

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Evaluating the Role of Project Constraints in Shaping Sustainable Construction Practices in South Africa: Insights from ECSA

[Josias Kgwadi Mamabolo](#)^{*} and Ada Dienga

Posted Date: 30 January 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202601.2375.v1

Keywords: sustainable construction; project constraints; ECSA; engineering regulation; South Africa; infrastructure development; project management; environmental sustainability



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](#), which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

Evaluating the Role of Project Constraints in Shaping Sustainable Construction Practices in South Africa: Insights from ECSA

Josias Kgwadi Mamabolo * and Ada Dienga

Independent Researcher, South Africa

* Correspondence: josias@ecsa.co.za

Abstract

Sustainable construction has become a strategic imperative within South Africa's built environment as the country confronts climate change, infrastructure deterioration, and increasing pressure on natural resources. Despite strong policy commitments and professional regulatory frameworks promoting sustainability, implementation across construction projects remains uneven. This article evaluates how project constraints shape the adoption of sustainable construction practices in South Africa, drawing insights from the regulatory and professional framework of the Engineering Council of South Africa (ECSA). Using a qualitative, document-based approach, the study analyses ECSA competency standards, accreditation criteria, professional conduct guidelines, and national sustainability policies, alongside existing construction industry literature. The findings reveal that financial limitations, skills shortages, regulatory fragmentation, time pressures, and weak project governance significantly undermine sustainability integration at project level. While ECSA has embedded sustainability within professional standards and education requirements, project realities often override regulatory intentions. The article proposes a multi-level framework to strengthen sustainability uptake through improved regulatory alignment, enhanced engineering capacity development, stronger project governance mechanisms, and targeted incentives for sustainable alternatives. The study contributes to the growing discourse on sustainable construction governance by highlighting the critical role of project constraints in mediating the relationship between professional regulation and practical implementation in the South African context.

Keywords: sustainable construction; project constraints; ECSA; engineering regulation; South Africa; infrastructure development; project management; environmental sustainability

1. Introduction

The construction sector plays a central role in South Africa's socio-economic development, serving as a key driver of infrastructure delivery, employment creation, and economic growth. At the same time, construction activities are among the largest contributors to environmental degradation through high energy consumption, carbon emissions, material extraction, and waste generation (Kibert, 2016; UNEP, 2020). As South Africa faces increasing climate risks, water scarcity, and aging infrastructure, sustainable construction has become a critical policy and professional priority.

National policy frameworks such as the *National Development Plan 2030*, the *National Climate Change Response Policy*, and sector-specific green building initiatives emphasise sustainability as a foundational principle for long-term development (NPC, 2012; DEA, 2011). These frameworks promote energy efficiency, resource optimisation, and environmental responsibility across infrastructure and building projects. However, despite this strong policy orientation, sustainability implementation across construction projects remains inconsistent and uneven (Windapo & Cattell, 2013; Aigbavboa & Thwala, 2014).

A growing body of literature suggests that the gap between sustainability policy aspirations and construction practice is shaped less by technical feasibility and more by project-level constraints, including cost pressures, time limitations, skills shortages, and governance weaknesses (Hwang & Ng, 2013; Darko & Chan, 2017). These constraints influence decision-making throughout the project lifecycle, often marginalising sustainability considerations in favour of immediate project delivery imperatives.

Within this context, the Engineering Council of South Africa (ECSA) occupies a pivotal governance position. As the statutory regulator of the engineering profession, ECSA sets competency standards, accredits engineering programmes, registers professionals, and enforces ethical conduct in the public interest. In recent years, ECSA has increasingly embedded sustainability principles within its regulatory instruments, positioning engineers as custodians of environmentally responsible development (ECSA, 2021). Nevertheless, the extent to which these regulatory mechanisms translate into sustainable construction outcomes under real-world project constraints remains insufficiently examined.

This article therefore investigates how project constraints shape sustainable construction practices in South Africa, using ECSA's regulatory framework as an analytical lens. By examining the interaction between professional regulation, project governance, and implementation realities, the study seeks to contribute to a deeper understanding of sustainability integration in the South African construction sector.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Sustainable Construction and Engineering Practice

Sustainable construction is commonly defined as an approach to planning, designing, constructing, operating, and decommissioning built assets in ways that minimise environmental impact while supporting social well-being and economic viability across the asset lifecycle (Kibert, 2016). Core principles include energy efficiency, responsible material selection, waste minimisation, water conservation, lifecycle cost optimisation, and stakeholder inclusivity (ISO, 2015; UNEP, 2020).

