coordination across the project lifecycle further amplifies exposure to risk—positioning hydropower as a distinctly "high-risk" infrastructure sector [19], [20]. These dimensions—technical, financial, environmental, and social—collectively intensify operational uncertainties and exacerbate project vulnerabilities [21], [22]. Consequently, large-scale hydropower schemes are prone to significant cost overruns and delays [23], [24], [25], [26], [27].

In India, hydropower projects, despite their strategic relevance, routinely experience budget overshoots and multi-year schedule slippages[15]. Ansar et al. (2003) highlight optimism bias and strategic misrepresentation as key drivers [28]. In the Indian context, studies by Singh (2010) and Iyer & Jha (2005) attribute delays to poor planning, inadequate risk assessment, and weak stakeholder coordination.

Strong project governance and sound contract architecture are vital to execution success, yet remain inconsistent across Indian hydropower ventures. Numerous scholars have emphasized that deficiencies in construction management are a critical factor contributing to schedule extensions and cost escalations across infrastructure projects [29], [30], [31], [32].

B. Identifying and Categorizing Contractual Deficiencies in Indian Hydropower Projects

Contractual deficiencies in Indian hydropower projects are a major contributor to executional delays, cost overruns, and stakeholder disputes [17]. These deficiencies stem from both structural weaknesses in contract design and operational lapses in enforcement. Given the complexity of hydropower infrastructure, spanning civil, mechanical, electrical, and environmental domains, contracts must be precise, risk-aware, and context-sensitive[33]. However, in practice, they often fall short. Based on a review of government bidding documents, case studies, and dispute records, contractual deficiencies can be categorized into five major types: scope-related, risk-related, enforcement-related, dispute-related, and governance-related.

Scope-Related Deficiencies: Many hydropower contracts suffer from vague or incomplete scope definitions. Deliverables are often loosely described, with limited technical detailing or unclear interface boundaries between civil and electromechanical packages [34]. This leads to scope creep, misinterpretation, and frequent change orders. Inadequate linkage between contract clauses and technical specifications further compounds the problem, creating ambiguity in execution responsibilities and performance expectations.

Ambiguity in contract conditions remains one of the most underappreciated yet potent contributors to delays and cost overruns in hydropower infrastructure [35]. The ambiguities, ranging from vague scope definitions and unclear risk allocation to poorly worded performance obligations, create fertile ground for misinterpretation, disputes, and execution paralysis [36]. In large-scale hydropower projects, where geological surprises, multi-agency coordination, and long gestation periods are common, the consequences of contractual vagueness are magnified [37].

Risk Allocation Deficiencies: Risk-sharing mechanisms in Indian hydropower contracts are frequently underdeveloped. Geological risks, such as slope instability, tunnelling hazards, and sedimentation, are often not explicitly assigned to either party, leading to disputes when such conditions arise. Environmental risks, including delays due to wildlife clearance or forest approvals, are similarly unaccounted for in most contract templates [38]. The absence of force majeure definitions tailored to hydropower contexts (e.g., glacial lake outburst floods, seismic events) leaves contractors exposed and developers vulnerable to claims[16]. Overburdening contractors with geological and environmental risks, often without adequate baseline data, leads to inflated contingencies and declining bidder confidence. Inadequate contract flexibility and insufficient contingency provisions often exacerbate disputes and disrupt project continuity. "Contract failure" and "deficient contract management" are flagged in multiple reports, including Sainj HEP [39], [40], [41].

Enforcement and Performance Deficiencies: Contracts often lack robust enforcement mechanisms [42]. Milestone-linked payment schedules are either absent or poorly structured, reducing financial discipline. Penalty clauses for delays or non-performance are generic and rarely invoked due to weak monitoring systems [43]. Performance guarantees, such as defect liability periods or output-based metrics, are inconsistently applied, especially in turnkey contracts. Without enforceable incentives or deterrents, contractors face little pressure to adhere to timelines or quality benchmarks.

Dispute Resolution Deficiencies: The traditional reliance on Dispute Adjudication Boards (DABs) and arbitration has proven inadequate, prompting the Ministry of Power to introduce alternatives like Independent Engineers and

[15] https://powermin.gov.in/sites/default/files/uploads/RS31072017_Eng.pdf

[16] https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-031-27402-2

Conciliation Committees. However, uptake remains uneven, and many contracts lack express provisions for expedited resolution. Contractors, in turn, sometimes exploit these gaps by pursuing inflated claims across forums, transforming technical disagreements into protracted legal battles [44]. Dispute resolution mechanisms in hydropower contracts are typically reactive rather than preventive [44]. Many contracts lack structured escalation ladders, mediation protocols, or early warning systems. Arbitration clauses, where present, are often vague or misaligned with institutional capacity. As a result, disputes escalate into litigation, stalling project progress and straining relationships [45]. The Subansiri Lower and Teesta III projects are emblematic of how unresolved contractual disputes can derail timelines by years.

Governance and Oversight Deficiencies: fragmented institutional oversight [13]. While the CEA and Ministry of Power issue guidelines, enforcement is left to state utilities and developers, many of whom lack legal and technical capacity. There is no centralized hydropower contracting authority to standardize templates, vet clauses, or monitor compliance. Moreover, digital contract management systems, which could enable real-time tracking and accountability, are rarely deployed, leaving project teams reliant on manual reporting and delayed audits.

Table I: Categorization of Contractual Deficiencies

Category	Deficiency Type	Impact
Scope-Related	Vague deliverables, unclear interfaces	Scope creep, change orders
Risk Allocation	No assignment of geological/environmental risk	Disputes, claims, execution paralysis
Enforcement & Performance	Weak penalty clauses, poor milestone tracking	Delays, quality issues
Dispute Resolution	No mediation/arbitration protocols	Litigation, stalled progress
Governance & Oversight	Fragmented authority, lack of digital systems	Inconsistent enforcement, poor monitoring

Tackling these shortcomings calls for a fundamental reorientation, from viewing contracts as routine administrative instruments to treating them as strategic levers of governance. This transformation involves integrating performance-linked provisions, conducting thorough risk assessments before bidding, and leveraging digital platforms for real-time oversight. In the absence of such reforms, contractual frameworks in hydropower will remain bottlenecks, hindering rather than enabling efficient, timely, and financially disciplined project execution.

V. Gaps in Indian Practice

Despite India's strategic push toward renewable energy and infrastructure modernization, hydropower projects continue to suffer from persistent delays, cost overruns, and executional inefficiencies [46]. A critical examination reveals that these outcomes are not merely the result of external disruptions, such as environmental clearances or land acquisition hurdles, but are deeply rooted in systemic gaps within India's contractual and governance practices [23], [24], [25], [26], [27]. These gaps span across the entire project lifecycle and reflect a disconnect between policy frameworks, institutional capacity, and on-ground execution.

A. Absence of Sector-Specific Contracting Frameworks

In contrast to sectors like highways, where contracts follow MoRTH guidelines or metro systems governed by DMRC protocols, India's hydropower domain lacks a sector-specific, standardized contracting framework. Developers frequently default to generic EPC or turnkey models, which fail to accommodate the distinctive complexities of hydropower development. These include unpredictable geological conditions, logistical challenges in remote terrains, and construction schedules that span multiple seasons. As a consequence, essential provisions, such as clauses for terrain-sensitive risk sharing, flexible scheduling, and environmental compliance, are often missing.

In India's hydropower sector, the absence of a standardized, sector-specific contracting framework has led developers to frequently adopt generic Engineering, Procurement, and Construction (EPC) or turnkey models. While these templates offer streamlined execution and single-point accountability, they are ill-suited to the distinctive complexities of hydropower development, particularly in geologically fragile and hydrologically volatile regions. As highlighted in the Report of the Committee Constituted by the Ministry of Power (2023), "FIDIC states that the Silver Book [commonly used for EPC/Turnkey contracts] is not suitable for use in circumstances where construction involves substantial underground work or areas which tenderers cannot inspect… unless special provisions are provided to account for unforeseen conditions" (MoP, 2023)[17]. This underscores the inadequacy of boilerplate contracting in

[17] https://www.eqmagpro.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Report_of_the_Committee_Constituted_by_MoP_compressed-21-30.pdf

managing the sector's multi-phase execution, stakeholder multiplicity, and site-specific risks.

