
Implementing Claim Management To Prevent Conflict In Construction Projects: A Literature Review

M. Alit Suryawan

Construction Project Management, Civil Engineering Department, Politeknik Negeri Ambon

*Corresponding Author

Email: alit.suryawan@polnam.ac.id

Abstract

Construction claims are a recurring source of conflict during project delivery and, when poorly managed, can escalate into formal disputes that adversely affect all parties involved. This study examines the concept and mechanisms of claim management, identifies the principal causes of construction claims, and evaluates the effectiveness of claim management as a means of preventing project conflict. A qualitative library-research approach was adopted by reviewing and synthesizing literature on construction claims and conflict. The review indicates that effective claim management depends on the integration of clear contract documentation, adequate institutional and human-resource capacity, accessible multi-tier dispute-resolution mechanisms, and stronger legal awareness among contracting parties. The causes of claims are multidimensional and span technical, managerial, administrative, and contractual-legal issues. The study recommends more adaptive contract drafting and stronger administrative governance of claims to reduce the likelihood that construction-project conflicts in Indonesia will escalate into formal disputes.

Keywords: *Project Conflict; Construction; Claim Management.*

INTRODUCTION

The construction industry is a strategic sector that supports national economic growth through its substantial contribution to Gross Domestic Product and its role in delivering public infrastructure (Maryan et al., 2026). At the same time, construction projects are inherently complex, involve numerous stakeholders with different interests, and are exposed to uncertainty in site conditions. These characteristics make the sector particularly vulnerable to disagreements between project owners and contractors. The Arcadis Global Construction Disputes Report shows that the average value of construction disputes worldwide has continued to rise, with a major underlying cause being the parties' failure to understand their contractual rights and obligations (Arcadis, 2022). This situation suggests that claims are not merely an administrative matter; they can become a central source of conflict that disrupts the achievement of project targets for time, quality, and cost.

A construction claim can generally be understood as a formal request made by one party to a contract, whether the contractor or the project owner, for additional time, cost, or other compensation arising from circumstances that differ from the original agreement (Wardhani, 2025). Previous studies show that claims may be triggered by many factors, including changes in the scope of work, delays in document submission, site conditions that differ from those anticipated during planning, and incomplete or ambiguous contract documents (Abadi et al., 2023). Unclear interpretations of contractual clauses further increase the potential for disputes. This has been observed in engineering, procurement, and construction (EPC) projects in Indonesia, where differing interpretations of contract provisions have been identified as a dominant cause of disputes (Ambadar & Amin, 2021). When claims are not managed systematically from an early stage, the likelihood of conflict increases and may lead to dispute-resolution processes that consume time and money while damaging working relationships among the parties (Setiawan, 2024).

From a theoretical perspective, claim management is a structured process that includes claim identification, documentation, evaluation, negotiation, and proportionate settlement so that a claim does not develop into a formal dispute. When introduced properly from the

contract-planning stage, claim management can serve as an effective preventive instrument for limiting the escalation of project conflict (Sugandi & Saputro, 2025). This preventive role is also supported by developments in digital contract management. For example, building information modelling (BIM) can be integrated with internationally recognized standard contract options to identify potential disputes earlier and improve transparency in claim documentation between the parties (Abougamil et al., 2024). Claim management should therefore be viewed not only as a reactive mechanism used after disagreement occurs, but also as an anticipatory strategy for preventing conflict at an early stage.

Although previous studies have examined the causes of claims and methods of resolving construction disputes, research that specifically synthesizes claim management as a strategy for preventing construction-project conflict through a comprehensive literature review remains relatively limited. Earlier studies have generally concentrated either on identifying the causes of claims or on evaluating dispute-resolution methods after conflict has occurred, without systematically linking those findings to claim management as a proactive preventive framework (Maryan et al., 2026). This research gap provides the basis for a more in-depth review that summarizes, compares, and synthesizes empirical and conceptual findings on the application of claim management to construction-conflict prevention. The intended contribution is an integrated perspective that brings together managerial, contractual, and legal dimensions of construction-claim management in Indonesia.