In the engineering domain, sustainability has increasingly been framed as a professional and ethical responsibility rather than a voluntary initiative. Internationally, professional bodies have integrated sustainability into competency standards, codes of conduct, and accreditation requirements, reflecting a shift toward outcome-based and socially responsive engineering practice (ICE, 2019). However, research consistently highlights a disconnect between sustainability ideals and construction practice, particularly in developing economies where institutional and capacity constraints are pronounced (Zuo & Zhao, 2014; Ofori, 2015).

2.2. Project Constraints in Sustainable Construction

Project constraints have traditionally been conceptualised through the "iron triangle" of cost, time, and scope. Contemporary project management scholarship expands this framework to include governance structures, risk allocation, regulatory compliance, and human resource capacity (PMI, 2021). In the context of sustainable construction, these constraints exert a decisive influence on whether environmentally responsible alternatives are considered viable.

Cost constraints are widely identified as the most significant barrier to sustainability adoption, particularly where procurement systems prioritise lowest initial cost rather than lifecycle value (Hwang & Ng, 2013; Darko et al., 2018). Time pressures further limit sustainability integration by reducing opportunities for integrated design processes, stakeholder engagement, and environmental modelling (Zuo et al., 2017). Skills shortages compound these challenges, as project teams may lack the expertise required to evaluate and implement sustainable technologies effectively (Ofori, 2015).

2.3. Regulatory Governance and the Role of ECSA

ECSA operates under the *Engineering Profession Act 46 of 2000* and is mandated to regulate engineering practice in the public interest. Its functions include accrediting engineering programmes, registering professionals, developing competency standards, and enforcing ethical conduct (ECSA, 2021). Recent revisions to ECSA's competency standards explicitly require engineers to demonstrate awareness of environmental sustainability, lifecycle performance, and risk-based decision-making.

Through accreditation criteria, ECSA also influences engineering education by requiring higher education institutions to integrate sustainability and social responsibility into curricula (ECSA, 2019). While these measures strengthen long-term professional capacity, their influence on immediate project outcomes is mediated by procurement frameworks, client priorities, and institutional governance arrangements (Windapo, 2018).

2.4. Sustainability Challenges in the South African Construction Sector

Empirical studies of South Africa's construction sector highlight persistent challenges, including fragmented regulatory oversight, inconsistent enforcement of sustainability standards, skills shortages, and inefficient public-sector procurement processes (Windapo & Cattell, 2013; CIDB, 2022). Sustainability requirements are unevenly applied across municipalities, resulting in variable adoption of green building practices (Van Wyk, 2019). These systemic challenges create conditions in which sustainability is frequently subordinated to cost containment and schedule adherence.

3. Research Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative, exploratory research design grounded in document analysis and literature synthesis. Primary sources include ECSA competency standards, accreditation criteria, professional conduct guidelines, and regulatory instruments. These are analysed alongside national sustainability policies and peer-reviewed construction management literature. A thematic analysis approach is used to identify recurring project constraints and to examine how these constraints interact with professional regulatory expectations. This methodology enables an interpretive understanding of sustainability governance within the South African construction context.

4. Findings: Project Constraints Shaping Sustainable Construction

The analysis reveals five interrelated categories of project constraints that significantly shape sustainability outcomes in South African construction projects.

4.1. Financial Constraints

Financial limitations consistently emerge as the dominant constraint affecting sustainability adoption. Sustainable materials, renewable energy systems, and environmental assessments often involve higher upfront costs, despite offering long-term lifecycle benefits. In practice, clients and contractors frequently prioritise short-term capital affordability over long-term value, reinforcing conventional construction approaches (Hwang & Ng, 2013; Darko et al., 2018).

4.2. Skills and Capacity Constraints

Although ECSA promotes sustainability competencies, many practising engineers and project managers lack specialised expertise in green technologies, lifecycle assessment, and environmental modelling. This skills gap limits the depth of sustainability integration, resulting in minimalist compliance rather than innovation-driven solutions (Ofori, 2015; ECSA, 2019).

4.3. Regulatory and Compliance Constraints

Regulatory fragmentation weakens sustainability enforcement across projects. Overlapping mandates between national departments and municipalities, combined with inconsistent adoption of green standards, dilute accountability. While ECSA establishes professional expectations, it has

limited authority over procurement decisions and construction-phase compliance monitoring (CIDB, 2022; Van Wyk, 2019).

4.4. Time and Project Management Constraints

Accelerated project schedules often limit sustainability analysis during planning and design stages. Time pressures discourage integrated design approaches and stakeholder engagement, marginalising sustainability considerations in favour of rapid delivery (Zuo et al., 2017).

