



Volume 12, Issue 2, March-April 2025

Impact Factor: 8.152



INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SERIAL NUMBER INDIA







🌐 www.ijarety.in 🛛 🎽 editor.ijarety@gmail.com

| ISSN: 2394-2975 | www.ijarety.in] | Impact Factor: 8.152 | A Bi-Monthly, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal |

|| Volume 12, Issue 2, March-April 2025 ||

DOI:10.15680/IJARETY.2025.1202033

Performance Comparison of Construction Project Delivery System

Miss. Divya G. Ingale¹, Prof. Hemant Dahake²

Student M. Tech, Dept. of Civil Engineering, G. H. Raisoni University, Amaravati, India¹

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Civil Engineering, G. H. Raisoni University, Amaravati, India²

ABSTRACT: Projects can be delivered through several accepted project delivery systems, some of which have evolved over the last few decades. Success or failure of any project is greatly influenced by the performance of cost, time and quality aspects of a project. As these systems have evolved, construction researchers have attempted to better understand the benefits of these systems. Design-Bid-Build (DBB), Design-Build (DB), CM-at-Risk (CMAR) are the three principal project delivery systems in the construction Industry excluding their hybrids, operational and financing modes. To improve the performance of DBB, DB and CMAR project delivery systems, an Agency Construction Management (Agency CM) is added to each of them. The Design-Bid-Build (DBB) system is the most frequently used delivery method for construction projects. The study included literature review, designing a questionnaire, collecting data from 4 projects of Amaravati city.

KEYWORDS: Design-Bid-Build, Design-Build, CM-at-Risk, Agency Construction Management.

I. INTRODUCTION

The global construction industry is expected to reach an estimated value of \$10.5 trillion by 2023. The major drivers of the construction industry are government spending, increasing population, high per capita income, and GDP growth. The future of the global construction industry looks good with opportunities in residential, non-residential, and infrastructure (Research and Markets, 2018). Increasing urbanization, easy credit availability, and rising consumer spending will also possibly boost the construction industry. Strong economic growth in developing nations, such as China, India, and the Middle East countries, is expected to further drive this industry.

Globally, Construction projects are suffering from cost overruns, time overruns and poor quality. The construction industry describes a successful building project as one that is completed on time, within budget constraints, and meets a certain quality standard.

Projects can be delivered through several accepted project delivery systems, some of which have evolved over the last few decades. Success or failure of any project is greatly influenced by the performance of cost, time and quality aspects of a project. As these systems have evolved, construction researchers have attempted to better understand the benefits of these systems. Research has varied from project specific cases, through opinion surveys, to empirical studies.

A. Agency Construction Management

Design-Bid-Build (DBB), Design-Build (DB), CM-at-Risk (CMAR) are the three principal project delivery systems in the construction Industry excluding their hybrids, operational and financing modes. Each of them has some disadvantages. These disadvantages affect the three major performance components of the project namely Cost, Time and Quality. It is reported that across the Construction Industry, including Architects, Engineers, Contractors and Owners, there appears to be a lack of consistency of opinion regarding the advantages and disadvantages of each method.

Agency Construction Management utilizes management techniques during the planning, design, construction and post construction phases of a project for the purpose of controlling the project cost, project schedule and project quality.

ISSN: 2394-2975 | www.ijarety.in] | Impact Factor: 8.152 | A Bi-Monthly, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal |

|| Volume 12, Issue 2, March-April 2025 ||

DOI:10.15680/IJARETY.2025.1202033



Fig 1 with and Without Agency CM

II. METHODOLOGY



Fig 2 Methodology

III. SITE SELECTIONS

A. Site 1- Heda Sky Tower

Heda Sky Tower is a residential project in Paranjpe Colony, Amravati. It is set in an area of 0.44 Acres. Heda Sky Tower offers Apartment.

B. Site 2- Daga Plazzo

Daga Plazzo is a commercial complex project Opp. D- Mart Mall, Camp, Amravati, It is set in an area of 0.44 Acres.

C. Site 3- Dreamz signature

Available configurations include 2 BHK formats in Shyam Nagar. It is a Under Construction project by Dreamz

| ISSN: 2394-2975 | www.ijarety.in| | Impact Factor: 8.152 | A Bi-Monthly, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal |

|| Volume 12, Issue 2, March-April 2025 ||

DOI:10.15680/IJARETY.2025.1202033

Infraspace. Dreamz Dreamz Signature is set in an area of 0.88 Acres and is complete with various modern-day amenities.

