



# INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS' ASSESSMENT THROUGH SDG TARGETS: TOWARDS a COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK

Paul Mansell<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Denny Van Rooyen<sup>3</sup>, Simon Philbin<sup>2</sup>, and Luca Sabini<sup>4</sup>

## Abstract

The achievement of the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is of paramount importance “for the peace and prosperity for people and the planet, now and in the future” (United Nations, 2015; Økland, 2015). Important changes are needed in order to achieve these goals, and infrastructure projects (IP) are critical to facilitate these changes at local and global levels, across health, energy, education, transport, communication and other critical infrastructure needs. However, a gap exists in understanding how SDGs are applied below the global-national levels. In order to increase global and local impact of infrastructure investments, an improved understanding is needed at organisational and infrastructure project levels. In this context, the purpose of this research study is firstly to build on a comprehensive literature review to investigate the existing UN SDG targets in relation to IP, and secondly, to lay a foundation for a comprehensive framework to structure research systematically in this field. This approach can help further our understanding of the topic, thereby providing an important contribution for regulators, policymakers, academia and practitioners on how to align IP to SDGs objectives. This will deliver increased value from infrastructure investments and enable the project management community to generate local impact on global issues, for ‘people and the planet, now and in the future’.

## Keywords

Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Sustainability, Sustainable Development, Project Success, Infrastructure project, Research framework

---

<sup>1</sup>Bartlett School of Sustainable Construction, London, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup>London South Bank University, Engineering Department, Nathu Puri Institute, London, United Kingdom

<sup>3</sup>University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

<sup>4</sup>Hertfordshire University Business School, Hatfield, United Kingdom

## INTRODUCTION

The defining research by Morris (2017) into what the project management profession should be doing about climate change and other grand challenges, as well as by many others (Sachs et al., 2016; Seinfeld and Pandis, 2016; United Nations, 2018), suggests that the planet is in crisis and we need radical change. Morris (2017), concentrating on project management, and Sachs et al. (2016), focusing on socio-economics, have shown that never before have we had such confidence in the evidence that demonstrates how many species are threatened and our ecosystem ‘faces massive change and collapse unless action is taken immediately’ (Morris, 2017). The urgency of finding solutions to these challenges is highlighted by the United Nations (UN) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which released their most damning report on eighth October 2018 (United Nations, 2015,2018). The report drew on 6 000 research papers. The evidence of global warming exceeding 2°C above pre-industrial levels by the end of the century is overwhelming and indicates ‘impending catastrophe’ – climate change is an existential threat to the human race. Whilst there have been some significant advances since the Rio Summit (1992 and +20 in 2012) and the 2005 Kyoto Protocol (2005), such as the transformational technologies for battery-powered cars and renewable energy,

even a rise of 1.5°C now appears to be inevitable (United Nations, 2015,2018; Sachs et al., 2016). Alongside the ‘climate emergency’, the widening gap between rich and poor, which is at its highest point in a decade, and growing social inequalities are fuelling social tensions and mass migration (United Nations, 2015,2018).

The response of the international community to the grand challenge of sustainable development was codified in the ‘2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’ that was adopted by the 193 Member States of the United Nations (2015) at the UN Sustainable Development Summit in September 2015 (United Nations, 2015; Økland, 2015). The UN General Assembly outlined seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), as shown in Figure 1, that are intended to provide a universal call to action to end poverty, protect the planet and ensure that all people enjoy peace and prosperity.

Five years into the global commitment to deliver meaningful SDG action, it is evident that we are falling behind on our local and global ambitions (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD), 2019; United Nations, 2015, 2019). This is relevant for project managers because much of tomorrow’s development will be delivered through projects (and by project management professionals), across all sectors, but especially infrastructure. For example, the IPCC’s October 2018 Report identifies that “directing



Figure 1 The Global Goals. United Nations (2018).



finance towards investment in infrastructure for mitigation and adaptation” is key to meeting SDG targets. Another indication of the importance of IP is shown by the estimated USD \$94 trillion (Global Infrastructure Outlook, 2019) of investment in IP that is required globally between 2018 and 2040. This represents a significant opportunity to stimulate economic prosperity, reduce poverty and raise standards in health, education and gender equality. Equally, done badly, the evidence suggests (Silvius et al., 2012; Thacker and Hall, 2018; Thacker et al., 2019) that economic benefits from projects’ impacts could be outweighed by the negative impact on the environment and society.

Given the preeminent importance that large (and mega-) projects have in pursuing high level societal changes (and potentially contributing massively to SDG achievement), this research study explores the gap in the literature by focusing on the measurement of IP through SDG targets. The study asks an overarching question: *What are the opportunities for research into the assessment of Infrastructure Projects through SDG targets?* In exploring this question, the study develops around three research questions, that can be used as a guide for broader research: (1) How extensive (broad and deep) has the research into SDG-IP been to-date?; (2) What issues and sub-issues were identified that may inform a future thematic framework to support more systematic research in the field?; and (3) How could such a framework be used to provide guidance to a range of stakeholders (including regulators, policymakers, academia, investors and infrastructure practitioners) on how to align IP and their impacts to the SDGs?

This article is structured as follows: In the first part we explore the background information where concepts of grand challenges, sustainability (and sustainable development), infrastructure projects, and project success in relation to the SDGs have been examined. This is followed by a description of the methodology employed for the systematic literature review. Subsequently, we delineate preliminary results from the systematic literature review. In the concluding part we develop a research framework with critical SDG-IP issues that can be used for further research to support the project level implementation of the 2030 SDG targets.

## THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

### Grand Challenges and SDGs

Grand Challenges is a term used, predominantly by the academic community, to qualify and structure responses to so called ‘wicked problems’ (Head and Alford, 2015) of immense magnitude and impact. ‘Grand Challenges’ capture ideas that are equally relevant to academics as well as practitioners. They are also, by definition, both ambitious (“capture the peoples’ imagination”) and achievable (“solve ... problems”) (Executive Office of the President, Office of Science and Technology Policy, 1989). Additionally, the definition identifies the need for impact and the measurement thereof to demonstrate meaningful progress. The definition of Grand Challenges has evolved since Mertz (2005) focus on the engineering communities, to a broader group of stakeholders that includes policy shapers, funders, and delivery-to-operations project teams (Omenn, 2006). Consequently, project management professionals have the opportunity to take a leading role in this, especially in providing tangible action that can be implemented by practitioners to effect improved performance against the SDG targets.

More recent research into Grand Challenges (Sakhrani et al., 2016) has identified five characteristics that are helpful in this paper’s SDG-IP analysis: Grand Challenges are (a) articulated by stakeholders, (b) specific, (c) ambitious yet feasible, (d) framed in a manner that suggests the use of specific methods or disciplines, and (e) have the potential for broad impact. These characteristics provide a useful reference point for developing a conceptual framework to deepen the research into how the project management community can define, design and measure IP contributions towards the SDGs. In effect, the five characteristics of the Grand Challenges provide the ‘lens’ to identify what links SDGs to IP.

### Sustainability and Sustainable Development in Relation to SDGs

Sustainability can be a challenging word. Indeed, fifteen years ago there were up to sixty definitions of sustainability (Hartshorn et al., 2005) with little



convergence of how the theory of sustainability could be given meaning in practice. There are those (Sverdrup and Rosen, 1998; Zuofa and Ochieng, 2016) who suggest that sustainability is essentially the long-term harnessing of an ecosystem to maximise the outcomes whilst ensuring the extraction of the input of resources from the ecosystem do not negatively impact its long-term viability. Alternatively, there are others (Costanza and Patten, 1995) who define sustainability simply as a measure of whether a system can ultimately continue or is self-consuming. Holling (2001) broadened the sustainability systems' definition to include 'development': "Sustainable development ... refers to the goal of fostering adaptive capabilities and creating opportunities". It can thus be shown that 'sustainability' has become mired in value-laden language, often vague in concept (Ciegis et al., 2009; Emas, 2015; Mebratu, 1998), that can cause diffusion of interpretation and confusion in practice (Ainger and Fenner, 2014; Fenner et al., 2006; Moore et al., 2017). These examples explain why the definition remains nebulous and why a practical definition has greater utility (Glavic and Lukman, 2007) for project managers.

For the purposes of this paper, the definition of sustainability builds on the broader definition of sustainable development as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (Brundtland, 1987). Over the past 50 years, the phraseology and understanding of 'sustainable development' (Sachs et al., 2016) has become an increasingly central theme of nation states and their citizens. Today, the Planetary Boundaries (Rockström et al., 2009; Steffen et al., 2015) provide a global litmus test for how we are doing. The concept of nine planetary boundaries within which humanity can continue to develop and thrive for generations to come was developed in 2009 by environmental scientists from the Stockholm Resilience Centre. The most significant global response to the Planetary Boundary challenge was in 2015, when all governments ratified the UN's seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (United Nations, 2015; Økland, 2015) to be achieved by 2030. To this end, 169 targets linked to 247 (231 without duplicates) indicators were agreed in 2017. This represented a major step-change in

the implementation of the sustainability agenda and effective responses to the Planetary Boundary challenge. Although the SDGs build on the earlier Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (United Nations, 2015, 2000), by focusing on similar issues, the SDGs differ from the MDGs in that they are for all countries in the world to implement – developed and developing nations alike. Also, unlike the MDGs, the SDGs are focused on monitoring, evaluation and accountability – across society, not just at national level. Therefore, it is critical that the link is made from 'bottom-to-top', meaning that impacts can be measured at project level and this can be benchmarked against the national and global targets and indicators. We argue that a gap exists – IP are not included in the SDGs' measurement, and the evidence (Martens and Carvalho, 2017 and Martens and Carvalho, 2016b) illustrates that the golden thread from project level measurement to global-national level, is missing. This echoes research highlighting a gap between theory and practice for incorporating sustainability measurement in project management (Økland, 2015).