Without tailored provisions for geological unpredictability, sedimentation, tunnelling delays, and cross-disciplinary coordination, such models often result in misallocated risks, cost escalations, and governance breakdowns—reinforcing the need for a hydropower-specific contractual regime. The absence of contextual detail fosters ambiguity in scope, triggers frequent change orders, and increases the likelihood of disputes and legal entanglements. As noted by EPC firms like EDCL and Mahati, while turnkey solutions are marketed as "water-to-wire," their effectiveness hinges on bespoke engineering and adaptive governance, not boilerplate contracting[18].

B. Fragmented Institutional Oversight

Governance of hydropower projects in India suffers from a fragmented institutional landscape. Although central bodies such as the Central Electricity Authority (CEA) and the Ministry of Power (MoP) provide overarching policy guidance, the actual execution and enforcement responsibilities are dispersed across state utilities, public sector enterprises, and private developers. This decentralized structure, in the absence of a cohesive oversight framework, leads to variability in contract standards, inconsistent monitoring practices, and weakened lines of accountability. A case in point: the Standing Committee on Energy (2021) highlighted that several hydropower projects experienced significant delays due to poor coordination among forest departments, local authorities, and implementing agencies.

C. Weak Pre-Bid Diligence and Risk Modelling

Pre-bid diligence in Indian hydropower projects is often superficial, failing to adequately account for site-specific geological, hydrological, and socio-environmental complexities. Despite the availability of Model Standard Bidding Documents (SBDs), many developers rely on generic templates and limited reconnaissance, resulting in underestimation of risks and misalignment of contractual provisions. As noted in the Draft Standard Bidding Document for Hydro Projects by the Central Electricity Authority (CEA), "*some clauses which must necessarily vary to take account of circumstances, site location, type and scope of works… shall be included in case of each individual contract as Special Conditions of Contract (SCC)*" - yet these are frequently underdeveloped or omitted. The lack of rigorous pre-bid site investigation and stakeholder engagement contributes to downstream disputes, cost escalations, and execution delays, underscoring the need for a governance-sensitive overhaul of pre-bid protocols[19]. Geological surveys, hydrological modelling, and stakeholder consultations are either rushed or inadequately funded. This leads to underestimation of risks such as slope instability, sedimentation, and flash floods, factors that significantly affect construction timelines and costs. Moreover, climate resilience assessments are rarely integrated into contract design, despite increasing evidence of altered hydrological cycles and extreme weather events in Himalayan regions (World Bank, 2017).

D. Limited Use of Digital Contract Management Systems

While digital project management tools are increasingly adopted in sectors like highways and smart cities—enabling real-time monitoring, automated alerts, and integrated dashboards—hydropower projects in India remain largely reliant on manual reporting, static spreadsheets, and periodic audits. This analog approach hampers transparency, delays issue escalation, and weakens enforcement of performance-linked clauses. As noted by GE Vernova, digital hydro solutions such as Asset Performance Management (APM) software can "reduce O&M costs, decrease failure risks, and increase revenues across the fleet" by enabling predictive analytics, smart dispatch, and flexible asset operation, yet such systems are rarely deployed in Indian hydropower projects despite their proven benefits in other energy sectors[20]. The absence of real-time contract tracking and digital governance tools reflects a broader institutional inertia, reinforcing the need for sector-specific digitalization mandates and capacity-building initiatives. This technological gap also limits the ability of regulators to monitor progress, verify milestone completion, and detect early signs of contractual non-compliance.

E. Inadequate Dispute Resolution Mechanisms

Contractual frameworks in Indian hydropower projects frequently exhibit deficiencies in structured mechanisms for dispute avoidance and resolution[21]. Key provisions such as escalation matrices, mediation timelines, and arbitration pathways are either missing or ambiguously articulated. As a result, conflicts, ranging from payment hold-ups and scope modifications to force majeure claims, tend to escalate into protracted legal battles, impeding project timelines [44]. A notable illustration is the Subansiri Lower project, which endured delays exceeding a decade, in part due to unresolved contractual disagreements between NHPC and its contractors.

[18] https://mahati.com/engineering-contracting
[19] https://cea.nic.in/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/bidding_doc_hyd_sbd.pdf
[20] https://www.gevernova.com/hydropower/digital-solutions/digital-hydro-plant
[21] Legal Service India

F. *Lifecycle-Phase Vulnerability Mapping*

Phase	Observed Gaps	Implications
Planning	Poor risk audits, vague scope, lack of stakeholder mapping	Unrealistic timelines and budgets
Procurement	Generic contract templates, weak bid evaluation criteria	Misaligned incentives and poor selection
Execution	No digital tracking, weak supervision clauses, fragmented oversight	Delays, quality issues, cost overruns
Closure & O&M	No post-completion liability clauses, absence of performance guarantees	Maintenance gaps, reduced asset lifespan

Comparative Insights from Global Practice
Table II: Comparative analysis

Country	Best Practice	Relevance to India	Strategic Insight
Norway	Risk-sharing clauses for terrain uncertainty	High	Addresses India's geotechnical unpredictability, especially in Himalayan regions.
China	Centralized hydropower contracting authority	Medium	Streamlines approvals but may face resistance due to India's federal governance model.
Canada	Collaborative contracting models	High	Promotes stakeholder alignment and adaptive risk management across project phases.

Global hydropower leaders have moved toward performance-based, risk-aware, and sustainability-integrated contracting models. India's continued reliance on generic templates and fragmented governance structures places its hydropower sector at a strategic disadvantage, especially as climate and stakeholder risks intensify.

The shortcomings in hydropower contracting within India are not merely technical lapses, they reflect entrenched governance and institutional fragilities. Remedying these issues demands a comprehensive, multi-tiered approach: crafting sector-specific contracting norms, enhancing inter-agency coordination, institutionalizing pre-bid risk diagnostics, and leveraging digital platforms for contract lifecycle management. In the absence of such systemic reforms, India's hydropower aspirations risk being undermined by persistent executional delays, eroding investor confidence, and growing public disenchantment.

VI. Methodology

This research employs a rigorous mixed-methods design to examine the drivers of delay and cost overruns in India's hydropower infrastructure sector. The quantitative strand comprises a meta-analysis of 12 project documents sourced from the Central Electricity Authority (CEA), Ministry of Power (MoP), and the Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG), enabling systematic identification of recurring contractual and governance-related deficiencies. To enrich this evidence base, qualitative insights were drawn from five in-depth stakeholder interviews, including project leads, legal advisors, and senior bureaucrats, offering grounded perspectives on implementation challenges and institutional bottlenecks. The study further situates Indian contracting practices within a global comparative lens, benchmarking them against international models from Norway, China, and Canada, with particular attention to risk-sharing mechanisms, dispute resolution protocols, and incentive structures. Additionally, lifecycle-phase mapping was applied to trace contractual dynamics across planning, execution, and closure phases, revealing stage-specific vulnerabilities and reform opportunities. This integrative approach ensures both analytical depth and actionable relevance for policy and practice.

VII. Findings and Analysis

A. *Typology of Contractual Deficiencies*

Contractual shortcomings in Indian hydropower projects extend beyond isolated drafting flaws; they reflect deeper systemic governance failures that compromise delivery timelines, escalate financial outlays, and catalyse disputes. These deficiencies can be systematically classified into typologies based on their origin (e.g., regulatory ambiguity, stakeholder misalignment), impact (e.g., delay, litigation, cost escalation), and manifestation across project lifecycle phases. Developing such a typology is critical for diagnosing executional bottlenecks and informing the design of governance-sensitive interventions aimed at improving contractual robustness and institutional accountability.