Based on this background, the study addresses three main questions. First, how are the concept and mechanisms of claim management applied in construction-project practice according to the existing literature? Second, what are the main factors that cause construction claims and create the potential for conflict or disputes between project parties? Third, how effective is claim management in preventing the escalation of conflict in construction projects, based on the synthesis of previous studies? Consistent with these questions, the study has three objectives: to describe the concept and stages of claim management in construction projects through a systematic review of the literature; to identify and classify the causes of construction claims that contribute to project-conflict risk; and to assess the effectiveness of claim management as a conflict-prevention strategy using empirical evidence reported in recent scientific literature.

This study is expected to provide both theoretical and practical value. Theoretically, it contributes to the construction-management literature by clarifying the relationship between claim management and strategies for preventing project conflict. Practically, the findings may serve as a reference for contractors, consultants, and project owners when designing more preventive claim-management systems. A well-structured system can help reduce dispute risk, limit financial losses, and preserve cooperative relationships among project participants throughout future construction work.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study adopts a qualitative approach using library research, a research procedure based on searching, reviewing, and synthesizing written sources without collecting primary data directly in the field (Hamzah, 2022). This approach was selected because the purpose of the study is conceptual: to examine, compare, and summarize previous scholarly findings on the use of claim management as an instrument for preventing conflict in construction projects. Accordingly, the primary objects of analysis are scholarly texts and discourse rather than empirical conditions observed directly on project sites. The study relies on secondary data drawn from national and international journal articles, conference proceedings, industry research reports, and methodological books relevant to claim management and construction-

project conflict. Priority was given to publications from the most recent five-year period to maintain the currency of the review.

Data collection was carried out in four stages: defining the topic and search keywords, locating sources through reputable academic databases, screening sources for relevance and credibility, and organizing the selected literature into thematic categories aligned with the focus of the study (Boaheng, 2024). The data were examined using content analysis, which involves identifying, grouping, and interpreting conceptual patterns that recur across the selected literature and then synthesizing them into a coherent and systematic discussion (Hamzah, 2022). The analysis consisted of three interrelated stages: data reduction to retain information most relevant to the research questions, data presentation through thematic categories concerning claim-management concepts and sources of project conflict, and the formulation of interpretive and reflective conclusions. To strengthen the trustworthiness of the findings, source triangulation was applied by comparing evidence across the literature, thereby providing an adequate basis for answering the study objectives comprehensively.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Concept and Mechanisms of Claim Management in Construction Projects

A construction project is essentially a unique undertaking carried out once within a specified period agreed upon in the contract. Because a project brings together many parties with different interests, a legally binding set of rules is needed to reduce the likelihood of conflict among them; these rules are embodied in the contract documents (Dinariana et al., 2025). In Indonesia, the preparation of construction contracts is governed, among other provisions, by Presidential Regulation No. 12 of 2021, which amended Presidential Regulation No. 16 of 2018 on Government Procurement of Goods/Services (Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia, 2021). This regulation provides a legal framework for selecting contract types, including lump-sum, unit-price, combined lump-sum and unit-price, turnkey, and cost-plus-fee contracts (Dinariana et al., 2025).

Selecting an appropriate contract type and drafting clear contractual clauses provide the initial foundation for effective claim management because many claims arise from ambiguity or incompleteness in the contract documents themselves. Conceptually, claim management is inseparable from broader contract management, which includes cost control, quality control, and risk control throughout the project life cycle (Dinariana et al., 2025). These control functions are closely connected. A weakness in one area, such as inadequate risk control, can directly increase the likelihood that one party will submit a claim. Sound contract management is therefore a prerequisite for claim management to function effectively.

The mechanisms of claim management can be examined more closely through a study of contractor claim-management strategies on the Peusangan Hydroelectric Power Plant project, which applied the FIDIC Red Book 1999. The study highlighted three important aspects: senior-management understanding of construction claims, administrative errors during claim submission, and strategies for improving claim effectiveness (Febriko et al., 2026). One notable finding was that claims were still frequently rejected because notices were submitted late or supporting documentation was incomplete, even when procedural understanding of the claim mechanism itself was considered adequate (Febriko et al., 2026). This finding shows that successful claim management depends not only on conceptual knowledge but also on administrative discipline in project implementation.