### **Sustainable IPs and Project Success in Relation to SDGs**

Most of society's developments in recent times can be connected to IP (Thacker and Hall, 2018; Thacker et al., 2019) and the UN recognise that the development of infrastructure represents a massive opportunity to stimulate economic prosperity, reduce poverty and raise standards in health, education and gender equality (United Nations Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, 2019).

It is apparent that ameliorating many of the risks associated with grand challenges, such as climate change, can only be achieved through investment in appropriate and resilient infrastructure and engineering (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD), 2019). For example, greenhouse gas emissions cannot be sufficiently reduced without new forms of energy infrastructure or less polluting transport networks; and water security requires investment in new and more resilient forms of water infrastructure (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and



Development (OECD), 2019; United Nations, 2015, 2019). This highlights the importance of IP to link from the local investment level to global goals and perhaps provides recognition of the ability of engineering and infrastructure to reduce strategic business risk.

Contribution to the growing literature on the measurement of IPs on sustainability is provided by Shen et al. (2010), who focus on the balance needed between benefits to *society* whilst protecting the *environment* and still achieving the *economic* benefits envisaged in the project business case. The linkage across the three areas in the construction industry is further defined by Kibert (2013), who suggests the interrelationship between a project's outputs and the society that is impacted is a central component of defining sustainability success of an infrastructure project. This introduces the concept that project success definition needs to consider success against the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) (Elkington, 1994) of social, environmental (or ecological) and economic (or financial) effects, otherwise noted as the 'Three Pillars' concept of 'people, profit and the planet' (Elkington, 1994; Elkington, 2013; Elkington, 2018; Griggs et al., 2013).

Defining IP success is central to the understanding of how to link global-national level SDGs with local IP because it allows stakeholders to align their expectations against shorter-term outputs as well as the longer-term outcomes and SDG impacts. More recent research into project success definition (Jenner, 2016; Lavagnon, 2009; Thiry, 2004) has consistently identified benefits and outcomes as being a critical determinant for the assessment of project success. For example, Thiry (2004) highlights that 'too many critical success factors are related to inputs and management processes and not enough on outcomes'. This is further supported by those (Morris, 2013; Cooke-Davies, 2007) who identify three levels of success criteria: project management success – was the project done right?; project success – was the right project done?; and consistent project success – were the projects done right, time after time?

Based on the overarching research question (What are the opportunities for research into the assessment of Infrastructure Projects through


SDG targets?) and the earlier exploration of the key thematic areas, the following systems map at Figure 2 was developed to guide the choice of methodology, based on the six core areas that are all linked as a systems-of-systems map. This demonstrates their interconnections and the basis for the chosen research approach.

## METHODOLOGY


In order to meet our research objectives, we decided to conduct a systematic literature review (SLR) focused on the leading journals that publish articles across the three thematics of business policy, sustainability and project management. A literature review can broadly be described as a systematic way of collecting and synthesising previous research (Baumeister and Leary, 1997; Tranfield et al., 2003). We selected an approach that conformed to established SLR protocols that have been mostly based on the rules and standards proposed by Liberati et al. (2009). This was complemented by a Level 2 Analysis that adopted a semi-systematic review process, advocated by Wong (2013), that evaluated the top 13 articles that had the highest prevalence of keywords within the selected dataset, and this supported the derived nodal map of key thematics that provide future research opportunities. These approaches are shown diagrammatically in Figure 3.

With an aim to ensure sufficiently comprehensive coverage across the three thematics, we focused our research on project management journals (International Journal of Project Management, and Project Management Journal), sustainability journals (Journal of Cleaner Production, and Sustainability); and policy journals (Journal of Environmental Management, Business Strategy and the Environment, Environmental Science and Policy, Research Policy, and Global Environmental Change). Combined, these journals publish the representative coverage of academic research across the three thematics of project management, sustainability and business policy.

In order to assemble the dataset, we used Scopus as the search engine, identifying articles by source types (peer-reviewed articles within the



**Figure 2** Systems map showing the key thematic areas related to the research question.



**Figure 3** The 'hopper' approach to SLR Level 1 and 2 Analysis.



**Table 1** Items containing combinations of keywords

Search keywords combinations across the title, abstract and index key words	No. of items		
	Title	Abstract	Index Key Words
“SDG”/“sustainable development goal” + “project”	0	47	0
“SDG”/“sustainable development goal” + “project management”	0	0	0
“SDG”/“sustainable development goal” + “infrastructure”	2	27	0
“sustainable development” + “project”	10	163	153
“sustainable development” + “project management”	1	12	78
“sustainable development” + “infrastructure”	5	89	65
“sustainability” + “project”	53	395	129
“sustainability” + “project management”	10	43	76
“sustainability” + “infrastructure”	17	227	100
“sustainable infrastructure”	11	17	6
Total items	109	1 020	607
Total	1 736		

selected journals). As part of the search, we used the following keywords: ‘sustainable development goal’, ‘sustainable development’, or ‘sustainability’ in conjunction with ‘project’, ‘project management’ or ‘infrastructure’ (from 2015–2020). The choice of the six keywords was based on clear differentiation of SDG and IP terminology, but also the need to limit the selection to a manageable data size for analysis. These keywords were searched within the fields of ‘title’, ‘abstract’ and ‘index key words’ as defined by the Scopus search engine. This yielded 1 651 articles, shown in the table below (as at February 2020).

The occurrence of searched keywords in relation to one another is displayed in detail below, in respect of the title, abstract and index key words (see Table 1: Items containing combinations of keywords). Some duplications of items containing a combination of more than two keywords were resolved.

To filter out less relevant articles from our sample, we created a subset based on the occurrence of the combinations of keywords, in both title and abstract, as represented in Table 2. The resultant abstracts were browsed for relevance, which eliminated numerous articles (most of which were focused on pedagogies and training around sustainable development goals,

or sustainability projects and initiatives in non-infrastructure sectors).

The 32 articles represent the final subset analysed. These were included in the final review dataset that followed the SLR approach adopted by Jarvis et al. (2003) that codifies data using relevant thematic frameworks, which in the case of this paper, was based on the SDG-IP thematic

**Table 2** The resultant reduction of dataset based on combination of keywords

Subset delineators: Combined keywords	Total items	Relevant articles
SDG/Sustainable Development Goal+ Project	42	12
SDG/Sustainable Development Goal+ Infrastructure	22	16
SDG/Sustainable Development Goal+ Project + Infrastructure	5	4
	<b>69</b>	<b>32</b>

structure, codifying key information in relation to seven areas of interest:

1. Type of contribution (such as framework proposition, framework testing, exploratory, theoretical, etc.).
2. Research design (namely, empirical, single/multiple case study, systematic literature review, etc.).
3. Primary geographical focus of study (ie, where the study took place or was focused).
4. Primary infrastructure sector (eg, water, energy, transport, etc.).
5. Primary industry (if applicable; eg, airports).
6. Relevant institutional level (eg, regional, national, organisational, etc.).
7. Sustainable Development Goals mentioned in the article.

The summary data across the 32 articles codified against the seven SDG-IP thematic is included as Appendix 1. The results from this analysis are captured and discussed in the following section. The analysis has been completed at two levels: level one examines the dataset of 32 articles across the seven SDG-IP thematic and level two provides a deeper analysis of the 13 most relevant articles, based on their prevalence of keyword combinations, across SDG-IP research issues and themes.

## RESULTS and DISCUSSION

### Quantity of Relevant Articles in Dataset

The analysis of the dataset, illustrated in Figure 4, showed that within this sample, there were identifiable differences and similarities. For example, across the four sustainability journals there was a total of 1 426 articles which equates to 285 articles per sustainability journal. This compares with a total of 204 across the policy journals. The least represented were the project management journals that had a total of 21 articles.

### Quantity of Use of Keywords in Abstracts Over Time

The dataset enabled the capture of the prevalence of keywords used over the selected time period of 2015 – February 2020, as shown in Figure 5. The value for researchers in this field is that it highlights the rapid increase in some keywords, especially in the past two years, and suggests that this is an increasing area of importance and relevance. For example, the prevalence of ‘SDG’ has increased by a factor of 29 with most of the increase in the last two years. Similarly, the appearance of the keywords of ‘sustainable development’ have increased by a factor of five and ‘sustainability’ by a factor of three. The latter two keywords have also had a noticeable inflection point in 2017, that is




Figure 4 Occurrences of articles appearing in selected journals using the keywords.






Figure 5 Occurrence of Keywords in abstracts over time.

most likely due to the increasing recognition of the SDG terminology since their introduction in 2015.

### Level 1 Analysis: Results Across the Seven Codified SDG-IP Thematics

This section covers the analysis of the seven thematic areas identified in the earlier part of this SLR.

#### SDG-IP thematic 1: Type of contribution (framework proposition, framework testing, exploratory, theoretical, etc.)

Since the aim of this paper is to evaluate the state of knowledge on the specific SDG-IP topic, it is useful to identify what approaches have been used to evaluate this area. The purpose was to create relevant research agendas, based on any identified gaps in research, or seek insights that will facilitate the next level of research. In this way, it has been proposed (Baumeister and Leary, 1997; Torraco, 2005) that literature reviews are useful to develop theory and conceptual models.

The results showed a pre-dominance (over 60%) of articles were based on Framework Testing (in this context a framework means an analytical tool to support a research study) and Framework Propositions, but there were fewer Theoretical article and Exploratory methods. This might suggest that there is confidence in existing theories, and that new frameworks are being developed to harness the theories more effectively for the emerging demands of the IP-SDG topic. While there is not necessarily an SDG-IP research gap in the type of contributions, the findings might highlight the preference for

frameworks as a way to engage with practitioners that are seeking tools to effect improved ways of measuring SDG impacts on IP.