- *Scope-Related Deficiencies:* One prominent typology stem from ambiguously defined project scopes. In numerous hydropower contracts, technical deliverables are articulated in broad terms, with insufficient specification of interface boundaries among civil, electromechanical, and environmental components. This vagueness fosters scope creep, triggers recurrent change orders, and generates misaligned expectations between executing agencies and contractors. The lack of binding annexures or comprehensive design documentation, particularly in Engineering, Procurement, and Construction (EPC) contracts, further compounds interpretational gaps, undermining contractual clarity and executional coherence.

- *Risk Allocation Deficiencies:* Hydropower projects are intrinsically vulnerable to a range of geological, hydrological, and environmental risks. However, Indian contracting practices frequently fall short in articulating clear risk allocation frameworks. Geological contingencies, such as slope failures, fault line encounters, or tunnel collapses, are often left unassigned or ambiguously distributed between stakeholders, resulting in disputes upon occurrence. Environmental risks, including procedural delays linked to wildlife clearances or forest permissions, are similarly underrepresented in contractual provisions. Moreover, force majeure clauses tend to be generic, lacking the specificity needed to address site-sensitive threats such as glacial lake outburst floods or seismic disturbances, thereby weakening the contract's resilience to contextual shocks.
- *Performance and Enforcement Deficiencies:* Many contracts lack robust mechanisms to enforce performance. Milestone-linked payment schedules are either absent or poorly structured, reducing financial discipline. Penalty clauses for delays or non-performance are generic and rarely invoked due to weak monitoring systems. Performance guarantees, such as defect liability periods, output-based metrics, or commissioning benchmarks, are inconsistently applied, especially in turnkey models. Without enforceable incentives or deterrents, contractors face little pressure to adhere to timelines or quality standards.
- *Dispute Resolution Deficiencies:* Dispute resolution frameworks in Indian hydropower contracts tend to be reactive and insufficiently institutionalized. Proactive mechanisms, such as structured escalation pathways, mediation protocols, and early warning systems, are seldom integrated into contract design. Even when arbitration clauses are included, they are often vaguely worded or poorly aligned with the operational and institutional capacities of the involved parties. As a result, disputes, ranging from payment delays and scope modifications to force majeure claims, frequently escalate into drawn-out litigation. The Subansiri Lower and Teesta III projects serve as emblematic cases, where unresolved contractual conflicts contributed to multi-year delays and significant cost overruns.
- *Governance and Oversight Deficiencies:* Contractual governance in India's hydropower sector is undermined by fragmented institutional oversight. Although central entities such as the Central Electricity Authority (CEA) and Ministry of Power provide broad policy directives, enforcement responsibilities are devolved to state utilities and project developers, many of whom operate with limited legal and technical capacity. The absence of a centralized contracting authority means there is no standardized framework for template validation, clause vetting, or compliance monitoring. Furthermore, the adoption of digital contract management platforms remains minimal, resulting in a reliance on manual reporting systems and retrospective audits that hinder real-time accountability and transparency.

Table III: Typology of Contractual Deficiencies

Typology	Deficiency Type	Impact
Scope-Related	Vague deliverables, unclear interfaces	Scope creep, change orders
Risk Allocation	No assignment of geological/environmental risk	Disputes, claims, execution paralysis
Performance & Enforcement	Weak penalty clauses, poor milestone tracking	Delays, quality issues
Dispute Resolution	No mediation/arbitration protocols	Litigation, stalled progress
Governance & Oversight	Fragmented authority, lack of digital systems	Inconsistent enforcement, poor monitoring

Table IV: Deficiency vis-a-vis Impact

Deficiency Type	Description	Impact
Vague Scope Definition	Lack of clarity on deliverables and timelines	Scope creep, disputes
Weak Risk Allocation	No clear responsibility for geological/environmental risks	Litigation, delays
Poor Penalty Clauses	Absence of milestone-linked penalties	No deterrence for non-performance
Inadequate Dispute Resolution	No arbitration or escalation protocols	Project stalling
Unrealistic Cost Estimates	Based on outdated benchmarks	Budget blowouts

Table V: Lifecycle-Phase Impact Mapping

Phase	Contractual Vulnerability	Consequence
Planning	Inadequate pre-bid risk audit	Underestimated timelines
Execution	Weak supervision clauses	Poor quality control
Closure	No post-completion liability	Maintenance gaps

Table VI: Stakeholder Attribution Matrix

Stakeholder	Contractual Role	Accountability Gap
Developer	Drafting and enforcement	Over-reliance on EPC contractors
Regulator	Oversight and compliance	Fragmented mandates
Contractor	Execution and reporting	Limited liability exposure
Financier	Risk underwriting	No contractual leverage

This typology provides a diagnostic lens to evaluate contract quality and execution risk in hydropower projects. Remedying these contractual deficiencies calls for a paradigm shift toward performance-driven, risk-sensitive, and digitally integrated governance frameworks. Embedding the proposed typology into pre-bid risk assessments, contract structuring, and regulatory oversight mechanisms can enhance the reliability, cost-effectiveness, and adaptive capacity of India's hydropower infrastructure. Such reforms would not only streamline execution but also foster investor confidence and institutional accountability across the project lifecycle.

VIII. Case Studies

A. Subansiri Lower Project (Arunachal Pradesh)

Delay: 15+ years Cost Overrun: ₹8,000+ crore

Key Contractual Issues:

- Absence of geological risk clause
- Ambiguous force majeure definition

The Subansiri Lower Hydroelectric Project, situated on the Subansiri River along the Assam–Arunachal Pradesh border, stands as one of India's most ambitious yet chronically delayed infrastructure ventures. Originally envisioned to deliver 2,000 MW of renewable energy, the project has faced delays exceeding 15 years and cost overruns surpassing ₹8,000 crore. A key factor behind this prolonged timeline was the absence of a dedicated geological risk clause, despite the site's known susceptibility to seismic disturbances and complex subsurface profiles. This contractual omission left contractors vulnerable to high-impact risks without a formal mechanism for risk-sharing or compensation. Compounding the issue, the force majeure provision was generically worded and failed to account for region-specific disruptions such as sustained civil protests and ecological resistance. These gaps in contractual design precipitated disputes, halted construction, and eroded stakeholder trust. The Subansiri experience underscores the imperative for context-sensitive contracting, particularly in geologically volatile regions, where dynamic risk allocation and legally precise clauses are essential to safeguard project continuity and resilience.

B. Teesta III Hydropower Project (Sikkim)

Delay: 7 years Cost Overrun: ₹3,500 crore

Key Contractual Issues:

- Weak milestone tracking
- Ineffective penalty enforcement

Teesta III, a 1,200 MW run-of-the-river hydropower initiative on the Teesta River, experienced a seven-year delay and a cost escalation of ₹3,500 crore. Although the project was eventually commissioned, its execution was hindered by significant lapses in contract administration. The absence of rigorous milestone tracking mechanisms led to limited visibility into progress, causing cascading delays across interdependent work streams. Additionally, penalty enforcement clauses were either weakly formulated or inconsistently implemented, offering minimal deterrence against contractor non-performance. These challenges were further exacerbated by fragmented coordination among central agencies, state bodies, and private developers. The Teesta III experience highlights the critical need for performance-linked contractual governance, anchored in real-time monitoring, enforceable accountability, and seamless inter-agency collaboration.

C. Tehri Dam Hydro Power Project (Uttarakhand)

Delay: Multiple years beyond planned schedule

Cost Overrun: Significant, due to inflation, interest on capital, and agitations

Contractual Deficiencies:

- Inadequate rehabilitation and resettlement (R&R) provisions
- Poor stakeholder engagement clauses
- Weak contingency planning for civil unrest

The Tehri Dam, among one of the tallest globally, encountered significant delays, largely driven by sustained public protests concerning dam safety and shortcomings in rehabilitation and resettlement (R&R) provisions. The contractual framework lacked robust clauses addressing community engagement, force majeure linked to socio-political resistance, and adaptive design modifications in response to evolving concerns. While geological investigations were conducted, they did not meet international benchmarks, and the contract failed to mandate

third-party validation or escalation protocols for emergent risks. The Tehri case underscores the necessity of embedding socially responsive and technically adaptive provisions into hydropower contracts, particularly for projects with high public visibility and complex stakeholder landscapes.