To address these shortcomings, an effective claim-management mechanism can include a dedicated claims team, personnel with appropriate competence in contracts and claims, and continuous human-resource development through structured training (Febriko et

al., 2026). This arrangement reflects the principle that claim management should be proactive rather than merely reactive after a dispute has already emerged. The proactive approach is also reflected in a range of anticipatory measures, such as preparing documents and developing a clear understanding of the contract from the outset, communicating contractual rights in a concise manner, establishing sound planning and scheduling, anticipating changes before they create disruption, and managing change orders in a disciplined way (Muhlis & Valdiansyah, 2023).

From a legal perspective, claim management must also be considered within the framework that governs the contractual relationship between service users and service providers. A construction contract is a legal instrument that guides the parties in carrying out the rights and obligations they have agreed upon, including the allocation of risk and the mechanisms available for dispute resolution (Hasbi, 2026). In Indonesia, construction contracting is grounded in Article 1601b of the Indonesian Civil Code concerning contracts for work, as well as Law No. 2 of 2017 on Construction Services (Hasbi, 2026). Contracts involving government procurement of goods and services must also comply with Presidential Regulation No. 16 of 2018, as amended by Presidential Regulation No. 12 of 2021 (Hasbi, 2026).

This legal framework provides the normative basis for ensuring that claim-management procedures operate within legally recognized boundaries. The application of international standard forms such as FIDIC (Federation Internationale Des Ingenieurs-Conseils) within the Indonesian legal system also creates its own set of issues. A normative study of FIDIC-based contracts used in Indonesian toll-road projects found that, although FIDIC reflects a common-law tradition emphasizing party autonomy, detailed risk allocation, and multi-tier dispute resolution, Indonesian law continues to apply mandatory norms that limit freedom of contract in the interests of public order and legal certainty (Taqwim et al., 2026). These normative tensions arise particularly in clauses dealing with risk allocation, variations, claim administration, and the finality of dispute-board decisions and arbitral awards (Taqwim et al., 2026).

These tensions do not make FIDIC irrelevant in Indonesia. Through adaptive clause drafting and systematic interpretation, FIDIC principles can still be integrated into the Indonesian civil-law framework (Taqwim et al., 2026). For major projects in Indonesia, an appropriate claim-management mechanism can therefore be understood as a harmonization of international contract standards and the applicable national legal framework. Contract type is another important variable because it shapes the way claims are managed. A lump-sum contract, for example, tends to place the risk of changes in work quantities on the contractor, so claims are more likely to relate to site conditions that differ from the original assumptions. A unit-price contract, by contrast, allows payment to be adjusted to actual quantities and may therefore generate claims that are more closely associated with delays in work verification and certification (Dinariana et al., 2025).

Differences in risk characteristics across contract types require claim-management mechanisms tailored to the specific contract rather than a uniform approach for all projects. Early notification, commonly required under FIDIC provisions, is particularly important in the initial stage of claim management because late notice has been identified as one of the main reasons contractor claims are rejected on large-scale projects (Febriko et al., 2026). A comprehensive claim-management mechanism should therefore integrate three elements: alignment between the selected contract type and the project's risk profile, timely compliance with notice and documentation procedures, and harmonization of international contractual provisions with applicable domestic regulations. Together, these elements allow claims to be submitted, assessed, and resolved in a more orderly and measurable manner (Taqwim et al., 2026).

Factors Causing Construction Claims with the Potential to Trigger Conflict

The literature shows that the causes of construction claims are multidimensional. They include technical, administrative, and contractual factors, as well as issues originating from the project owner. One comprehensive empirical study examined government-building projects in Jambi City using a combination of primary data from questionnaires completed by 40 medium-qualified contractors and secondary data from the Jambi Province Construction Company Directory (Maryan et al., 2026). The study identified six main factors that could lead to conflict and subsequent claims, ranked according to mean scores derived from Likert-scale analysis (Maryan et al., 2026). To provide a more systematic overview, Table 1 synthesizes the literature by grouping the causes of construction claims into four broad categories and identifying the relevant sources.