#### SDG-IP thematic 2: Research design (empirical, single/multiple case study, systematic literature review, etc.)

The analysis of SDG-IP Thematic two on research design used these five headings (shown in Figure 6) to give a high-level quantification of design use. This illustrates that empirical analysis was the most favoured approach, and that two thirds of articles used case studies in some form.

The results showed that empirical analysis was the favoured approach followed by multi-case studies and single studies, thus indicating that two thirds of articles used case studies in some form. Drawing conclusions on future research focus from these findings is informed by Tranfield et al. (2003) who contend that many SLRs have researcher bias, lack rigour and have insufficient empirical evidence to underpin insights that could enable intervention




Figure 6 Research design approaches.

into the practitioners’ operational roles. The results of this thematic area therefore underpin the increasing emphasis towards using empirical evidence and case studies. This suggests that future research should seek design methods that relate to practitioners and thereby help inform the SDG-IP policy formulation and implementation.

**SDG-IP thematic 3: Primary geographical focus of study (where the study took place or was focused)**

The geographical spread of the articles was significant. There were eleven articles that had a focus on BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) countries and only two from OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) countries. There were also some outliers that included Mozambique, Curacao, Ethiopia and Somalia. The balance of articles between developed countries (n=26) and developing countries (n=4), with a smaller number having a global focus, shows that there remains a predominance of research in the more accessible databases of developed countries.

The larger data set of articles from and of developed countries indicates a prevalence of research due to more accessible databases of developed countries as well as a larger body of research resource capacity. There is an opportunity to

close the gap by focusing more research resources on developing countries since that is where many of the greatest SDG challenges are situated (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD), 2019; United Nations, 2018).

**SDG-IP thematic 4: Primary infrastructure sector (eg, water, energy, transport, etc.)**

The representation across the infrastructure sector showed (in Figure 7) a dominance of water-focused articles (n=9), followed by urban development (n=6) and energy (n=4). The remaining eleven areas had a combined total of one less article (n=18, versus n=19) of the top three areas. In some cases, the article covered more than a single sector, hence the increased total above the 32 articles analysed.

The dominance of water-focused, urban development and energy articles suggests key SDG-related IP, such as health (SDG 3 – Good Health and Wellbeing) are under-represented and perhaps, the key enabling IP areas such as roads, housing, sanitation, are also research areas that would benefit from increased focus.

**SDG-IP thematic 5: Primary industry (e.g. airports)**

The more detailed analysis of each article was carried out to identify their specific subsector focus




Figure 7 Sectoral focus of subset articles.

provided less definitive findings. For example, whilst the prevalence of water sector IP articles illustrated that there were six areas of subcategories used (namely rural water services; transboundary resources; water transfer; river basins and water quality; water supply, solid waste), there was little value gained from further analysis of the other sectors.

The sample set was too narrow to make any significant conclusions from the results but to some extent, the results indicated that the spread of subsector topics in articles is broad, if not deep, across sub-sectors. An opportunity might exist to compare the IP related sub-sector topics with SDG goals and targets, to seek research alignment, for example, analysing SDG targets for SDG 6 (Clean Water and Sanitation) could highlight specific topics related to the targets and their indicators that deserve greater focus. In this case, Target 6.1, ‘By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all’, has indicator 6.1.1, measuring the ‘Proportion of population using safely managed drinking water services’, which could provide a structured way of narrowing the focus for deeper research into specific sub-sector topical areas.

**SDG-IP thematic 6: Relevant institutional level (eg, regional, national, organisational, etc.)**

The analysis of the dataset of articles (see Figure 8) indicates that there is less research conducted

at the higher and lower ends of the hierarchy. For example, the top levels from global-national spanned 15 articles, the lower level from sector-project spanned 11 articles whilst the middle three levels from national to industry included 20 articles.

The concentration of articles in the central area is not necessarily surprising but it does highlight the paucity of research at the lower levels that this paper seeks to clarify. This suggests that at the organisational level there is better coverage but that a gap exists at the sector-project level. An existing framework for the analysis across levels is provided by Müller et al. (2019) in their organisational levels in project management (OPM) model. In project management terms, this includes the project, programme, and portfolio levels of organisational design and this could allow the alignment of the IP-SDG analysis with the Müller-developed theory to help explain the SDG interface and interaction of the OPM elements across the layers within the model.

**SDG-IP thematic 7: Sustainable Development Goals mentioned in the articles**

The final of the seven SDG-IP thematic themes was a numeric counting of which specific SDGs (of the 17 goals) were the focus of the articles in the dataset. Unsurprisingly, given the heavy sectorial focus on water in the dataset, SDG six on Clean Water and Sanitation, was the most prevalent (n=6). This was followed by SDG 11, Sustainable




Figure 8 Institutional focus of subset articles.

Cities and Communities, which aligns closely with the search parameters of IP (n=4). Eight articles referred to SDGs in a general reference without a specific focus on individual SDGs and six of the SDGs were specifically mentioned in the articles but with lower occurrence.

The results on this thematic suggests that there is an opportunity to broaden the research across the SDGs that were under-represented, specifically into those SDGs identified as being most affected by the development of infrastructure, or, to deepen the research in areas already covered, such as SDG six or 11.

### Level 2 Analysis of the 13 Top SDG-IP Articles Based on Their Keyword Occurrences

Whilst the SLR methodology used in the preceding sections has been mostly based on the rules and standards proposed by Liberati et al. (2009), it has only provided a high-level indication of where the future research opportunities might lie. Therefore, the semi-systematic review process, sometimes referred to as a ‘narrative review approach’ is used for topics that have been conceptualised

differently and researched by groups across diverse disciplines. This approach does not easily fit with a full systematic review process as advocated by Wong (2013), which suits the purposes of a Level two analysis. This is because it enables the tailoring of the research to the specific needs of the project, which in this case involves the further de-selection of articles to the most relevant based on their prevalence of keywords. The articles are then analysed to identify SDG-IP issues and sub-issues that have relevance in guiding future research opportunities in the SDG-IP field. The data in Figure 9 highlights the correlation between the issues and sub-issues and the author reference of where the sub-issues are derived from in the top 14 research articles. This provides future researchers the opportunity to build on these identified themes to derive new SDG-IP insights. A summary of all the relevant extracts from the top 13 articles is included at Appendix 2 and full data screenshot is shown at Appendix 3 of the 1 651 artefacts.

Analysis of the nodal framework shown in Figure 9 indicates that there is a balanced spread of the top articles that relate to the identified SDG-IP research issues although there are three




Figure 9 Research Issues and sub-issues based on the 13 most relevant articles.



that dominate: ‘definition and evaluation of project success’ (n=4); ‘sustainable construction’ (n=3); and ‘investment priorities in SDGs’ (n=3). There is clearer differentiation of the most common sub-issues across the research themes: ‘policy to implementation’ (n=8); ‘research approach’ (n=4); ‘opportunities for delivery of sustainability’ (n=4); ‘challenges to delivery of sustainability’ (n=4); and ‘outputs versus outcomes’ (n=3).

## What Research Themes Have Emerged From the SLR?

The research study has sought to explore opportunities for research into the assessment of Infrastructure Projects through SDG targets. We adopted an SLR methodology to examine a subset of relevant journal articles to understand the quantitative data across 7 SDG-IP thematic areas. We then developed a Level two analysis to identify some qualitative insights into the type of issues that have been covered within the sample set.

The following sections will explore the themes that have been examined through the SLR process and consolidate emerging opportunities for further research. The answer to the first question is provided from analysis of the SLR results of the seven thematic criteria. The second and third questions are answered using the Level 2 analysis of the 13 top articles.

### (1) How extensive (broad and deep) has the research into SDG-IP been to-date?

The Level one analysis has indicated that there is a growing body of research into SDG-IP, with a marked increase since 2017. The relative coverage of the SDG-IP, against other business and project management research areas is less easy to quantify since SDGs have only been in existence since 2015 and the SDG targets and indicator framework was only fully agreed by the 193 signatory nations in 2016. However, recent SLR studies (Aarseth et al., 2017; Engert et al., 2016) have shown that sustainability in a project context is still a nascent and fragmented research area, but that there is growing awareness of its criticality to business success, and indeed, also to society and environmental success. This reinforces

the contention that SDG-IP research is ‘nascent’ to an even greater degree because there were approximately 300% more sustainability keyword connections than for SDGs.


### (2) What issues and sub-issues were identified that might inform a future thematic framework to support more systematic research in the field?

The level two analysis has provided useful insights into the issues and sub-issues that emerged from the qualitative analysis of the highest ranked articles in the dataset. The diagram below (Figure 10) illustrates the research themes that were developed from the SLR.

Whilst the analysis of the individual articles indicated their specific research focus areas, the overview across all the research articles provided a strategic perspective of linkages between the issues, sub-issues and derived supra-themes. In many cases the studies did not overtly cover these areas, and this could be evidence of a research gap. More helpful for future research is an emerging research framework that provides a strategic context to analyse the assessment of SDGs on IP. To give an indication of how this might be used, the sections below provide an overview of the main points emerging from five of the seven “SDG-IP Research Issues” shown in Figure 10 in the left column.