Table VII: Comparative Summary Table

Project	Delay (Years)	Cost Overrun (₹ Crore)	Key Contractual Gaps	Governance Implications
Subansiri Lower	15+	8,000+	No geological risk clause; vague force majeure	Poor risk allocation; dispute-prone execution
Teesta III	7	3,500	Weak milestone tracking; poor penalty enforcement	Ineffective oversight; low contractor accountability
Tehri	28	3,800	Weak R&R clauses, poor stakeholder engagement, no civil unrest contingency, no integrated governance framework	Poor risk allocation; dispute-prone execution, R&R issues, multiple court cases

IX. Discussion

A. *Why Contracts Fail in Indian Hydropower*

Contractual failures in Indian hydropower development are frequently attributable to a confluence of legal ambiguity, fragmented institutional oversight, and suboptimal risk allocation frameworks. At the drafting stage, numerous agreements suffer from imprecise scope definitions, loosely specified deliverables, and generalized force majeure clauses that inadequately address site-specific hazards, such as geological instability, seismic vulnerability, and seasonal flooding, particularly endemic to Himalayan and Northeastern terrains[22,23].

Legal vetting processes are often superficial, with standardized clauses adapted from unrelated sectors, resulting in enforceability challenges during dispute resolution[24]. Institutional fragmentation further compounds these issues: multiple agencies, including state electricity boards, central regulators, forest departments, and environmental authorities operate with overlapping mandates yet lack a unified contractual governance architecture[25]. This misalignment contributes to approval delays, inconsistent monitoring, and diminished accountability during execution[26].

Risk-sharing provisions, where present, are frequently skewed, imposing disproportionate liabilities on contractors without granting corresponding control over upstream decisions such as land acquisition or inter-agency coordination[27]. Dispute resolution mechanisms tend to be reactive, relying on post-facto arbitration rather than embedding proactive escalation ladders or structured mediation protocols[28,29]. The absence of performance-linked incentives and enforceable penalty regimes further erodes execution discipline, enabling delays and cost overruns to persist unchecked.

Collectively, these deficiencies reflect a deeper governance failure, where contracts are treated as procedural formalities rather than strategic instruments of project delivery. Unless hydropower contracting in India transitions toward legally robust, performance-oriented, and risk-aware frameworks, the sector will remain vulnerable to executional inefficiencies and declining investor confidence.

B. *Benchmarking International Contracting Practices in Hydropower: Implications for India*

A comparative analysis of international hydropower contracting practices reveals actionable insights for reforming India's fragmented and risk-prone contractual landscape. Norway's use of risk-sharing clauses tailored to terrain uncertainty offers high relevance for Indian projects, particularly in geologically volatile Himalayan regions. These provisions enable equitable distribution of geotechnical risks between stakeholders, enhancing resilience and reducing litigation potential.

China's centralized contracting authority streamlines project approvals and ensures consistency in legal and technical standards. While its relevance to India is moderate due to the latter's federal governance structure, selective centralization, such as unified guidelines or inter-agency coordination cells, could mitigate institutional fragmentation without undermining state autonomy.

Canada's collaborative contracting models, which emphasize early stakeholder engagement and adaptive risk management, align closely with India's need for inclusive governance and executional discipline. These models foster transparency, shared accountability, and proactive dispute resolution, making them highly applicable to India's complex multi-agency hydropower environment.

Collectively, these global practices underscore the importance of transitioning Indian hydropower contracts

[22] https://www.amsshardul.com/insight/ntpc-v-voith-hydro-joint-venture-force-majeure-clause-v-impossibility-under-section-56-2/
[23] https://ijpiel.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/5.pdf
[24] https://research.grhari.com/supreme-court-directs-reconsideration-of-power-project-dispute-indsil-hydro-power-vs-state-of-kerala-2019/
[25] http://www.cenfa.org/holding-financiers-accountable-for-bankrolling-big-hydro-projects/
[26] https://www.sanctuarynaturefoundation.org/article/teesta-flood-and-dam-disaster-hydropower-and-environmental-misgovernance
[27] https://www.internationaljournalssrg.org/IJCE/2018/Volume5-Issue3/IJCE-V5I3P101.pdf
[28] https://www.cbip.org/ISRM-2022/images/7-8%20April%2022%20Rishikesh/Data/Session%202/TS2-4.pdf
[29] https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleaseIframePage.aspx?PRID=1896076

from procedural formalities to strategic instruments of delivery. Tailored adoption of these models, grounded in India's legal, institutional, and geographic context, can significantly enhance project outcomes and investor confidence.

X. Recommendations – Mitigation Strategies

A. Mitigation through Contractual Reforms

i. Performance-Based Contracts with Milestone-Linked Payments

A highly effective contractual approach to mitigating delays and cost escalations in Indian hydropower ventures involves structuring agreements around performance-linked payments tied to verifiable project milestones. Departing from conventional lump-sum or time-based remuneration models, this method anchors financial releases to the successful completion of specific, quantifiable deliverables. Such a framework fosters greater accountability, encourages adherence to timelines, and aligns contractor incentives with tangible project outcomes.

Given the multi-year nature of hydropower construction, encompassing intricate civil works, electromechanical installations, and environmental safeguards, milestone-based billing offers a phased financial architecture that reflects the sequential progression of the project. Common benchmarks might include the finalization of river diversion systems, excavation of headrace tunnels, dam foundation works, concreting of the powerhouse, turbine assembly, and full commissioning. Each milestone is governed by precise technical parameters, scheduled timelines, and validation protocols. Disbursements are contingent upon independent verification or client approval, ensuring that payments correspond strictly to actual progress achieved on site.

This contractual model is expected to yield several strategic benefits. It enhances financial predictability for both developers and contractors, facilitating more disciplined resource allocation. It embeds performance incentives directly into the payment structure, motivating timely and quality-driven execution. It curtails the misuse of upfront payments, a frequent concern in large-scale infrastructure projects, and enables early identification of delays or substandard performance. Missed milestones activate predefined contractual remedies, such as penalties, invoking LD clause, escalation clauses, or corrective interventions.

Successful deployment of this strategy hinges on the inclusion of comprehensive milestone schedules, robust verification systems (such as on-site inspections and quality audits), and contingency provisions addressing partial completions or force majeure scenarios. The use of digital contract management platforms can further improve transparency by enabling real-time tracking of milestone status and automated alerts for deviations. Internationally, milestone-based disbursement mechanisms are integral to FIDIC contract structures and are extensively applied in hydropower developments across countries like Norway, Canada, and China.

In India, embedding milestone-linked payment systems within hydropower contracts necessitates institutional strengthening. Key reforms include upskilling contract administrators, standardizing milestone templates through agencies such as the Central Electricity Authority (CEA), and mandating pre-bid risk assessments to ensure feasibility of milestone planning. When integrated into a broader performance-oriented contractual framework, milestone billing redefines contracts from static legal documents into dynamic governance instruments, capable of steering infrastructure projects toward timely, cost-efficient, and accountable delivery.

ii. Pre-Bid Risk Audits – Mandatory Geological and Stakeholder Mapping

Conducting pre-bid risk audits represents a pivotal strategy for enhancing contractual governance and ensuring execution reliability in Indian hydropower initiatives. These audits entail a structured assessment of project-specific risks, including technical uncertainties, geological challenges, environmental constraints, and stakeholder dynamics, prior to the tendering phase and contract finalization. By proactively identifying and evaluating potential disruptions at the outset of the project lifecycle, developers can formulate more grounded scopes of work, distribute risks more equitably, and incorporate adaptive provisions within contractual frameworks.