Table 1. Synthesis of Construction-Claim Causes Identified in the Literature

Factor Category	Form/Example of Claim Cause	Source
Technical and Planning Factors	Design and specification changes, unavailable material standards, variations/additional and omitted work	(Yeremy, 2023); (Muhlis & Valdiansyah, 2023)
Project Owner Management Factors	Unilateral schedule changes, delays in document approval, delays attributable to the service user	(Yeremy, 2023)
Administrative Factors	Late claim notification, incomplete claim documentation	(Febriko et al., 2026)
Contractual-Legal Factors	Breach of contract, unlawful acts, delayed payment, allocation of arbitration costs	(Yeremy, 2023); (Hinelo et al., 2025)

Source: compiled from the reviewed literature (2023-2026)

Table 1 shows that the causes of construction claims are generally multidimensional rather than isolated. Technical, managerial, administrative, and contractual-legal factors often interact and may arise simultaneously within the same project. Managing such claims therefore requires a comprehensive, cross-functional approach rather than a response focused on only one category of cause.

These findings are consistent with a comparative study of construction-claim causes in three developing countries: Indonesia, the United Arab Emirates, and India. The study identified five recurring triggers: delays attributable to the project owner, variations or additional and omitted work, delayed payments, allocation of arbitration costs, and delays caused by circumstances beyond the control of the parties (Yeremy, 2023). The similarity between the Jambi findings and the cross-country evidence suggests that owner-caused delays and variations are common claim drivers that are not confined to a particular geographic setting or level of economic development (Yeremy, 2023).

As a preventive measure, the comparative study recommends that contracting parties refer to relevant FIDIC clauses, particularly in construction contracts used in developing countries (Yeremy, 2023). Beyond technical and schedule-related matters, administrative weaknesses also play an important role in claim rejection and can ultimately prolong conflict. The study of claim-management strategies on the Peusangan Hydroelectric Power Plant project found that late notification and incomplete supporting documents were significant reasons contractor claims were rejected, even when the claims had a strong substantive basis (Febriko et al., 2026). This demonstrates that the causes of claim-related conflict do not necessarily originate in technical failures on site; they may also arise from weaknesses in the administrative governance of the claim process itself.

From the perspective of claim type and justification, another study grouped claims into several categories: claims for losses arising from owner-directed modifications, claims for additional components of the contract value, claims resulting from changes in activities, and

claims arising from project suspension (Muhlis & Valdiansyah, 2023). This classification indicates that the underlying causes of claims often stem from changes that fall outside the original contractual plan, whether technical or managerial. Such conditions require both flexibility and clarity in drafting variation clauses from the beginning of the contract. The causes of claims can also be examined from a legal perspective through court decisions that illustrate actual forms of contractual breach.

A review of two court decisions, Decision No. 433/Pdt.G/2021/PN Jkt.Pst and Decision No. 46/Pdt.G/2018/PN Bgr, found that construction-contract conflicts may arise from breach of contract when a debtor fails to perform an agreed obligation, or from unlawful acts that cause loss to another party (Hinelo et al., 2025). In the first case, breach of contract resulted in a claim for damages. In the second, a violation of the original agreement delayed completion of the work and led to the service provider being blacklisted and the contract being unilaterally terminated by the service user (Hinelo et al., 2025). The study also emphasizes that project delay is not always solely attributable to the service provider; it may result from changes introduced by the service user without a corresponding formal extension of time (Hinelo et al., 2025).

These findings underscore the need for careful contextual analysis when determining responsibility for project delay rather than relying only on administrative judgments. Overall, the literature suggests that the causes of construction claims can be grouped into four broad categories: technical and planning factors, such as design changes, specifications, and material availability; owner-management factors, such as schedule changes and delayed document approvals; administrative factors, such as late notices and incomplete claim documentation; and contractual-legal factors, such as breach of contract and differing interpretations of contractual clauses. These categories are interconnected and frequently occur together within a single project, requiring a comprehensive rather than fragmented approach to claim management.

The causes of claims can also be distinguished according to the party from which they primarily originate. Owner-related claims commonly concern unilateral modifications to the work, additions to the contract value, changes introduced during execution, or suspension of the project for a specified period (Muhlis & Valdiansyah, 2023). Contractor-related claims, in contrast, more often involve requests for extensions of time or compensation for costs arising from circumstances beyond the contractor's control, including delayed payment or disproportionate allocation of arbitration costs (Jeremy, 2023). Distinguishing the source of a claim is important because the preventive strategy required for an owner-driven change will differ from the response needed when the issue is associated with limitations in the contractor's own capacity.