### SDG-IP future Research Issue 1. Cascading from global to the local level

As shown in Appendix 2 and Figure 12, there were 4 of the top 13 articles that had a research focus on understanding the link from global to local level. For example, Hall et al. (2017) examined how to operationalise SDG goals-targets through IP, both at organisational and government levels. This was similar to Terrapon-Pfaff et al. (2018) who also sought to look further down the hierarchical levels, specifically on the WEF [water-energy-food] nexus discussions which they noted had rarely been cascaded below national or global levels. This new research provides insights to ‘macro-level drivers, material flows and large Infrastructure developments’, which they contend is the critical



**Figure 10** Structure of issues, sub-issues and emerging supra-themes.

requirement of research because ‘*major nexus challenges are faced at local level*’.

### SDG-IP future Research Issue 2. Definition and evaluation of Project Success

Dean et al. (2017) considered the definition of project success is currently too narrow and concluded that the inclusion of socio-economic assessments, as well as environmental, were needed to derive improved investment decisions, exclaiming that “*current evaluative methods that support decision making on social housing interventions fail to capture all of the socio-environmental value contained in the UN SDG II*”. Their study addressed the issue by demonstrating how Sustainable Return on Investment can successfully describe and analyse a range of externalities related to the sustainable value generated by social housing regeneration schemes. This view was complemented by Schwanitz et al. (2017) and Diaz-Sarachaga et al. (2016) where both research teams analysed the fundamental basis for investment decisions. In the first case, the article considers the green rating systems and the impact of an absence of meaningful metrics, while the second explores other sustainability assessment tools such as LEED ND and Envision, suggesting that both

are lacking in one of the triple bottom line areas of economic, societal or environmental dimensions. The latter study is supported by Schwanitz et al. (2017) who proposed further work was needed to develop relevant ‘*indicators and visualisation methods*’ that are relevant for IP at sub-national level. A third study that highlighted the need for harmonised indicators was the da Silva et al. (2019) team, which aimed to develop a ‘*relevant set of sustainability indicators to analyse municipal solid waste management (MSWM) in large and medium-sized worldwide cities*’. They also highlighted the need for better information databases that were currently insufficient for the sectors’ needs.

### SDG-IP future Research Issue 3. Sustainable Construction

Goel et al. (2019) noted that few research studies analyse the literature of sustainable construction (SC) in India. They identified both a thematic-knowledge research gap and also a geographical and sector gap. This provides a useful line of future research opportunities, where both thematic and geographical gaps can be addressed by a single research study. This would typically be the objective of most research agendas, to find a

**Table 3 Proposed questions for further research**

SLR reference	Research questions & Themes <b>Envisaged practical applications of research</b>
<p><b>SDG-IP Research Issue 1. Cascading from Global to the local level (Governance)</b> Hall et al., 2017; Terrapon-Pfaff et al., 2018</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How does the OECD definition of governance and the underlying principles of governance effect the measurement of projects' SDG impact?</li> <li>▪ Who are the major governance stakeholders and shareholders that influence the measurement of SDGs beneath global-national levels, at the organisational-project level?</li> <li>▪ How does the theory of a temporary organisation effect the measurement of SDGs at project level as compared to the organisational level?</li> </ul>
<p><b>SDG-IP Research Issue 2. Definition and evaluation of Project Success</b> Dean et al., 2017; Diaz-Sarachaga et al., 2016; Schwanitz et al., 2017; da Silva et al., 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does the current definition of project success place sufficient value in the wider criteria across environmental and societal factors as well as existing economic drivers?</li> <li>▪ If there is insufficient effective action in measuring SDGs, how is the governance model strengthened to drive greater success at project level?</li> <li>▪ What understanding had been derived from the research into projects' benefits management and how might this effect the successful measurement of SDGs on projects?</li> </ul>
<p><b>SDG-IP Research Issue 3. Sustainable Construction</b> Goel et al., 2019; Munyasya and Chileshe, 2018</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What research across the engineering and infrastructure sector that has focused on measurement of sustainability success on projects can be used for assessment of SDG-IP impact?</li> <li>▪ What existing tools and processes (eg, LEED, Envision, CEEQUAL) could be utilised for the assessment of SDG-IP impact?</li> </ul>
<p><b>SDG-IP Research Issue 4. Practical application of Theoretical sustainability models</b> Dushenko et al., 2018; Tranfield et al., 2003</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What empirical evidence has been collated in relation to SDG-IP issues that can be used to drive practical solutions to SDG-IP challenges?</li> <li>▪ What theoretical or concept models developed for the project management community for the identification and measurement of benefits could be used to support practical SDG-IP assessments?</li> </ul>
<p><b>SDG-IP Research Issue 5. Investment priorities in SDG</b> Aust et al., 2020</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What are the international contextual issues (political, cultural, environmental and social) that effect the measurement of SDG impacts at Infrastructure project level?</li> <li>▪ What are the international investment criteria that inform decisions in sustainable infrastructure and how might the existing frameworks be utilised for the SDG-IP assessment challenge?</li> </ul>

new area of study that their research can inform and positively impact future practical changes. Munyasya and Chileshe (2018) also highlighted that whilst there were plenty of research studies on sustainable infrastructure, there are few on the ‘*influencing drivers and barriers particularly within the South Australian construction industry*’. They identified a research gap across three areas: ‘the lack of steering mechanism, multi-disciplinary nature of the word “sustainability”, and lack of cooperation and networking’ which they considered major barriers.

#### SDG-IP future Research Issue 4. Practical application of theoretical sustainability models

As mentioned earlier, there are those, such as Tranfield et al. (2003), who contend that many SLRs have insufficient empirical evidence to underpin insights that could enable intervention into the practitioners’ operational roles. In short, they don’t add value to the practitioners’ world thereby undermining the essence of research value-add. In this regard, Dushenko et al. (2018) postulate that there is an over preponderance on theoretical models that don’t have practical application. This provides a research opportunity to assess existing theoretical sustainability models that might be used for SDG-IP needs. There are models, such as a theoretical model to build a logical framework to map the inputs of a project to the expected ‘ends’ of the projects’ outcomes. The Logframe model might be an example of an existing conceptual model that could be harnessed.

#### SDG-IP future Research Issue 5. Investment priorities in SDG

Aust et al. (2020) start from the proposition that IP are critical to make serious impacts on the 2030 Agenda of Sustainable Development. They specifically examine the use of foreign direct investment (FDI) as a source of external financing in the private sector across 44 African countries. This builds on the suggestions for future research from the Level 1 Analysis that research resources from the developed world could, and should, be utilising more of their capacity and capabilities



**Figure 11** Type of contributions, using a hierarchical treemap chart, across subset.

to examine the SDG-IP knowledge gap across developing countries. They contend that their study assists decision-makers with investment plans to achieve the SDGs, which aligns with the Research issues 2 and 4 in that they also focus on practical solutions emanating from SDG-IP research studies to encourage, as Aust et al., state: ‘*further investments in Africa and progress against the SDGs*’.

#### (3) How could such a framework be used to provide guidance to a range of stakeholders (including regulators, policymakers, academia, investors and infrastructure practitioners) on how to align IP and their impacts to the SDGs?

A recurring theme emanating from analysis of the selected articles is the need to make the research accessible and relevant to the practitioner community of stakeholders, whether policy makers, investors, project managers or others. Indeed, there was a specific thematic area that was identified as SDG-IP Research Issue 4: Practical application of Theoretical sustainability models, which is a theme Tranfield et al. (2003), championed. The collective wisdom from these papers has been to seek research opportunities to assess existing theoretical sustainability models that might be used for SDG-IP needs.

The focus on practical application of research can be supported by the emerging list of possible questions that this SLR article has informed. The list of questions in Table 3 is preliminary but gives a view of the proposed ‘direction of travel’.






Figure 12 SDG mentions across subset.

## CONCLUSION

In the context of climate change as an existential threat to the human race, alongside the COVID-19-exacerbated threats of growing social and economic inequalities, rising social tensions, and mass migration (United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), 2018), the international community has responded to the

Table 4 Items containing keywords, in the database per Journal

Journal	Total
Journal of Cleaner Production	433
Journal of Environmental Management	366
Sustainability (Switzerland)	376
Business Strategy and the Environment	214
Environmental Science and Policy	162
Research Policy	40
Global Environmental Change	37
International Journal of Project Management	17
Project Management Journal	4
Journal of Social Policy	2
	1 651

grand challenge of sustainable development with the ‘2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’, culminating in 17 Sustainable Development Goals, linked to 169 targets and 231 (unique) indicators. The IPCC has identified that “directing finance towards investment in infrastructure for mitigation and adaptation” is key to meeting SDG targets (2018) and the estimated USD \$94 trillion infrastructure investment that is required globally between 2018 and 2040 (Global Infrastructure Outlook, 2019), represents a significant opportunity to stimulate economic prosperity, reduce poverty and raise standards in living, health, education and gender equality. This is relevant for the project management community, a critical profession in the delivery of infrastructure through projects across all sectors, and thus in development.

This reason has motivated an overarching enquiry in opportunities for research into the assessment of IP through SDG targets, distilled through three research questions: (1) How extensive (broad and deep) has the research into SDG-IP been to-date? (2) What issues and sub-issues were identified that may inform a future thematic framework to support more systematic research in the field? (3) How could such a framework be used to provide guidance to a range of stakeholders



**Table 5** Data analysis of key words tabulated across the two dimensions of SDG and IP.

Data capture in Title	Project	Project Management	Infrastructure
SDG/Sustainable Development Goal	0	0	2
Sustainable Development	10	1	5
Sustainability	53	10	17
<b>Data capture in Abstract</b>			
SDG/Sustainable Development Goal	47	0	27
Sustainable Development	163	12	89
Sustainability	395	43	227
<b>Data capture in Index Key Words</b>			
SDG/Sustainable Development Goal	0	0	0
Sustainable Development	153	78	65
Sustainability	129	76	100

(including regulators, policymakers, academia, investors and infrastructure practitioners) on how to align IP and their impacts to the SDGs? Question one was answered through a Level 1 analysis of an SLR, which identified 7 SDG-IP thematic areas. Questions 2 and 3 were answered using the Level 2 analysis of the 13 top articles.