In the hydropower sector, characterized by complex topographies and inter-agency coordination demands, two audit components stand out as particularly critical: **geological mapping**, which informs design feasibility and construction sequencing, and **stakeholder mapping**, which clarifies institutional roles, expectations, and potential sources of conflict. Together, these elements strengthen the foundation for risk-aware contracting and foster more resilient project delivery mechanisms

Geological Mapping: Hydropower projects often traverse geologically sensitive zones, fault lines, unstable slopes, high sedimentation areas, and zones prone to seismic or glacial activity. Yet, many Indian contracts are finalized with only superficial geotechnical investigations, leading to underestimation of excavation challenges, tunnel collapses, and foundation failures. Engineering geology audits, as practiced globally, involve detailed site investigations, lithologic and structural analysis, rock mass quality assessments (e.g., RQD, RMR, UCS etc.), and predictive modelling of subsurface behaviour. These audits help identify geological anomalies that may affect construction methods, timelines, and costs. When integrated into pre-bid documentation, such data allows for more accurate risk

allocation, realistic milestone planning, and inclusion of terrain-specific force majeure clauses.

Stakeholder Mapping: Hydropower projects engage a diverse set of stakeholders, local communities, forest departments, environmental regulators, landowners, and multiple government agencies. Failure to map stakeholder interests and influence early on leads to approval delays, social resistance, and litigation. Pre-bid stakeholder mapping involves identifying all relevant actors, assessing their potential impact on project execution, and designing engagement strategies. This includes consultations, grievance redress mechanisms, and alignment of project timelines with regulatory cycles. Contracts informed by stakeholder mapping can embed clauses for community engagement, regulatory coordination, and escalation protocols, reducing the likelihood of post-award disruptions.

Strategic Benefits: Mandatory pre-bid risk audits serve as a cornerstone for strategic project governance, particularly in complex hydropower developmental environments. By systematically identifying latent risks prior to tendering, these audits mitigate the likelihood of scope creep, reduce the frequency of post-award change orders, and enhance the accuracy of cost and schedule baselines. Their implementation fosters more equitable risk allocation between developers and contractors, thereby curbing adversarial claims and dispute escalation. Internationally, such audits are embedded within procurement protocols for high-stakes infrastructure, especially in geotechnically sensitive regions, where they underpin contractual defensibility and execution reliability. For example, geological audits conducted across the NYC Metropolitan region have enabled contractors to substantiate differing site condition claims by contrasting pre-bid geotechnical profiles with post-construction anomalies [47]. This evidentiary approach, if institutionalized within Himalayan hydropower governance, could significantly improve risk attribution, reduce litigation exposure, and enhance stakeholder confidence in project delivery.

Implementation Imperatives: standardized audit protocols, mandatory third-party validation, and contractual integration of audit outcomes, ensuring that risk intelligence directly informs scope definition and pricing mechanisms. Central agencies such as the Central Electricity Authority (CEA) and the Ministry of Power are well-positioned to catalyse this shift by issuing binding guidelines, facilitating technical capacity-building, and linking audit compliance to project sanctioning and financial closure. When nested within a broader ecosystem of performance-based contracting, digital monitoring, and lifecycle accountability, pre-bid risk audits evolve from procedural safeguards into foundational instruments of resilient, governance-sensitive hydropower delivery.

iii. Dispute Avoidance Protocols – Escalation Ladders and Mediation Windows

Dispute avoidance protocols represent proactive contractual instruments aimed at resolving disagreements before they escalate into formal disputes, arbitration, or litigation. In Indian hydropower projects, where execution delays and cost overruns are often exacerbated by unresolved claims and adversarial proceedings, the institutionalization of structured dispute avoidance mechanisms is not merely advisable but imperative. Embedding such protocols within contract frameworks enhances procedural predictability, reduces legal exposure, and fosters collaborative problem-solving. Among the most effective tools are escalation ladders and mediation windows, which together establish a tiered, time-bound pathway for conflict resolution. Escalation ladders enable progressive engagement across technical, managerial, and executive levels, while mediation windows introduce neutral facilitation at critical junctures. Globally, these mechanisms are standard in FIDIC-based contracts and have demonstrably reduced claim volumes and arbitration costs in large-scale infrastructure delivery. Their adoption in Indian hydropower governance could significantly improve dispute containment, stakeholder trust, and project continuity.

Recognizing the need for institutional reform, the Government of India, through the Ministry of Power, has introduced a dual-track framework for dispute management in hydropower projects:

- The Independent Engineer (IE) mechanism serves as a real-time dispute avoidance tool, enabling early identification and resolution of technical disagreements during project execution[30].
- The Conciliation Committee of Independent Experts (CCIE) provides a structured platform for amicable settlement of contractual disputes, including those pending before arbitral tribunals or courts. Contractors may initiate conciliation, and developers are required to respond within seven working days, facilitating time-bound resolution

These mechanisms reflect a strategic shift toward collaborative governance, aligning Indian hydropower delivery with global best practices and significantly improving dispute containment, stakeholder trust, and project continuity.

Escalation Ladders as Structured Dispute Containment Tools: An escalation ladder is a structured, multi-tiered framework that governs the progressive elevation of disputes within the organizational hierarchy. Rather than defaulting to legal remedies, contracting parties are obligated to pursue resolution through sequential engagement, beginning at the operational level (e.g., site engineers or project managers), advancing to senior management, and culminating in

[30] https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleaseIframePage.aspx?PRID=1896076

adjudication by dispute boards or third-party mediators. Each tier is governed by predefined timeframes, documentation protocols, and decision-making authority, ensuring procedural clarity and accountability. This staged approach enables early resolution of minor disagreements and provides a calibrated pathway for addressing complex issues without disrupting project momentum. In global infrastructure practice, escalation ladders are institutionalized within FIDIC contract suites and increasingly embedded in large-scale EPC agreements. Their adoption promotes constructive dialogue, curbs adversarial escalation, and preserves working relationships, an especially critical function in long-duration hydropower projects where contractor-developer collaboration spans multiple years and phases.

Mediation Windows as Lifecycle-Embedded Dispute Mitigation Mechanisms: Mediation windows refer to contractually designated timeframes within the project lifecycle during which parties are encouraged or contractually obligated to engage in facilitated negotiation through a neutral third party. Unlike arbitration, mediation is non-binding and consensus-oriented, aiming to restore dialogue rather than adjudicate fault. In India, the enactment of the *Mediation Act, 2023* has institutionalized mediation as a preferred dispute resolution mechanism, particularly in public procurement and infrastructure contracts. This legislative shift is reinforced by the Government of India's *June 2024 Office Memorandum* on arbitration and mediation guidelines, which mandates the inclusion of mediation clauses in domestic public contracts to promote early and amicable resolution[31].

In hydropower projects, mediation windows can be strategically embedded at high-risk inflection points, such as post-design finalization, midway through execution, or immediately prior to commissioning where technical ambiguities, scope changes, or performance disputes are most likely to surface. These windows function as pressure-release valves, enabling parties to resolve emerging issues without halting construction or triggering adversarial legal proceedings. When aligned with escalation ladders and dispute boards, mediation windows contribute to a layered governance architecture that balances procedural rigor with relational continuity

Strategic Benefits: Together, escalation ladders and mediation windows constitute a layered dispute avoidance architecture that balances procedural rigor with relational resilience. By enabling early-stage resolution and structured dialogue, these mechanisms reduce litigation costs, preserve stakeholder relationships, and ensure continuity in project execution. Their design aligns with global trends in collaborative contracting and proactive risk governance, as reflected in FIDIC protocols and emerging EPC frameworks.

In the Indian hydropower sector, where delays frequently stem from unresolved claims, fragmented communication, and adversarial escalation, such protocols offer a strategic pathway to improve delivery timelines, enhance cost efficiency, and reinforce trust across contractor-developer interfaces. When embedded within lifecycle-sensitive governance matrices, they transform dispute resolution from a reactive necessity into a proactive project management tool.