The legal dimension further shows that some claim causes are rooted in breach of contract, namely the failure of one party to perform the obligations agreed in the contract, as reflected in court decisions concerning construction disputes (Hinelo et al., 2025). A more precise understanding of the source and underlying cause of a claim enables the parties to design mitigation measures that are better targeted from the project-planning stage onward.

Effectiveness of Claim Management in Preventing the Escalation of Construction-Project Conflict

The effectiveness of claim management as a conflict-prevention instrument can be considered from two main dimensions: a preventive dimension before a claim is formally submitted and a curative dimension concerned with resolving claims that have already arisen. In the preventive dimension, the Jambi City study found that respondents regarded negotiation as the most effective dispute-resolution option, followed by arbitration and mediation, while litigation was the least preferred alternative (Maryan et al., 2026). The preference for negotiation suggests that construction practitioners tend to favor solutions that

preserve working relationships and are more efficient in terms of time and cost than formal court proceedings, which generally require a longer process (Maryan et al., 2026).

This finding has an important implication for claim management: negotiation should be positioned as the first line of resolution before the parties move to more formal mechanisms such as arbitration or litigation. Effectiveness also depends heavily on the contractor organization's readiness to manage claims professionally. In the Peusangan Hydroelectric Power Plant study, measures implemented to improve claim effectiveness included establishing a dedicated claims team, assigning competent personnel, and continuously developing human resources (Febriko et al., 2026). The study also recommends strengthening administrative capacity and providing ongoing training to support compliance with FIDIC requirements, thereby reducing the number of claims rejected because of administrative omissions (Febriko et al., 2026).

These recommendations show that effective claim management is not solely a contractual-technical matter; it also depends on the institutional and human-resource capacity of the service-provider organization. In the curative dimension, effectiveness is reflected in the parties' ability to select a dispute-resolution mechanism suited to the nature of the problem. Construction-contract disputes may be addressed through litigation or non-litigation procedures in accordance with the parties' contractual agreement, while legal-risk mitigation begins with drafting contracts that are clear, detailed, and balanced at the project-planning stage (Hasbi, 2026). Applying the prudence principle from the planning stage is considered capable of reducing the likelihood of disputes, construction failure, and subsequent building failure (Hasbi, 2026).

A comprehensively drafted construction contract, supported by an effective legal-risk mitigation strategy, can therefore reduce the potential for disputes and provide greater legal certainty for the parties involved in project delivery (Hasbi, 2026). The effectiveness of claim management should also be assessed in relation to the harmonization of international contract standards with the national legal framework, particularly on large strategic projects such as toll-road infrastructure. A normative study shows that appropriate alignment between the FIDIC contract structure and Indonesia's civil-law system can preserve the legal validity of the contract while supporting efficiency, certainty, and accountability in implementation (Taqwim et al., 2026). This finding highlights the importance of contract-drafting quality from the outset, because adaptively written clauses can facilitate the identification, submission, assessment, and proportionate resolution of claims without requiring escalation to a formal dispute (Taqwim et al., 2026).

The effectiveness of conflict prevention also depends on correctly identifying the type of claim and taking anticipatory action at an early stage. Measures such as preparing contract documents carefully, developing a thorough understanding of contractual rights, establishing realistic planning and scheduling, anticipating changes in the scope of work, and administering change orders in an orderly manner have been shown to reduce the likelihood that claims will escalate into formal disputes (Muhlis & Valdiansyah, 2023). The availability of alternative resolution routes, including negotiation, mediation, arbitration, and litigation, also gives the parties flexibility to choose a mechanism that matches the complexity of the issue and the value of the losses associated with the claim (Muhlis & Valdiansyah, 2023).