The analysis identified the recurring need to make research accessible and relevant to the practitioner community by pursuing studies that will result in practical applications for theoretical sustainability models. This culminated in the proposal of several research questions across the emergent research issues: the importance of localising assessment; defining project success in light of the SDGs; expanding on sustainable construction research; driving practical assessment solutions and benefits for stakeholders; and prioritising investment into SDG assessment where it is most critical, both thematically in terms of specific SDGs, as well as geographically, with a renewed focus on developing countries where sustainability challenges abound. With a focus on IP, this study finds that SDGs are seldom linked to projects (either in delivery or in their outputs and outcomes) and we suggest that increased knowledge in this area may improve both IP investment decisions and performance against SDGs. The framework presented thus guides the advancement of meaningful research into the assessment of IP through an SDG lens. In regard to future work it is

suggested that further research is required in order to develop an integrated framework to link global level SDGs with project level features and outputs. Such a framework should then be tested through appropriate empirical studies, such as through a large-scale survey of practitioners engaged on IP delivery as well as through case study research on mega projects that need to be linked to the achievement of SDG outcomes.

## References

- Aarseth, W., Ahola, T., Aaltonen, K., Økland, A. and Andersen, B. (2017), “Project sustainability strategies: a systematic literature review”, *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 35 No. 6, pp. 1071–1083. 10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.11.006
- Ainger, C.M. and Fenner, R.A. (2014), *Sustainable infrastructure: principles into practice*. London, UK: ICE publishing.
- Anwar, B., Xiao, Z., Akter, S. and Rehman, R.-U. (2017), “Sustainable urbanization and development goals strategy through Public–Private partnerships in a South-Asian Metropolis”, *Sustainability*, Vol. 9 No. 11, p. 1940. 10.3390/su9111940
- Aust, V., Morais, A.I. and Pinto, I. (2020), “How does foreign direct investment contribute to sustainable development goals? Evidence from African countries”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 245 No. 3, 118823. 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118823
- Baumeister, R.F. and Leary, M.R. (1997), “Writing narrative literature reviews”, *Review of General Psychology*



- chology, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 311–320. 10.1037/1089-2680.1.3.311
- Brundtland, G.H. (1987), “What is sustainable development”, *Our common future*, Vol. 8 No. 9.
- Cheng, S., Li, Z., Uddin, S.M.N., Mang, H.-P., Zhou, X., Zhang, J., Zheng, L. and Zhang, L. (2018), “Toilet revolution in China”, *Journal of environmental management*, Vol. 216, pp. 347–356. 10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.09.043
- Ciegis, R., Ramanauskiene, J. and Martinkus, B. (2009), “The concept of sustainable development and its use for sustainability scenarios”, *Engineering economics*, Vol. 62 No. 2.
- Cooke-Davies, T. (2007), “The “real” success factors on programmes”. In: Morris and Pinto, J, ed, *The Wiley Guide to Managing Projects*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. pp. 106–108.
- Costanza, R. and Patten, B.C. (1995), “Defining and predicting sustainability”, *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 193–196. 10.1016/0921-8009(95)00048-8
- da Silva, L., Marques Prietto, P.D. Pavan Korf, E., Domingos, P. and Prietto, M. (2019), “Sustainability indicators for urban solid waste management in large and medium-sized worldwide cities”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 237, 117802. 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.117802
- Dean, K., Trillo, C. and Bichard, E. (2017), “Assessing the value of housing schemes through sustainable return on investment: a path towards Sustainability-Led evaluations?” *Sustainability*, Vol. 9 No. 12, p. 2264. 10.3390/su9122264
- Di Vaio, A. and Varriale, L. (2018), “Management innovation for environmental sustainability in seaports: managerial accounting instruments and training for competitive green ports beyond the regulations”, *Sustainability*, Vol. 10 No. 3, p. 783. 10.3390/su10030783
- Diaz-Sarachaga, J.M., Jato-Espino, D., Alsulami, B. and Castro-Fresno, D. (2016), “Evaluation of existing sustainable infrastructure rating systems for their application in developing countries”, *Ecological Indicators*, Vol. 71 No. 6, pp. 491–502. 10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.07.033
- Ding, X., Zhou, C., Mauerhofer, V., Zhong, W. and Li, G. (2019), “From environmental soundness to sustainable development: improving applicability of payment for ecosystem services scheme for diverting regional sustainability transition in developing countries”, *Sustainability*, Vol. 11 No. 2, p. 361. 10.3390/su11020361
- Dushenko, M., Thærie Bjorbæk, C. and Steger-Jensen, K. (2018), “Application of a sustainability model for assessing the relocation of a container terminal: a case study of Kristiansand Port”, *Sustainability*, Vol. 11 No. 1, 87. 87–18. 10.3390/su11010087
- Elkington, J. (1994), “Towards the sustainable Corporation: Win-win-win business strategies for sustainable development”, *California Management Review*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 90–100. 10.2307/41165746
- Elkington, J. (2013), “Enter the triple bottom line”. *The triple bottom line*. London, UK: Routledge. pp. 23–38.
- Elkington, J. (2018), *25 Years Ago, I Coined the Phrase “Triple Bottom Line.” Here’s Why It’s Time to Re-think It*, *Harvard Business Review*. 25 June 2018.
- Emas, R. (2015), “The concept of sustainable development: definition and defining principles”, *Brief for GSDR*, Vol. 2015. 10.13140/RG.2.2.34980.22404
- Engert, S., Rauter, R. and Baumgartner, R.J. (2016), “Exploring the integration of corporate sustainability into strategic management: a literature review”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 112 No. 4, pp. 2833–2850. 10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.08.031
- Executive Office of the President, Office of Science and Technology Policy. (1989), *The Federal High-Performance Computing Program*. pp. 49–50.
- Farinosi, F., Giupponi, C., Reynaud, A., Ceccherini, G., Carmona-Moreno, C., De Roo, A., Gonzalez-Sanchez, D. and Bidoglio, G. (2018), “An innovative approach to the assessment of hydro-political risk: a spatially explicit, data driven indicator of hydro-political issues”, *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 52, pp. 286–313. 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2018.07.001
- Fenner, R.A., Ainger, C.M., Cruickshank, H.J. and Guthrie, P.M. (2006), “Widening engineering horizons: addressing the complexity of sustainable development”ed. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Engineering Sustainability*. vol. 159. London, UK: Thomas Telford Ltd. pp. 145–154, (12). 10.1680/ensu.2006.159.4.145
- Fuldauer, L.I., Ives, M.C., Adshead, D., Thacker, S. and Hall, J.W. (2019), “Participatory planning of the future of waste management in small island developing states to deliver on the sustainable development goals”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 223, pp. 147–162. 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.02.269
- Glavič, P. and Lukman, R. (2007), “Review of sustainability terms and their definitions”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 15 No. 18, pp. 1875–1885. 10.1016/j.jclepro.2006.12.006



- Global Infrastructure Outlook. (2019), “Infrastructure Investment need in the Compact with African countries”, available at: [https://outlook.gihub.org/?utm\\_source=GIHub+Homepage&utm\\_medium=Project+tile&utm\\_campaign=Outlook+GIHub+Tile](https://outlook.gihub.org/?utm_source=GIHub+Homepage&utm_medium=Project+tile&utm_campaign=Outlook+GIHub+Tile) [accessed 23 Jul 2019].
- Goel, A., Ganesh, L.S. and Kaur, A. (2019), “Sustainability integration in the management of construction projects: A morphological analysis of over two decades’ research literature”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 236 No. 2, 117676. 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.117676
- Griggs, D., Stafford-Smith, M., Gaffney, O., Rockström, J., Öhman, M.C., Shyamsundar, P., Steffen, W., Glaser, G., Kanie, N. and Noble, I. (2013), “Policy: sustainable development goals for people and planet”, *Nature*, Vol. 495 No. 7441, 305. 10.1038/495305a
- Hall, R., Ranganathan, S. and G. C., R. (2017), “A general Micro-Level modeling approach to analyzing interconnected SDGs: achieving SDG 6 and more through Multiple-Use water services (Mus)”, *Sustainability*, Vol. 9 No. 2, p. 314. 10.3390/su9020314
- Hartshorn, J., Maher, M., Crooks, J., Stahl, R. and Bond, Z. (2005), “Creative destruction: building toward sustainability”, *Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 170–180. 10.1139/104-119
- Head, B.W. and Alford, J. (2015), “Wicked problems: implications for public policy and management”, *Administration & Society*, Vol. 47 No. 6, pp. 711–739.
- Heravi, G., Fathi, M. and Faeghi, S. (2017), “Multi-criteria group decision-making method for optimal selection of sustainable industrial building options focused on petrochemical projects”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 142 No. 2, pp. 2999–3013. 10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.10.168
- Holling, C.S. (2001), “Understanding the complexity of economic, ecological, and social systems”, *Ecosystems*, Vol. 4 No. 5, pp. 390–405. 10.1007/s10021-001-0101-5
- Jama, A.A. and Mourad, K.A. (2019), “Water services sustainability: institutional arrangements and shared responsibilities”, *Sustainability*, Vol. 11 No. 3, p. 916. 10.3390/su11030916
- Jarvis, C. B., MacKenzie, S. B. and Podsakoff, P. M. (2003), “A critical review of construct indicators and measurement model misspecification in marketing and consumer research”, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 199–218. 10.1086/376806
- Jenner, S. (2016), *Transforming government and public services: realising benefits through project portfolio management*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Kibert, C.J. (2013), *Sustainable construction: Green building design and delivery*. 3rd ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Klaufus, C., van Lindert, P., van Noorloos, F. and Steel, G. (2017), “All-inclusiveness versus exclusion: urban project development in Latin America and Africa”, *Sustainability*, Vol. 9 No. 11, p. 2038. 10.3390/su9112038
- Lavagnon, A.I. (2009), “Project success as a topic in project management journals”, *Project Management Journal* No. , Vol. 40 No. 4. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.20137>
- Liberati, A., Altman, D.G., Tetzlaff, J., Mulrow, C., Gøtzsche, P.C., Ioannidis, J.P. and Moher, D. (2009), “The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration”, *Annals of Internal Medicine*, Vol. 151 No. 4, W-65. 10.7326/0003-4819-151-4-200908180-00136
- Lucas, P.L., Hilderink, H.B.M., Janssen, P.H.M., KC, S., van Vuuren, D.P. and Niessen, L. (2019), “Future impacts of environmental factors on achieving the SDG target on child mortality—A synergistic assessment”, *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 57 No. 9890, p. 101925. 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2019.05.009
- Makino, T., Noda, K., Keokhamphui, K., Hamada, H., Oki, K. and Oki, T. (2016), “The effects of five forms of capital on thought processes underlying water consumption behavior in suburban Vientiane”, *Sustainability*, Vol. 8 No. 6, p. 538. 10.3390/su8060538
- Martens, M.L. and Carvalho, M.M. (2016b), “Sustainability and success variables in the project management context: an expert panel”, *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 47 No. 6, pp. 24–43. 10.1177/875697281604700603
- Martens, M.L. and Carvalho, M.M. (2017), “Key factors of sustainability in project management context: A survey exploring the project managers’ perspective”, *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 35 No. Issue 6, pp. 1084–1102. 10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.04.004
- Mebratu, D. (1998), “Sustainability and sustainable development: historical and conceptual review”, *Environmental impact assessment review* No. , Vol. 18 No. 6, pp. 493–520. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-9255\(98\)00019-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-9255(98)00019-5)
- Menhas, R., Mahmood, S., Tanchangya, P., Safdar, M.N. and Hussain, S. (2019), “Sustainable Develop-