D. Site 4- Nanda Hilife

This project by Nanda Properties ensures an open lifestyle to its residents. The apartments, covering a total area of 0.45 acres, consists of 3,4,5 and 6 BHK apartments ranging from 1,164 to 2,747 sq. Ft Carpet Area.

IV. QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

Agency Construction Management questionnaire have been prepared by authors for Employee of the construction sites of Amaravati City for high-rise buildings. The study describes the analysis of research data collected during interviews with engineers/ Employee of the sites.



Above graph shows the result for responses collected from four different sites of the Amravati it shows 50 % for Nanda Hilife, 20.8% for Dreamz signature, 16.7% for Daga Plazzo, and 12.5% for Heda Sky Tower.



Above graph shows the result for responses collected for current construction managed by a CM agency and 79.2% are replied with No.



Above graph shows the result for responses collected for ACM influence the performance of project, and 95% of responses says yes for that.

| ISSN: 2394-2975 | www.ijarety.in| | Impact Factor: 8.152 | A Bi-Monthly, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal |

|| Volume 12, Issue 2, March-April 2025 ||

DOI:10.15680/IJARETY.2025.1202033



Above graph shows the result for responses collected for opinion for project delivery systems, respondence suggest the Design-Build (DB) with 41.7%, and CM-at-Risk (CMAR) with 33.3% with ACM both.

V. ANALYSIS IN MSP

Microsoft Project is really a computer database that uses two main tables of data to keep track of your project. Project uses one table to store information about the tasks of your project and the other for resource information.

A. Site For Msp - Site 2- Daga Plazzo

Daga Plazzo is a commercial complex project Opp. D- Mart Mall, Camp, Amravati, It is set in an area of 0.44 Acres

- Cost of project: 2.4 cr.
- Total Duration of completion 1.5 years





B. Scheduling In MSP

Ł	딊	9-	Ch -	1	GAULT CHART COCKS MSP - Project Professional (Product Activation Failed)	7 - 8			
11	ε.	TAS	K 1	IESOURCE	REPORT PROJECT VIEW FORMAT	Sign in [C] #			
and the second		lask lage -	Cale	vork (Xagte ndær * er Views * e	n - New Classors View - Parent Construction - New Classors View - New Classors V	Antitad Salt They Salt They Sa			
			7.00			Half 3 2023 Half 3 2023 Half 3 2023			
		θ	Mc+	WBS +	Task Nama .	H D J F M A M J J A S O N D J F M A M J			
	1		-	1	# DAGA PLAZZO	F			
	2		-	11	4 MOBILISATION	e 01-04			
	2	18	-	111	Mobilization of site	C .			
	4		-	11.2	Mobilisation of Civil contractor	4			
	5		-	12	 SUBSTRUCTURE 	<u> </u>			
	8		-	1.2.1	LARTH WORK	h			
			-3	1.2.2	ENCAVATION - Town Asea	JCB, Labour 1, Labour 2			
	1	~	-	123	11	Labour 1, Labour 2, Appregate [5 Brass], Cemer			
	2		-	1.2.4	Centre line checking and approval from Arch.	1			
	10		-	12.5	Feeting Shuttering	Carpainter 1, Carpainter 2, Carpaintor 3, Carpa			
	13		-	1.2.6	Footing Reinforcement	Fitter 1,Fitter 2,Fitter 3,Fitter 4,Fitter 5,Steel			
	12		-	127	Footing Casting	Labour 1, Labour 2, Labour 3, Labour 4, Labo			
	13		-	1.2.5	Planth column Shuttering	Carpainter 1, Carpainter 2, Carpainter 3, Car			
	14		-	12.9	Plath Column Reinforoment	Fitter 1, Fitter 2, Fitter 3, Fitter 4, Fitter 5, Ste			
	15		-	1.2.10	Plinth column Casting	Aggregate(1 Brass),Coment(1 bag),Labou			
	tá		-	1211	Feeting Excention Filling	JCB,Labour 1,Labour 2,Labour 3			
	17		-	12.12	Plath Sean Shutteing	Carpainter 1, Carpainter 2, Carpainter 3, C			
	10		-	1.2.13	Pinth bean Reinforcement	Fitter 1, Fitter 2, Fitter 3, Fitter 4, Fitter 5,			
	19		-	12.14	Pinth Beam casting	Aggregate[1 Brass],Coment[1 bag],Li			
	20		-	1.2.15	7 ding	1CB			
	21		-	12.16	Comparison	Labour 1, Vibrator			
	22		-	12.17	Planth Level Blab Casting	Aggregate[1 Brass],Cement[1 bag],La			
1			-	4.510	~	2 m.w			