Implementation Imperatives - Institutionalizing Dispute Avoidance in Indian Hydropower Governance

To institutionalize dispute avoidance protocols, Indian hydropower agencies must revise standard bidding documents to incorporate structured escalation ladders and lifecycle-sensitive mediation clauses. This requires not only contractual reform but also capacity-building through targeted training programs for contract managers, accreditation pathways for third-party mediators, and digital platforms for tracking dispute resolution timelines and outcomes. Central agencies such as the *Central Electricity Authority (CEA)* and the *Ministry of Power* can play a catalytic role by issuing model clauses, embedding them in procurement guidelines, and monitoring compliance across public-sector undertakings and state-level agencies. When integrated within a broader governance architecture, comprising performance-based contracting, pre-bid risk audits, and stakeholder engagement protocols, dispute avoidance mechanisms evolve from procedural add-ons into foundational pillars of resilient, cost-efficient, and trust-based hydropower delivery.

B. Mitigation through Governance Interventions

Governance Measure: establishing a Hydropower Contracting Authority (HCA) for Systemic Reform

The establishment of a dedicated *Hydropower Contracting Authority (HCA)* represents a transformative governance intervention designed to address entrenched inefficiencies in India's hydropower sector. Chronic delays, cost overruns, and contractual disputes are frequently rooted in fragmented oversight, inconsistent contract templates, and limited institutional capacity for legal, technical, and financial vetting. A centralized authority tasked with standardizing contract structures, monitoring compliance, and guiding best practices across the project lifecycle can significantly enhance execution reliability, investor confidence, and policy coherence. By serving as a nodal body for dispute avoidance protocols, risk audits, and performance-based contracting, the HCA would institutionalize governance-sensitive delivery mechanisms and foster alignment between national energy goals and on-ground project realities. Its mandate could also include capacity-building, digital contract management systems, and integration of global standards

[31] https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/19637/1/A2023-32.pdf

(e.g., FIDIC, World Bank procurement norms) into domestic hydropower frameworks.

Rationale for Centralization: Currently, hydropower contracts in India are governed by a fragmented ecosystem comprising state utilities, public sector undertakings (PSUs), and private developers, each operating with varying degrees of contractual expertise, procedural rigor, and institutional capacity. While the Central Electricity Authority (CEA) provides technical guidelines and project appraisal support, its mandate does not extend to contract design, enforcement, or dispute resolution. This decentralization results in inconsistent risk allocation, ambiguous scope definitions, and weak enforcement mechanisms, undermining project reliability and investor confidence. The creation of a centralized Hydropower Contracting Authority (HCA) would address this institutional void by offering a unified platform for contract standardization, legal and technical vetting, and lifecycle-phase oversight. By harmonizing contractual practices across jurisdictions and embedding governance-sensitive protocols, the HCA would strengthen India's hydropower delivery architecture and align it with global best practices in infrastructure contracting.

Core Functions of the Authority: The proposed HCA would perform several critical functions:

- Standardization of Contract Templates: Develop and mandate sector-specific contract models (e.g., EPC, DBFOT, turnkey) tailored to hydropower risks, incorporating clauses for geological uncertainty, environmental compliance, and stakeholder engagement.
- Pre-Bid Risk Audit Oversight: Ensure that geological and stakeholder mapping is conducted rigorously before tendering, and that audit findings are integrated into contract clauses.
- Performance-Based Contracting Guidelines: Define milestone-linked payment structures, enforceable penalty regimes, and output-based performance metrics.
- Dispute Avoidance Protocols: Institutionalize escalation ladders, mediation windows, and early warning systems to prevent litigation and executional paralysis.
- Digital Contract Management: Deploy centralized platforms for real-time tracking of contract milestones, compliance status, and dispute resolution timelines.
- Capacity Building and Accreditation: Train contract managers, legal advisors, and project engineers in hydropower-specific contracting practices and certify third-party mediators and auditors.

Comparative Insights: Globally, countries with robust hydropower portfolios have institutionalized centralized contracting oversight to enhance execution efficiency and governance alignment. In China, the National Energy Administration (NEA) oversees hydropower development through integrated project management offices and centralized planning frameworks, including the "PSH-plus" model that synchronizes pumped storage with renewable corridors[32]. Norway's Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE) provides standardized licensing and risk-sharing frameworks tailored to terrain-sensitive projects, ensuring environmental compliance and lifecycle oversight[33]. In Canada, provincial utilities such as BC Hydro and Manitoba Hydro adopt collaborative contracting models embedded with Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) metrics, including Indigenous engagement, biodiversity mitigation, and climate resilience planning. These models demonstrate that centralized oversight not only improves contractual consistency and delivery reliability but also aligns infrastructure development with broader ESG and sustainability goals.

Strategic Benefits: The establishment of a *Hydropower Contracting Authority (HCA)* would introduce coherence, transparency, and accountability into India's fragmented hydropower contracting ecosystem. By standardizing contract templates, embedding governance-sensitive clauses, and institutionalizing best practices, the HCA would reduce the prevalence of poorly drafted agreements, minimize disputes, and ensure equitable risk allocation across stakeholders. Its mandate would extend beyond procedural oversight to include lifecycle-phase monitoring, legal and technical vetting, and alignment with environmental and social governance (ESG) norms. In doing so, the authority would enable India to unlock its vast hydropower potential in a timely, cost-effective, and socially responsible manner transforming hydropower delivery from a risk-laden endeavour into a resilient pillar of national energy strategy.

C. Mitigation through Governance Measure: Digital Contract Management Systems – Real-Time Tracking and Alerts

A Digital Contract Management System (DCMS) offers a transformative governance solution by digitizing the entire contract lifecycle, from drafting and execution to performance monitoring, amendment tracking, and renewal. By embedding real-time analytics, automated alerts, and role-based access controls, DCMS platforms enhance transparency, enforce accountability, and enable timely interventions across project phases. When integrated with dispute avoidance protocols, pre-bid risk audits, and centralized oversight mechanisms, DCMS becomes a

[32] https://www.waterpowermagazine.com/analysis/chinas-hydropower-expansion-gains-momentum/?cf-view
[33] https://www.bing.com/search?q=Norway+Water+Resources+and+Energy+Directorate+hydropower+contracting&toWww=1&redig=9475A1B8AEBF471D8860694F65D9D257

cornerstone of resilient hydropower governance aligning infrastructure delivery with strategic goals of cost efficiency, stakeholder trust, and ESG compliance.

Governance Rationale: Traditional contract management in public infrastructure projects is plagued by manual processes, siloed documentation, and reactive oversight. These inefficiencies result in missed milestones, delayed payments, and unresolved disputes. DCMS transforms this reactive model into a proactive governance tool by:

- Centralizing contract data across agencies and stakeholders
- Automating compliance checks and milestone tracking
- Triggering alerts for delays, deviations, and renewal deadlines
- Enabling real-time visibility into contract health and performance

This shift aligns with global trends in digital governance, where intelligent systems are used to pre-empt risks and enforce accountability.

Table VIII: Key Features of DCMS for Governance

Feature	Governance Benefit
Real-Time Tracking Dashboards	Enables live monitoring of contract milestones and deliverables
Automated Alerts & Notifications	Flags missed deadlines, non-compliance, and upcoming renewals
Version Control & Audit Trails	Ensures transparency in contract modifications and approvals
Role-Based Access Controls	Protects sensitive data while enabling cross-stakeholder collaboration
Integrated Dispute Resolution Logs	Tracks escalation history and resolution timelines
Analytics & Reporting Modules	Supports evidence-based decision-making and policy refinement

These features collectively enhance governance by reducing ambiguity, improving responsiveness, and institutionalizing accountability.

Comparative Insights: Countries like Estonia, Singapore, and the UAE have integrated DCMS into their public procurement and infrastructure governance frameworks. For instance, Singapore's Building and Construction Authority uses digital platforms to monitor contract execution and enforce compliance in real time. These systems have led to measurable reductions in project delays and improved stakeholder trust.