- ment under Belt and Road Initiative: A Case Study of China-Pakistan Economic Corridor's Socio-Economic Impact on Pakistan", *Sustainability*, Vol. 11 No. 21, p. 6143. 10.3390/su11216143
- Mertz, D.R. (2005), "Grand challenges: a strategic plan for bridge engineering, NCHRP project 20-07/Task 199, transportation research board, Washington, DC".
- Monteiro, N.B.R., Moita Neto, J.M. and da Silva, E.A. (2018), "Bibliometric study of the crushed stone mining sector", *Mineral Processing and Extractive Metallurgy Review*, Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 235–249. 10.1080/08827508.2018.1433174
- Moore, J.E., Mascarenhas, A., Bain, J. and Straus, S.E. (2017), "Developing a comprehensive definition of sustainability", *Implementation science: IS*, Vol. 12 No. 1, p. 110. 10.1186/s13012-017-0637-1
- Morris, P. (2013), *Reconstructing Programme Management*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Morris, P. (2017), "Climate Change and what the project management profession should be doing about it. Association for Project Management", available at: <https://www.apm.org.uk/media/7496/climate-change-report.pdf> [accessed 11 May 2018].
- Müller, R., Drouin, N. and Sankaran, S. (2019), "Modeling organizational project management", *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 50 No. 4, pp. 499–513. 10.1177/8756972819847876
- Munyasya, B. and Chileshe, N. (2018), "Towards sustainable infrastructure development: drivers, barriers, strategies, and coping mechanisms", *Sustainability*, Vol. 10 No. 12, p. 4341. 10.3390/su10124341
- Omenn, G.S. (2006), "Presidential address: grand challenges and great opportunities in science, technology, and public policy", *Science*, Vol. 314 No. 5806, pp. 1696–1704. 10.1126/science.1135003
- Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). (2019), "Measuring Distance to the SDG Targets 2019: An Assessment of Where OECD Countries Stand", available at: [https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/measuring-distance-to-the-sdg-targets-2019\\_a8caf3fa-en#page1](https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/measuring-distance-to-the-sdg-targets-2019_a8caf3fa-en#page1) [accessed 15 Jul 2019].
- Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F.S., Lambin, E.F., Lenton, T.M., Scheffer, M., Folke, C., Schellnhuber, H.J., Nykvist, B., de Wit, C.A., Hughes, T., van der Leeuw, S., Rodhe, H., Sörlin, S., Snyder, P.K., Costanza, R., Svedin, U., Falkenmark, M., Karlberg, L., Corell, R.W., Fabry, V.J., Hansen, J., Walker, B., Liverman, D., Richardson, K., Crutzen, P. and Foley, J.A. (2009), "A safe operating space for humanity", *Nature*, Vol. 461 No. 7263, pp. 472–475. 10.1038/461472a
- Sachs, J., Schmidt-Traub, G., Kroll, C., Durand-Delacre, D. and Teksoz, K. (2016), *SDG index & dashboards: A global report*. Gütersloh, Germany: Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Sakhriani, V., Chinowsky, P. S. and Taylor, J. (2016), "Grand challenges in engineering project organization", *The Engineering Project Organization Journal*, Vol. 7, pp. 1–18. 10.25219/epoj.2017.00102
- Schwanitz, V., Wierling, A. and Shah, P. (2017), "Assessing the impact of renewable energy on regional Sustainability—A comparative study of Sogn OG Fjordane (Norway) and Okinawa (Japan)", *Sustainability*, Vol. 9 No. 11, p. 1969. 10.3390/su9111969
- Seinfeld, J.H. and Pandis, S.N. (2016), *Atmospheric chemistry and physics: from air pollution to climate change*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Shen, L.-yin., Tam, V.W.Y., Tam, L. Ji, Y.-bo, Shen, L., Ji, Y. (2010), "Project feasibility study: the key to successful implementation of sustainable and socially responsible construction management practice", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 254–259. 10.1016/j.jclepro.2009.10.014
- Silvius, G., Schipper, R., Planko, J., van der Brink, J. and Köhler, A. (2012), *Sustainability in project management*. Surrey: Gower Publishing Limited.
- Sperling, J., Romero-Lankao, P. and Beig, G. (2016), "Exploring citizen infrastructure and environmental priorities in Mumbai, India", *Environmental Science & Policy*, Vol. 60 No. 1, pp. 19–27. 10.1016/j.envsci.2016.02.006
- Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., Cornell, S.E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E.M., Biggs, R., Carpenter, S.R., de Vries, W., de Wit, C.A., Folke, C., Gerten, D., Heinke, J., Mace, G.M., Persson, L.M., Ramathan, V., Sörlin, S. and Sörlin, S. (2015), "Sustainability. planetary boundaries: guiding human development on a changing planet", *Science*, Vol. 347 No. 6223, 1259855. 10.1126/science.1259855
- Sverdrup, H. and Rosen, K. (1998), "Long-Term base cation mass balances for Swedish forests and the concept of sustainability", *Forest Ecology and Management*, Vol. 110 No. 1-3, pp. 221–236. 10.1016/S0378-1127(98)00283-7
- Teferi, Z.A. and Newman, P. (2018), "Slum upgrading: can the 1.5 °C carbon reduction work with SDGs in these settlements?" *Urban Planning*, Vol. 3 No. 2 52–63. 10.17645/up.v3i2.1239
- Terrapon-Pfaff, J., Ortiz, W., Dienst, C. and Gröne, M.-C. (2018), "Energising the WEF nexus to enhance sustainable development at local level", *Journal of*



- environmental management*, Vol. 223, pp. 409–416. 10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.06.037
- Thacker, S., Adshead, D., Fay, M., Hallegatte, S., Harvey, M., Meller, H., O'Regan, N., Rozenberg, J., Watkins, G. and Hall, J.W. (2019), "Infrastructure for sustainable development", *Nature Sustainability*, Vol. 2 No. 4 324–331. 10.1038/s41893-019-0256-8
- Thacker, S. and Hall, J. (2018), *Engineering for Sustainable Development*. Oxford, UK: Infrastructure Transition Research Consortium (ITRC), University of Oxford.
- Thiry, M. (2004), "Value Management". In: Morris P, Pinto J, eds, *Wiley Guide to Managing Projects*. Holbrooken, NJ: Wiley.
- Torraco, R.J. (2005), "Writing integrative literature reviews: guidelines and examples", *Human Resource Development Review*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 356–367. 10.1177/1534484305278283
- Tranfield, D., Denyer, D. and Smart, P. (2003), "Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 207–222. 10.1111/1467-8551.00375
- United Nations. (2015), *Transforming Our World: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development, Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly*. United Nations, New York: .
- United Nations. (2018), "The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2018", available at: <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/report/2018/TheSustainableDevelopmentGoalsReport2018-EN.pdf> [accessed 15 Jul 2019].
- United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2018), "Global warming of 1.5°C, an IPCC special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty".
- United Nations Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. (2019), "Report of the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services on the work of its seventh session", available at: [https://www.ipbes.net/system/tdf/ipbes\\_7\\_10\\_add-1-advance\\_0.pdf?file=1&type=node&id=35245](https://www.ipbes.net/system/tdf/ipbes_7_10_add-1-advance_0.pdf?file=1&type=node&id=35245) [accessed 15 Jul 2019].
- Wong, K.K.K. (2013), "Partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) techniques using SmartPLS", *Marketing Bulletin*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 1–32.
- Zhang, Q., Liu, S., Wang, T., Dai, X., Baninla, Y., Nakatani, J. and Moriguchi, Y. (2019), "Urbanization impacts on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of the water infrastructure in China: trade-offs among sustainable development goals (SDGs)", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 232 No. 1, pp. 474–486. 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.05.333
- Zuofa, T. and Ochieng, E. (2016), "Sustainability in construction project delivery: a study of experienced project managers in Nigeria", *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 47 No. 6, pp. 44–55. 10.1177/875697281604700604
- Økland, A. (2015), "Gap analysis for incorporating sustainability in project management", *Procedia Computer Science*, Vol. 64 No. 2, pp. 103–109. 10.1016/j.procs.2015.08.469

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1 - Table of data across the seven SDG-IP Thematics

The main data points from the SLR analysis have been collated into the table below that summarises the key thematics across the seven codified areas. This provides a high-level overview of the focus areas of the selected dataset.