Even so, the effectiveness of claim management cannot be assured without adequate legal awareness among all parties involved. Studies of legal conflict in construction projects show that disputes may still arise even where claim-management mechanisms are available if one party breaches the contract or commits an unlawful act that causes actual loss to another party (Hinelo et al., 2025). For this reason, the literature emphasizes the importance of sound contractual understanding, stronger construction regulation, and genuinely effective dispute-resolution mechanisms to reduce the recurrence of similar conflicts (Hinelo

et al., 2025). Effective claim management must therefore be accompanied by a stronger culture of contractual compliance among construction-industry participants, so that conflict-prevention mechanisms do not become merely administrative formalities.

Claim-management effectiveness can also be strengthened through a multi-tier dispute-resolution mechanism, as commonly adopted in FIDIC arrangements. Under such an approach, negotiation is used first, followed by mediation when negotiation does not resolve the issue, then arbitration, with litigation treated as the final option (Taqwim et al., 2026). This tiered structure gives the parties an opportunity to settle disagreements at the most time- and cost-efficient stage before entering more complex formal proceedings. Conflict prevention also depends on the consistent application of the prudence principle from contract drafting through project implementation, including a clear allocation of risk between service users and service providers in accordance with applicable civil-law provisions (Hasbi, 2026).

By integrating tiered dispute-resolution procedures, administrative compliance in claim submission, and clear contractual risk allocation, claim management can operate as an early preventive instrument rather than simply as a tool for resolving conflict after it has occurred. The extent to which a construction project can avoid harmful escalation ultimately depends on applying these measures comprehensively and consistently (Febriko et al., 2026). Across the eight sources synthesized in this review, four elements emerge as central to effective claim management for conflict prevention: clear and harmonized contract documents from the planning stage; adequate institutional and human-resource capacity for managing claims; the availability and appropriate use of dispute-resolution mechanisms suited to the circumstances; and stronger legal awareness among the parties in fulfilling their contractual rights and obligations. When these four elements are implemented together and consistently, the likelihood that claims will develop into open conflict or formal disputes can be substantially reduced, supporting the achievement of project objectives for time, cost, and quality.

CONCLUSION

Based on the literature reviewed, claim management can be regarded as a strategic instrument that is inseparable from contract management as a whole. Its effectiveness depends on clear contract documents, administrative compliance in notice and documentation procedures, and harmonization between international contract standards and national regulations. The causes of construction claims are multidimensional, covering technical factors, owner-management issues, administrative weaknesses, and contractual-legal matters that often arise simultaneously within a project. Effective claim management, supported by a dedicated team, stronger administrative capacity, and the use of multi-tier dispute-resolution mechanisms, can reduce the escalation of conflict into formal disputes.

The findings also imply that successful prevention of construction-project conflict cannot depend on one party alone. It requires a shared commitment by service users and service providers to maintain contractual compliance from planning through project implementation. Construction-industry participants should therefore draft more adaptive contract clauses, maintain orderly claim-documentation systems, and prioritize negotiation as the first line of dispute resolution. Future research should complement this conceptual review with empirical case studies to test and validate the findings identified in the literature.