4.5. Construction-Site Operational Constraints

At site level, sustainability measures are frequently undermined by weak environmental management systems, insufficient monitoring, and subcontractor non-compliance. These operational challenges further dilute sustainability intentions established during earlier project phases.

5. Discussion

The findings highlight a persistent gap between sustainability regulation and construction practice in South Africa. While ECSA embeds sustainability within professional standards and education requirements, project constraints related to finance, skills, governance, and time systematically undermine implementation. This supports international scholarship arguing that sustainability outcomes are shaped less by technical capability and more by institutional and governance arrangements (Zuo & Zhao, 2014; UNEP, 2020).

The analysis suggests that professional regulation alone is insufficient to drive sustainable construction. Instead, sustainability requires integrated reforms across procurement systems, project governance structures, and capacity development frameworks.

6. Proposed Framework for Enhancing Sustainable Construction

To address identified constraints, the article proposes a multi-level framework comprising:

- **Regulatory Alignment:** Harmonising national, municipal, and professional sustainability standards and embedding ECSA guidelines within procurement frameworks.
- **Capacity Development:** Expanding ECSA-accredited continuing professional development programmes focused on sustainable construction.
- **Project Governance:** Mandating sustainability plans and independent audits at key project stages.
- **Economic Incentives:** Introducing fiscal incentives and preferential tender scoring for sustainability compliance.
- **Digital Monitoring:** Leveraging digital tools for real-time tracking of environmental performance during construction.

7. Conclusions

Project constraints play a decisive role in shaping sustainable construction practices in South Africa. Although ECSA provides a robust regulatory and professional framework promoting sustainability, implementation is constrained by financial pressures, skills shortages, regulatory fragmentation, and project management realities. Addressing these constraints through integrated governance reforms, enhanced capacity development, and incentive alignment is essential for embedding sustainability within the construction sector. The study underscores the need for a systemic approach that aligns professional regulation with project-level execution to achieve meaningful and durable sustainability outcomes.

References

1. Aigbavboa, C., & Thwala, W. (2014). Sustainable construction practices in South Africa: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Construction Project Management*, 6(1), 1–14.
2. Burger, P., & Hawkesworth, I. (2011). How to attain value for money: Comparing PPP and traditional infrastructure public procurement. *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 11(1), 91–146.
3. CIDB. (2022). *Construction industry indicators*. Construction Industry Development Board, Pretoria.
4. Darko, A., & Chan, A. P. C. (2017). Review of barriers to green building adoption. *Sustainable Development*, 25(3), 167–179.
5. Darko, A., Chan, A. P. C., Owusu-Manu, D.-G., & Ameyaw, E. E. (2018). Drivers for implementing green building technologies. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 196, 659–673.
6. Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA). (2011). *National Climate Change Response Policy*. Pretoria.
7. ECSA. (2019). *Accreditation criteria for engineering programmes*. Engineering Council of South Africa, Pretoria.
8. ECSA. (2021). *Competency standards for professional engineers*. Engineering Council of South Africa, Pretoria.
9. Flyvbjerg, B. (2014). What you should know about megaprojects and why. *PM World Journal*, 3(2), 1–10.
10. Hwang, B.-G., & Ng, W. J. (2013). Project management knowledge and skills for green construction. *International Journal of Project Management*, 31(2), 272–284.
11. ICE. (2019). *Sustainability and engineering professionalism*. Institution of Civil Engineers, London.
12. ISO. (2015). *ISO 14001: Environmental management systems*. International Organization for Standardization.
13. Kibert, C. J. (2016). *Sustainable construction: Green building design and delivery* (4th ed.). Wiley.
14. National Planning Commission (NPC). (2012). *National Development Plan 2030*. Pretoria.
15. Ofori, G. (2015). Nature of the construction industry, its needs and its development. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries*, 20(2), 1–21.
16. PMI. (2021). *A guide to the project management body of knowledge (PMBOK® Guide)* (7th ed.). Project Management Institute.
17. UNEP. (2020). *2020 global status report for buildings and construction*. United Nations Environment Programme.
18. Van Wyk, L. (2019). Green building regulation and implementation in South Africa. *Journal of Energy in Southern Africa*, 30(2), 12–21.
19. Windapo, A. (2018). Examining regulatory frameworks and construction performance in South Africa. *Construction Economics and Building*, 18(3), 1–15.
20. Windapo, A., & Cattell, K. (2013). The South African construction industry: Perceptions of key challenges. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries*, 18(2), 65–79.
21. Zuo, J., & Zhao, Z.-Y. (2014). Green building research—current status and future agenda. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 30, 271–281.
22. Zuo, J., Jin, X., & Flynn, L. (2017). Social sustainability in construction—An explorative study. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 17(3), 1–13.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.