Combined search keywords	Authors	Article title	Type of contribution	Primary research design	Primary geographical focus	Infrastructure sector focus	Industry / Narrowed Sector	Level	SDGs mentioned
SDG & Project	Hall et al. (2017)	A general micro-level modelling approach to analysing interconnected SDGs: Achieving SDG 6 and more through multiple-use water services (MUS)	Framework proposition	Multiple case study	Mozambique	Water	Rural water services	Project; Organisational	SDG 6
SDG & Project	Klaufus et al. (2017)	All-inclusiveness versus exclusion: Urban project development in Latin America and Africa	Framework proposition	Multiple case study	Latin America & Africa	Urban development	N/A	Local; Sectoral	SDG 11
SDG & Project	Farinosi et al. (2018)	An innovative approach to the assessment of hydro-political risk: A spatially explicit, data driven indicator of hydro-political issues	Framework proposition	Empirical analysis	Global	Water	Trans-boundary resources	Global	SDG 6.5.2
SDG & Project	Dean et al. (2017)	Assessing the value of housing schemes through sustainable return on investment: A path towards sustainability-led evaluations?	Framework testing	Multiple case study	United Kingdom	Housing	Social housing	Project	SDG 11
SDG & Project	Goel et al. (2019)	Deductive content analysis of research on sustainable construction in India: current progress and future directions	Framework proposition	Systematic literature review	India with developing economy reach	Not specified	Construction	Industry	General
SDG & Project	Heravi et al. (2017)	Evaluation of sustainability indicators of industrial buildings focused on petrochemical projects	Theoretical	Empirical analysis	Iran	Buildings	Industrial (Petro-chemical)	Industry	General
SDG & Project	Ding et al. (2019)	From environmental soundness to sustainable development: Improving applicability of payment for ecosystem services scheme for diverting regional sustainability transition in developing countries	Framework proposition	Single case study	China	Water	Water transfer	Regional; National	General
SDG & Project	Lucas et al. (2019)	Future impacts of environmental factors on achieving the SDG target on child mortality—A synergistic assessment	Framework testing	Empirical analysis	Global	Health, Water, Energy Nexus	N/A	Global	General
SDG & Project	Ishikawa Y., Murata M., Kawaguchi T.	Globally applicable water quality simulation model for river basin chemical risk assessment	Framework testing	Single case study	Japan	Water & Sanitation	River basins; Water quality	Organisational	General
SDG & Project	Wang W., Chen J., Liu Q., Guo Z.	Green project planning with realistic multi-objective consideration in developing sustainable port	Framework proposition	Single case study	China	Port	N/A	Sectoral	General, leaning towards environmental
SDG & Project	Zhang L., Chu Z., He Q., Zhai P.	Investigating the constraints to building information modelling (BIM) applications for sustainable building projects: A case of China	Exploratory	Empirical analysis	China	Buildings	Sustainable buildings	Local; Sectoral	General
SDG & Project	Calderón Márquez A.J., Cassettari Filho P.C., Rutkowski E.W., de Lima Isaac R.	Landfill mining as a strategic tool towards global sustainable development	Exploratory	Multiple case study	North America, Europe, Asia and the Middle East	Waste management	Solid Waste	Regional; Global	General
SDG & Project & Infrastructure	Dushenko et al. (2018)	Application of a sustainability model for assessing the relocation of a container terminal: A case study of kristians and port	Framework testing	Single case study	Scandinavia	Port	N/A	Industry	General
SDG & Project & Infrastructure	Terrapon-Pfaff et al. (2018)	Energising the WEF nexus to enhance sustainable development at local level	Framework testing	Empirical analysis	Global south	Water, Energy, Food Nexus	N/A	Project	General

Combined search keywords	Authors	Article title	Type of contribution	Primary research design	Primary geographical focus	Infrastructure sector focus	Industry / Narrowed Sector	Level	SDGs mentioned
SDG & Project & Infrastructure	Menhas et al. (2019)	Sustainable development under Belt and Road Initiative: A case study of China-Pakistan Economic Corridor's socio-economic impact on Pakistan	Theoretical	Single case study	Pakistan	Multi-sector	N/A	Regional	General
SDG & Project & Infrastructure	Anwar et al. (2017)	Sustainable urbanisation and development goals strategy through public-private partnerships in a South-Asian metropolis	Theoretical	Multiple case study	South Asia	Urban development	Mega-cities; PPPs	Regional	SDG 11
SDG & Infrastructure	Schwanitz et al. (2017)	Assessing the impact of renewable energy on regional sustainability-A comparative study of Sogn og Fjordane (Norway) and Okinawa (Japan)	Framework proposition	Multiple case study	Norway; Japan	Energy	Renewable energy	Regional	General
SDG & Infrastructure	Diaz-Sarachaga et al. (2016)	Evaluation of LEED for neighbourhood development and envision rating frameworks for their implementation in poorer countries	Framework testing	Multiple case study	Developing countries	Urban development	N/A	Project	General
SDG & Infrastructure	Sperling et al. (2016)	Exploring citizen Infrastructure and environmental priorities in Mumbai, India	Theoretical	Empirical analysis	India	Urban development	N/A	Local	General, leaning towards SDG 11
SDG & Infrastructure	Aust et al. (2020)	How does foreign direct investment contribute to Sustainable Development Goals? Evidence from African countries	Theoretical	Empirical analysis	Africa (44 countries)	Multi-sector	N/A	National; Regional	General, leaning towards SDG 13
SDG & Infrastructure	Wei X., Xu H., Zhang B., Li J.	Infrastructure operation efficiency and influential factors in developing countries: Evidence from China	Exploratory	Multiple case study	China	Roads	Expressways; Toll road operations	Industry	General
SDG & Infrastructure	Fuldauer et al. (2019)	Participatory planning of the future of waste management in small island developing states to deliver on the Sustainable Development Goals	Framework proposition	Single case study	Curacao	Waste management	N/A	National	General
SDG & Infrastructure	Zheng B., Bedra K.B.	Recent sustainability performance in China: Strength-weakness analysis and ranking of provincial cities	Framework proposition	Empirical analysis	China	Urban development	N/A	Local	General
SDG & Infrastructure	Di Vaio and Varriale (2018)	SDGs and airport sustainable performance: Evidence from Italy on organisational, accounting and reporting practices through financial and non-financial disclosure	Framework testing	Multiple case study	Italy	Airports	N/A	Organisational; Industry	SDG 11, 17
SDG & Infrastructure	Teferi and Newman (2018)	Slum regeneration and sustainability: Applying the Extended Metabolism Model and the SDGs	Framework testing	Single case study	Ethiopia	Urban development	Slums and settlements	Local	SDG 1
SDG & Infrastructure	da Silva et al. (2019)	Sustainability indicators for urban solid waste management in large and medium-sized worldwide cities	Framework testing	Multiple case study	Brazil	Waste management	Solid waste	Local	General
SDG & Infrastructure	Monteiro et al. (2018)	Sustainable development goals in mining	Exploratory	Multiple case study	Brazil	Mining	N/A	Industry	SDG 1, 2, 5, 8, 13
SDG & Infrastructure	Makino et al. (2016)	The effects of five forms of capital on thought processes underlying water consumption behaviour in suburban vientiane	Framework testing	Empirical analysis	Vientiane, Lao	Water	Water supply	Local	General
SDG & Infrastructure	Cheng et al. (2018)	Toilet revolution in China	Exploratory	Literature review	China	Sanitation	N/A	National	General, leaning towards SDG 6
SDG & Infrastructure	Munyasya and Chileshe (2018)	Towards Sustainable Infrastructure Development: Drivers, barriers, strategies, and coping mechanisms	Theoretical	Empirical analysis	Australia	Not specified	Construction	Industry; Sectoral	General
SDG & Infrastructure	Zhang et al. (2019)	Urbanisation impacts on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of the water Infrastructure in China: Trade-offs among sustainable development goals (SDGs)	Framework testing	Empirical analysis	China	Water, Energy Nexus	N/A	Local; Regional	SDG 6, 11, 13
SDG & Infrastructure	Jama and Mourad (2019)	Water services sustainability: Institutional arrangements and shared responsibilities	Theoretical	Empirical analysis	Somalia	Water	Water supply	Sectoral; National	SDG 6.1, emphasising its link to many others



## Appendix 2 – Summary of the Level two research Issues and sub-issues examined within the top 13 most relevant articles.

The nodal structure shown at Figure 8 is expanded below in Table 7.