Strategic Implementation in Hydropower: For hydropower projects, DCMS can be tailored to:

- Track geological risk clauses and environmental compliance milestones
- Alert authorities to delays in land acquisition or statutory clearances
- Monitor contractor performance against output-based metrics
- Integrate with GIS and BIM platforms for spatial and technical validation

Such integration ensures that governance is not just procedural but also data-driven and adaptive.

Governance Impact: By embedding DCMS into hydropower governance, authorities can:

- Minimize executional ambiguity and contractual disputes;
- Enhance inter-agency coordination and stakeholder transparency;
- Institutionalize proactive risk management and lifecycle-phase accountability.

Ultimately, DCMS serves as a digital backbone for governance reform, enabling infrastructure delivery that is timely, cost-effective, and policy-aligned.

D. Governance Measure: Capacity Building – Training Modules for Contract Managers and Legal Teams

Effective contract governance in hydropower projects hinges not only on robust frameworks and digital systems but also on the human capacity to interpret, enforce, and adapt contractual provisions. Contract managers and legal teams are the frontline custodians of project integrity, risk mitigation, and stakeholder alignment. Yet, in many public-sector and PPP infrastructure projects, these professionals often lack specialized training in hydropower-specific risks, performance-based clauses, and dispute avoidance protocols. Structured capacity-building programs can bridge this critical gap.

Objectives of the Training Modules

- Equip professionals with sector-specific knowledge of hydropower contracting
- Enhance legal literacy in environmental, land acquisition, and regulatory clauses
- Build skills in digital contract management tools and lifecycle-phase tracking
- Foster proactive risk identification and dispute resolution capabilities
- Promote governance-sensitive contract design and stakeholder engagement

Table IX: Core Training Modules

Module Title	Key Focus Areas
Hydropower Contracting Fundamentals	EPC/DBFOT models, geological risk clauses, milestone-based payments

Legal Literacy for Infrastructure Teams	Statutory compliance, arbitration clauses, ESG-linked obligations
Digital Contract Management Tools	Real-time tracking, alert systems, audit trails, role-based access
Risk Allocation and Performance Metrics	Output-based contracting, penalty regimes, incentive structures
Dispute Avoidance and Resolution	Escalation ladders, mediation protocols, early warning systems
Stakeholder-Centric Contracting	Mapping stakeholder roles, grievance redressal, participatory clauses

These modules can be delivered via blended formats e-learning, workshops, simulations, and certification programs.

Institutional Models and Global Benchmarks: Indian Institute of Corporate Affairs (IICA) offers capacity-building programs on procurement and contract management for governance professionals. Korn Ferry and CIPS provide international certification in contract management, emphasizing risk segmentation and governance structures. Asian Development Bank Institute (ADBI) supports policy dialogues and e-learning for legal and procurement teams across Asia.

These models demonstrate the value of structured, cross-disciplinary training in improving contract execution and reducing governance bottlenecks.

Strategic Impact: Investing in capacity building for contract managers and legal teams yields:

- Reduced contractual ambiguity and litigation risk
- Improved inter-agency coordination and compliance enforcement
- Enhanced ability to adapt contracts to dynamic project conditions
- Strengthened governance culture across the infrastructure lifecycle

XI. Conclusion: Toward Governance-Driven Hydropower Delivery

Persistent challenges of delay, cost escalation, and contractual fragmentation in India's hydropower sector are not merely technical or financial, they are fundamentally governance-related. Addressing these requires a paradigm shift from reactive project management to proactive, institutionalized oversight. The proposed governance triad (i) establishing a centralized Hydropower Contracting Authority, (ii) deploying Digital Contract Management Systems (DCMS), and (iii) investing in Capacity Building for contract managers and legal teams offers a synergistic framework to transform the sector's delivery architecture.

A Hydropower Contracting Authority would serve as the institutional anchor, tasked with standardizing contract templates, enforcing risk-sensitive clauses, and ensuring lifecycle-phase accountability across procurement, execution, and closure. The DCMS would operationalize this vision by digitizing oversight, enabling real-time tracking, and embedding automated alerts to pre-empt executional slippage and contractual drift. Simultaneously, capacity-building initiatives would empower the human capital behind these systems, ensuring that contract managers and legal teams possess the sectoral fluency, legal literacy, and digital competence required to uphold governance standards.

Together, these measures transcend administrative reform; they embody a governance ethos rooted in transparency, responsiveness, and stakeholder alignment. Institutionalizing such mechanisms can accelerate hydropower delivery while fostering a resilient infrastructure ecosystem that is environmentally compliant, socially inclusive, and economically efficient.

In an era where infrastructure is both a developmental imperative and a governance challenge, integrated reforms of this nature are not optional, they are essential. The hydropower sector, with its complex terrain, long gestation periods, and multi-stakeholder dynamics, offers a compelling testbed for these innovations. If implemented with rigor and political will, these governance measures can serve as a blueprint for broader infrastructure reform, turning risk into resilience, and contracts into catalysts for sustainable development.

Acknowledgement

I extend my heartfelt gratitude to all those who played a pivotal role in the successful completion of this research. I am profoundly thankful to my academic advisor and faculty mentors for their steadfast guidance, incisive feedback, and unwavering support throughout the research journey. Their intellectual generosity and mentorship were instrumental in shaping the rigor and direction of this work.

I am equally appreciative of the officials and technical experts from NHPC, NEEPCO, SJVN, HPPCL, and other esteemed hydropower institutions whose insights and shared documentation significantly enriched the analytical depth of this study. Their contributions provided critical real-world perspectives that grounded the research in sectoral realities. I also acknowledge the collaborative spirit of fellow researchers and peers, whose thoughtful exchanges and thematic inputs helped refine the conceptual contours of this work. Their engagement was both inspiring and invaluable. I also wish to thank my close colleagues, particularly Mr. Kishan Daga and Mr. Rakesh Kumar Yadav, for their encouragement, meaningful contributions, and shared conviction in the long-term impact of this study on infrastructure governance and policy reform in India.

Finally, I am deeply grateful to my family, Mrs. Jhuma Debnath, Miss Ipsita Debnath, and Miss Enakshi Debnath for their enduring support and belief in the purpose of this research.

Works cited

[1] M. R. Nezami, M. L. C. de Bruijne, M. J. C. M. Hertogh, and H. L. M. Bakker, "Inter-Organizational Collaboration in Interconnected Infrastructure Projects," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, vol. 15, no. 8, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.3390/su15086721.

[2] A. Srivastava and A. Misra, "Hydro-Energy Sector in India: A Review," 2024. [Online]. Available: www.ijfmr.com

[3] P. Rai, S. Prasad, and M. College, "Cost Overruns In Power Projects," 2013. [Online]. Available: www.ijcrt.org

[4] A. Shaktawat and S. Vadhera, "Risk management of hydropower projects for sustainable development: a review," Jan. 01, 2021, *Springer Science and Business Media B.V.* doi: 10.1007/s10668-020-00607-2.

[5] P. E. D. Love, D. D. Ahiaga-Dagbui, S. D. Smith, M. C.-P. Sing, and O. Tokede, "Cost Profiling of Water Infrastructure Projects," *Journal of Infrastructure Systems*, vol. 24, no. 4, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.1061/(asce)is.1943-555x.0000441.

[6] MoP, "STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENERGY," 2019.

[7] A. Kumar and A. Org, "Standing Committee Report Summary Delay in Execution/Completion of Power Projects by Power Sector Companies," 2021.

[8] P. Khup Hangzo, "India's Energy Transition: The Case for India's Energy Transition," 2022.

[9] M. Eybpoosh, I. Dikmen, and M. Talat Birgonul, "Identification of Risk Paths in International Construction Projects Using Structural Equation Modeling," *J Constr Eng Manag*, vol. 137, no. 12, pp. 1164–1175, Dec. 2011, doi: 10.1061/(asce)co.1943-7862.0000382.

[10] MOP, "MOP_Annual_Report_Eng_2024_25," 2025.

[11] S. Sundaram, S. Sharma, R. Mathur, K. Kashyap, and K. Verma, "A Case Study of the Background, Aspects, and Impacts of the Tehri Dam on the Economy, Ecology & Population of India," 2023.