REFERENCES

- Abadi, I., Utomo, J., & Sukamta, S. (2023). Evaluasi Klaim Konstruksi dalam Persepektif Kontraktor Utama dan Subkontraktor. *Wahana Teknik Sipil: Jurnal Pengembangan Teknik Sipil*, 28(2), 157–173.
- Abougamil, R. A., Thorpe, D., & Heravi, A. (2024). A BIM Package with a NEC4 Contract Option to Mitigate Construction Disputes in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Buildings*, 14(7), 2009.
- Ambadar, H. U., & Amin, S. H. M. (2021). Faktor-Faktor Penyebab Terjadinya Sengketa Konstruksi Pada Proyek Epc Brownfield. *Jurnal Konstruksia*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.24853/jk.13.1.17-28>
- Arcadis, N. V. (2022). Successfully navigating through turbulent times. *Amsterdam, Netherlands: Arcadis*. <https://www.arcadis.com/en/insights/perspectives/global/global-construction-disputes-report>
- Boaheng, I. (2024). An essential guide to research methodologies in theology and religious studies. *Noyam, Accra*. <https://doi.org/10.38159/npub.eb2024601>
- Dinariana, D., Abduraahim, M. F., Waiti, U., Sumaryanto, S., Noverli, A., & Telaumbanua, I. wardhany S. A. S. P. (2025). Kontrak Dan Manajemen Kontrak Serta Implementasinya Dalam Proyek Konstruksi Di Indonesia. *IKRA-ITH Teknologi Jurnal Sains Dan Teknologi*, 9(1), 306–312. <https://journals.upi-yai.ac.id/index.php/ikraith-teknologi/article/view/4525>
- Febriko, J., Jumas, D., Peli, M., & Ariani, V. (2026). Strategi Manajemen Klaim Kontraktor di Proyek PLTA Peusangan Kabupaten Aceh Tengah berdasarkan FIDIC Red Book 1999. *Jurnal Aplikasi Teknik Sipil*, 24(1), 21–26.
- Hamzah, A. (2022). Metode Penelitian Kepustakaan (Library Research) Kaajian Filosofis, Teoritis, Aplikasi Proses Dan Hasil. *Depok: PT Rajagrafindo Persada*. <https://bintangpusnas.perpusnas.go.id/konten/BK48414/metode-penelitian-kepustakaan-library-research-kajian-filosofis-teoretis-aplikasi-proses-dan-hasil-penelitian-edisi-revisi>
- Hasbi, M. (2026). Penyelesaian Sengketa Kontrak Konstruksi Sebagai Upaya Mitigasi Risiko Hukum. *ISIHUMOR: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 4(3), 416–426.
- Hinelo, A. P., Thalib, M. C., & Mandjo, J. T. (2025). Konflik Hukum Dalam Proyek Konstruksi Antara Wanprestasi Dan Perbuatan Melawan Hukum. *YUDHISTIRA : Jurnal Yurisprudensi, Hukum Dan Peradilan*, 3(3), 17–26. <https://doi.org/10.59966/yudhistira.v3i3.2006>
- Maryan, D., Handayani, E., & Zulfiati, R. (2026). Analisis Faktor Penyebab Klaim Konstruksi dan Penyelesaian Sengketa pada Proyek Bangunan Gedung Pemerintah Kota Jambi. *Jurnal Civronlit Unbari*, 11(1), 37–49. <http://jt.unbari.ac.id/index.php/CIVRONLIT/article/viewFile/186/131>
- Muhlis, M., & Valdiansyah, M. (2023). Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Klaim Dan Strategi Penyelesaiannya Dalam Industri Konstruksi (Analysis of Factors Affecting Claims and Settlement Strategies In The Construction Industry. *Jurnal Teknik Sipil Universitas Tulungagung*, 3(1), 10–16. <http://journal.unita.ac.id/index.php/daktilitas/>
- Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia. (2021). *Peraturan Presiden (PERPRES) Nomor 12 Tahun 2021 Perubahan atas Peraturan Presiden Nomor 16 Tahun 2018 tentang Pengadaan Barang/Jasa Pemerintah*. <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/161828/perpres-no-12-tahun-2021>
- Setiawan, B. (2024). Perlindungan hukum para pihak dalam perjanjian jasa konstruksi.

- Jurnal Cinta Nusantara (JCN)*, 2(02).
- Sugandi, H., & Saputro, A. (2025). Efektivitas Penyelesaian Sengketa Kontrak Konstruksi di Indonesia dalam Analisis Hukum Implementasi dan Tantangan Proyek Infrastruktur. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.59141/japendi.v6i3.7349>
- Taqwim, K. I., Samián, S., & Wibowo, D. E. (2026). Penerapan Kontrak Konstruksi Berbasis FIDIC dalam Proyek Jalan Tol Indonesia: Kajian Normatif terhadap Undang-Undang Jasa Konstruksi. *Journal of Legal, Political, and Humanistic Inquiry*, 1(3), 364–381. <https://doi.org/10.65310/vfhfek84>
- Wardhani, F. H. (2025). Klaim Konstruksi: Sengketa dan Solusi Damai dalam Proyek. *Kementerian Pekerjaan Umum*. <https://klop.pu.go.id/knowledge/Klaim-Konstruksi-pada-Proyek>
- Jeremy, J. (2023). Kajian Penyebab Klaim Konstruksi di Negara Berkembang – Studi Kasus: Indonesia, Uni Emirate Arab, & India. *Journal of Sustainable Construction*, 2(2), 48–57. <https://doi.org/10.26593/josc.v2i2.6660>