Authors	SDG-IP research issue	Sub-Issue	Research issues and thematics extracted from the selected most relevant (based on keyword occurrence articles)
Hall et al. (2017)	Cascading from Global to the local level	Policy to Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The challenge now facing development organisations and governments is how to operationalize this interconnected set of goals and targets through effective projects and programmes.</li> </ul>
		Micro-level OPM modelling approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This paper presents a micro-level modelling approach that can quantitatively assess the impacts associated with rural water interventions that are tailored to specific communities.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The multilevel modelling framework provides a generalizable template that can be used in multiple sectors</li> </ul>
Dean et al. (2017)	Definition and evaluation of Project Success	Inclusion of socio-economic assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current evaluative methods that support decision making on social housing interventions fail to capture all of the socio-environmental value contained in the UN SDG 11.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The paper addresses the issue by demonstrating how Sustainable Return on Investment can successfully describe and analyse a range of externalities related to the sustainable value generated by social housing regeneration schemes.</li> </ul>
		Inclusion of environmental and socio-economic assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The findings show that, historically, the environmental and social value of regeneration schemes have been largely disregarded because of a gap in the evaluation methods, and that there is room for significant improvement for future evaluation exercises.</li> </ul>
Goel et al. (2019)	Sustainable Construction	Lack of relevant research for project levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is lack of studies that synthesise and critically evaluate the available literature to provide an overview of the current state of sustainable construction (SC) research in India and provide directions for future research</li> </ul>
		Lack of relevant research for project levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current SC research endeavours are predominantly oriented towards the macro-industry level, the environmental dimension and the internal stakeholders.</li> </ul>
		Outputs versus outcomes success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additionally, more emphasis has been provided on the final project deliverable compared to the project processes.</li> </ul>
		Research approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall, this study makes three specific contributions [of which the first two are]: i) the current thrust areas of SC research in India have been identified while pointing out the imbalance in this academic pursuit; ii) a deductive content analysis framework has been developed that provides a generic template for conducting similar SLRs in the context of other countries</li> </ul>
Zhang L., Chu Z., He Q., Zhai P.	Application of BIM technology for sustainability	Challenges to delivery of sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conducted a questionnaire survey with 389 respondents to investigate the applications of BIM technology in sustainable building projects. The results showed that there were four main constraining factors: "Public participation", "technology application", "economic cost", and "application management" "public participation" was particularly important.</li> </ul>
		Opportunities for delivery of sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The study offers practical and managerial implications based on the findings for local government and the private sector</li> </ul>
Dushenko et al. (2018)	Practical application of Theoretical sustainability models	Limitations of theoretical models	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When documenting a sustainable design of port projects, decision-makers use theoretical sustainability models to conceptualise features of a sustainable society. However, a major challenge for the decision-makers was that the sustainability assessment results did not show, as expected, the same results as those of three existing theoretical sustainability models.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The benchmark results indicate a disparity between the importance of what sustainability models describe and what is important in practice.</li> </ul>




Authors	SDG-IP research issue	Sub-Issue	Research issues and thematics extracted from the selected most relevant (based on keyword occurrence articles)
Terrapon-Pfaff et al. (2018)	Cascading from Global to the local level	Policy to Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Until now, the focus of WEF [water-energy-food] nexus discussions and applications has mainly been on national or global levels, macro-level drivers, material flows and large Infrastructure developments. This overlooks the fact that major nexus challenges are faced at local level.</li> </ul>
		Micro-level OPM modelling approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The study identifies the complex links which exist between sustainable energy projects and the food and water sectors and highlights that these needs are currently not systematically integrated into project design or project evaluation.</li> </ul>
		Outputs versus outcomes success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A more systematic approach, integrating the water and food pillars into energy planning at local level in the global south, is recommended to avoid trade-offs and enhance the development outcomes and impacts of energy projects.</li> </ul>
Schwanitz et al. (2017)	Definition and evaluation of Project Success	Policy to Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apply a range of assessment methods and study their usefulness as tools to identify trade-offs and to compare the sustainability performance. We calculate cross-sectoral footprints, self-sufficiency ratios and perform a simplified Energy-Water-Food nexus analysis.</li> </ul>
		Outputs versus outcomes success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We recommend a general upgrade to indicators and visualisation methods that look beyond averages and a fostering of infrastructure for data on sustainable development based on harmonised international protocols.</li> </ul>
		Research approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We warn against rankings of countries or regions based on benchmarks that are neither theory-driven nor location-specific.</li> </ul>
Diaz-Sarachaga et al. (2016)	Definition and evaluation of Project Success	Policy to Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green rating systems have been launched during the last decades to facilitate the assessment of sustainable development in terms of building and infrastructure, including the evaluation of sustainable urban development through the study of communities. The absence of metrics in the New Urban Agenda led to relate its commitments to the SDGs, which revealed that the prerequisites and credits included in LEED ND and Envision mainly focused on managerial and environmental aspects and disregarded the economic and social dimensions. Consequently, the premises under which LEED ND and Envision were developed must be updated and complemented with the two latest guidelines recently adopted by the United Nations in the field of urban and sustainable development.</li> </ul>
Sperling et al. (2016)	Cascading from Global to the local level	Policy to Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With growing discussion and tensions surrounding the new urban sustainable development goal, announced by the UN in late September 2015, and a new global urban agenda document to be agreed upon at 'Habitat III', issues on whether sustainable urbanisation priorities should be set at the international, national or local level remain controversial.</li> </ul>
		Micro-level OPM modelling approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As such, this study aims to first understand determinants of and variations in local priorities across one city, with implications discussed for local-to-global urban sustainability.</li> </ul>
Aust et al. (2020)	Investment priorities in SDG	Policy to Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The public and the private sectors play fundamental roles in mobilising capital to achieve the 2030 Agenda of Sustainable Development. In particular, developing countries can benefit from foreign direct investment (FDI) as a source of external financing in the private sector. This study aims to investigate whether FDI contributes to the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Africa. We analyse a sample of 44 African countries regarding their SDG scores and apply a multivariate analysis and an ordered profit model.</li> </ul>
		Opportunities for delivery of sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our results indicate that the presence of foreign investors positively influences SDG scores.</li> </ul>
		Challenges to delivery of sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>However, although FDI has a positive impact in areas such as basic infrastructure, clean water, sanitation, and renewable energy, some adverse environmental consequences may occur for host countries. In fact, the relationship between FDI and the probability of achieving SDG13 (Climate action) is negative.</li> </ul>
		Policy to Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This study contributes to the literature on sustainable development and can be useful for decision-makers in developing investment plans to support the achievement of SDGs.</li> </ul>
		Policy to Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Furthermore, we provide evidence of a positive influence of FDI on the SDGs, which might encourage further investments in Africa.</li> </ul>




Authors	SDG-IP research issue	Sub-Issue	Research issues and thematics extracted from the selected most relevant (based on keyword occurrence articles)
Di Vaio and Varriale (2018)	Investment priorities in SDG	Policy to Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This article investigates the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Agenda introduced by the United Nations, 2015 in 2015 outlining if and which organisational, accounting and reporting practices are adopted to sustainable performance. Specifically, adopting the sustainability disclosure framework, we analyse how firms within the airport industry achieve the SDGs 11 and 17 showing how the initiatives are developed and implemented.</li> </ul>
		Research approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The article conducts a qualitative study through the reading and processing of financial statements and non-financial reports (sustainability and social reporting) of seven major strategic airport infrastructures in Italy to outline the initiatives implemented for meeting the SDGs.</li> </ul>
		Opportunities for delivery of sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This article outlines the need to create conditions for developing and better implementing the accounting and reporting practices, like the SBSC (Sustainable Balanced Scorecard), as well as adequate organisational architectures and educational training and management programmes for achieving the SDGs goals within firms.</li> </ul>
da Silva et al. (2019)	Definition and evaluation of Project Success	Policy to Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This work aimed to select a relevant set of sustainability indicators to analyse municipal solid waste management (MSWM) in large and medium-sized worldwide cities and to apply these findings in three municipalities located in the state of Rio Grande do Sul, in southern Brazil.</li> </ul>
		Policy to Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The result was the selection of a set of 49 indicators for application in a case study. It was only possible to measure 11 indicators with the information publicly available for the three Brazilian cities studied, demonstrating the fragility of information regarding sustainability issues.</li> </ul>
		Challenges to delivery of sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Also, data related to social issues and natural and energy resources were insufficient for indicators to be measured. The analysis revealed difficulties regarding the availability of information in databases...</li> </ul>
Munyasya and Chileshe (2018)	Drivers of Sustainable Infrastructure	Opportunities for delivery of sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While there is a plethora of studies around sustainable infrastructure, there are limited studies undertaken on the influencing drivers and barriers particularly within the South Australian construction industry.</li> </ul>
		Challenges to delivery of sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Lack of steering mechanism", "multi-disciplinary nature of the word "sustainability", and "lack of cooperation and networking" were the critical barriers.</li> </ul>


### Appendix 3 – Full Table of SLR data (1651 artefacts) – (digital data available on request)







The image shows a screenshot of a spreadsheet application displaying the first page of a large table. The table has a complex header structure with multiple columns, some of which are color-coded (red, yellow, green, blue). The data rows are densely packed and also feature color-coding. A large, semi-transparent watermark reading "Page 1" is centered over the spreadsheet content.






This image shows a continuation of the spreadsheet from the previous page, displaying the second page of data. The layout, including the multi-column headers and color-coded data rows, remains consistent. A horizontal blue dashed line is visible across the middle of the page, likely indicating a scroll position or a page break.















The image shows a screenshot of a data analysis software interface. The main area is filled with a large table of data, where each row is color-coded in alternating bands of green, red, and blue. A large, semi-transparent watermark reading 'Page 12' is centered over the table. At the bottom of the interface, there is a navigation bar with several tabs: 'SLR Journal Analysis', 'SLR Keyword Results', 'SLR Thematic Analysis', 'SLR Top Articles (13)', 'SLR Reviewed (22)', 'SLR Screened (89)', and 'SLR Dataset (1651)'. The 'SLR Dataset (1651)' tab is currently selected and highlighted in blue.