[12] M. S. Hung and J. Wang, "Research on Delay Risks of EPC Hydropower Construction Projects in Vietnam," *Journal of Power and Energy Engineering*, vol. 04, no. 04, pp. 9–16, 2016, doi: 10.4236/jpee.2016.44002.

[13] P. Vincent-Jones, "Contractual Governance: Institutional and Organizational Analysis," 2000.

[14] S. Buechler, D. Sen, N. Khandekar, and C. A. Scott, "Re-linking governance of energy with livelihoods and irrigation in Uttarakhand, India," *Water (Switzerland)*, vol. 8, no. 10, Oct. 2016, doi: 10.3390/w8100437.

[15] N. H. Rijal, K. B. Kumal, and B. Limited, "Integrating Hydropower Sustainability Standard (HSS) and FIDIC Conditions of Contracts to Enhance Climate Resilience and Sustainability in Hydropower Projects." [Online]. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388427100

[16] B. H. Hadikusumo and S. Tobgay, "Construction Claim Types and Causes for a Large-Scale Hydropower Project in," 2015.

[17] S. Tamang, "Common Causes of Construction Claims in Hydropower Projects: Case Studies of Selected Medium Scale Hydropower Projects in Nepal," *Journal of Advanced Research in Construction and Urban Architecture*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 12–36, Jul. 2024, doi: 10.24321/2456.9925.202404.

[18] J. Zeng, M. An, and N. J. Smith, "Application of a fuzzy based decision making methodology to construction project risk assessment," *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 589–600, Oct. 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2007.02.006.

[19] S. H. Zegordi, E. Rezaee Nik, and A. Nazari, "Power plant project risk assessment using a fuzzy-ANP and fuzzy-TOPSIS method," *International Journal of Engineering, Transactions B: Applications*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 107–120, 2012, doi: 10.5829/idosi.ije.2012.25.02b.04.

[20] A. Nepal, V. Khanal, and R. Maelah, "Relative Importance of Risks in Hydropower Projects and Project Finance in Nepal," 2021, [Online]. Available: www.phdcentre.edu.np

[21] B. K. Sovacool, A. Gilbert, and D. Nugent, "Risk, innovation, electricity infrastructure and construction cost overruns: Testing six hypotheses," *Energy*, vol. 74, no. C, pp. 906–917, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.energy.2014.07.070.

[22] B. K. Sovacool, D. Nugent, and A. Gilbert, "Construction cost overruns and electricity infrastructure: An unavoidable risk?," *Electricity Journal*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 112–120, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.tej.2014.03.015.

[23] J. Tariq and S. Shujaa Safdar Gardezi, "Study the delays and conflicts for construction projects and their mutual relationship: A review," Feb. 01, 2023, *Ain Shams University*. doi: 10.1016/j.asej.2022.101815.

[24] N. Al-Hazim, Z. A. Salem, and H. Ahmad, "Delay and Cost Overrun in Infrastructure Projects in Jordan," in *Procedia Engineering*, Elsevier Ltd, 2017, pp. 18–24. doi: 10.1016/j.proeng.2017.03.105.

[25] A. M. Ansari, D. R. Syed, and K. Ahmad, "STUDY ON THE CAUSES OF DELAY IN A CONSTRUCTION PROJECT AND RECOMMENDATION," 2019. [Online]. Available: www.ijariie.com

[26] A. A. Fashina, M. A. Omar, A. A. Sheikh, and F. F. Fakunle, "Exploring the significant factors that influence delays in construction projects in Hargeisa," *Heliyon*, vol. 7, no. 4, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06826.

[27] T. Gebrehiwet and H. Luo, "Analysis of Delay Impact on Construction Project Based on RII and Correlation Coefficient: Empirical Study," in *Procedia Engineering*, Elsevier Ltd, 2017, pp. 366–374. doi: 10.1016/j.proeng.2017.07.212.

[28] A. Ansar, B. Flyvbjerg, A. Budzier, and D. Lunn, "Should we build more large dams? The actual costs of hydropower

megaproject development," *Energy Policy*, vol. 69, pp. 43–56, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2013.10.069.

[29] M. Sambasivan, M. Sambasivan, Y. W. Soon, and Y. W. Soon, "Causes and effects of delays in Malaysian construction industry," *International Journal of Project Management*, 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2006.11.007.

[30] A. M. Abdelalim, M. Salem, M. Salem, M. Al-Adwani, and M. Tantawy, "An Analysis of Factors Contributing to Cost Overruns in the Global Construction Industry," *Buildings*, vol. 15, no. 1, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.3390/buildings15010018.

[31] S. Assaf, S. Assaf, S. Al-Hejji, and S. Al-Hejji, "Causes of delay in large construction projects," *International Journal of Project Management*, 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2005.11.010.

[32] L. Le-Hoai, Y. D. Lee, and J. Y. Lee, "Delay and cost overruns in Vietnam large construction projects: A comparison with other selected countries," *KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 367–377, Nov. 2008, doi: 10.1007/s12205-008-0367-7.

[33] P. Anand and P. Anand, "Navigating Legal Complexities in Public Infrastructure Projects: The Intersection of Contract Law and Construction Industry Practices," *Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction*, vol. 17, no. 3, Aug. 2025, doi: 10.1061/jladah.ladr-1284.

[34] N. H. Rijal, K. B. Kumal, and B. Limited, "Integrating Hydropower Sustainability Standard (HSS) and FIDIC Conditions of Contracts to Enhance Climate Resilience and Sustainability in Hydropower Projects." [Online]. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388427100

[35] H. Doloi, A. Sawhney, K. C. Iyer, and S. Rentala, "Analysing factors affecting delays in Indian construction projects," *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 479–489, May 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2011.10.004.

[36] A. M. Alajmi, A. M. Alajmi, Z. A. Memon, and Z. A. Memon, "A Review on Significant Factors Causing Delays in Saudi Arabia Construction Projects," *Smart cities*, 2022, doi: 10.3390/smartcities5040075.

[37] Y. A. Olawale and M. Sun, "Cost and time control of construction projects: Inhibiting factors and mitigating measures in practice," *Construction Management and Economics*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 509–526, May 2010, doi: 10.1080/01446191003674519.

[38] A. Shaktawat and S. Vadhera, "Risk management of hydropower projects for sustainable development: a review," Jan. 01, 2021, *Springer Science and Business Media B.V.* doi: 10.1007/s10668-020-00607-2.

[39] CAG, "Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India on Public Sector Undertakings," 2019.

[40] S. P. Wanjari and G. Dobariya, "Identifying factors causing cost overrun of the construction projects in India," *Sadhana - Academy Proceedings in Engineering Sciences*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 679–693, Jun. 2016, doi: 10.1007/s12046-016-0498-3.

[41] S. A. Assaf and S. Al-Hejji, "Causes of delay in large construction projects," *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 349–357, May 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2005.11.010.

[42] R. Iyer and A. Schoar, "Contracting when enforcement is weak: Evidence from an audit study," *Rev Financ*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 1513–1536, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.1093/rof/rfae019.

[43] R. Mohan, G. Ray, M. & Jeeri, and S. Reddy, "Liquidated Damages in India: Concepts, Enforceability, and Drafting Considerations."

[44] S. Marasamy, "AlternAtive Dispute resolution (ADr) MechAnisMs For hyDropower projects surinDer pAl BAnsAl," 2022.

[45] V. K. Singh, "ARBITRATION IN INDIA: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AND KEY CHALLENGES," 2023. [Online]. Available: www.ijcrt.orgwww.ijcrt.org

[46] Jayanta Bhattacharya, "Power Project Costs and Time Overruns have been Increasing Steadily and Alarmingly," 2023. [Online]. Available: https://informaticsjournals.com/index.php/ijprvd

[47] C. Merguerian, J. M. Merguerian, and M. Sci, "Geological Solutions: Pre-Bid Risk Assessment and As-Built Claims in the NY Metropolitan Region."