Fig 4 Insert Task



| ISSN: 2394-2975 | www.ijarety.in] | Impact Factor: 8.152 | A Bi-Monthly, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal |

|| Volume 12, Issue 2, March-April 2025 ||

DOI:10.15680/IJARETY.2025.1202033

	11	K I	RESOURCE	ALFORT PADIECT VEW FORMAT	10065 MEP - P	sject Professional (Produc	Activation Failed]		7 - 6 X Signin 🏳 6 X
lartt kart *	Paste	¥ Ca Pà Ci ∳ Fo Club	et 1937 – Innat Pairte Ioard	Term New Rox - 9	 Mark on Track Respect Links Inactivate 	Manualy Schedule Schedule	Impact Move Mode	Sale Sale Sale Sale Sale Sale Sale Sale	Internation Intern
	0	Tai Me •	wes .	Task Name -	Duration +	Start	- 1666 -	Predecesso +	mail 1, 2022 mail 2, 2022 mail 1, 2023 N_D_I_I_F_MI_A_M_I_2_A_S_0_N_D_2_T_F_M_A_M_I
8.		100	1	+ DAGA PLAZZO	402 days?	Wed 30-43-22	Tue 11-07-23	2	
2		100	3.5	4 MOBILISATION	3 days	Wed 30-43-22	Fy100-84-22		@ 01-04
1	08	100	111	Mobilization of sits	2 days	WH6 20.03-22	The 31-43-22		C .
-4		-	112	Mobilipation of Civil contractor	3 days	Wed 30-03-22	Fei01-04-22	355	L.
5		-	1.2	SUBSTRUCTURE	71 days	Set 02-84-32	Thu 13-86-22	2	<u> </u>
6		100	1.2.1	EARTH WORK	4 days	Set 02-04-22	Wed 16-04-22		h
		-	122	ENCAVATION -Tenner Area	7 days	Fm 08-04-22	Fil 13-04-22	6	JCB,Labour 1,Labour 2
1	4	-	1.2.3	18	6 days	Sat 16-04-22	Fei 22-04-22	7	Labour 1,Labour 2,Aggregate(5 Brais),Cement
. 4		-	1.2.4	Centre line checking and approval from Arch.	3 days	Sat 23-04-22	Tue 26-04-22	1	A second s second second sec
to		100	1.2.5	Footing Shutteing	4 days	Wed 23-04-22	Sat 33-04-22	9	Carpainter 1, Carpainter 2, Carpainter 3, Carpai
11		-	12.6	Footing Reinforcement	3 days	Dna 28-04-22	Sat 30-04-22	10FS-3 days	Fitter 1, Fitter 2, Fitter 3, Fitter 4, Fitter 5, Steel
12		-	1.2.7	Facting Casting	2 days	3den 02-05-22	Tue 10-05-22	11	Labour 1, Labour 2, Labour 3, Labour 4, Labour
13		-	128	Planth column Shuttering	6 days	Wed 11-05-22	Tue 11-05-22	12	Carpainter 1, Carpainter 2, Carpainter 3, Carp
14		102	1.2.9	Plinth Column Reinfortment	4 days	Fe 13-45-32	Tue 17-05-22	13F5-4 days	Fitter 1, Fitter 2, Fitter 3, Fitter 4, Fitter 5, Stee
15		-	1.2.99	Plinth column Casting	9 days	Wed 18-05-22	Fei 27-85-22	14	Aggregate(1 Brass),Cement(1 log),Labour
16		-	1.2.11	Feeting Expendion Filling	4 days	Sat 28-05-22	Wed 01-06-22	15	JCB, Labour 1, Labour 2, Labour 3
17		-	1.2.12	Planth Beam Shuttering	7 days	Thu 02-06-22	Thu 09-06-22	36	Carpainter 1, Carpainter 2, Carpainter 3, Ca
10		-	1.2.13	Planth beam Reinforcement	4 days	3does 06-06-22	Thu 09-05-22	1775-4 days	Fitter 1, Fitter 2, Fitter 3, Fitter 4, Fitter 5, Fi
19		-	12.14	Pliesth Beans castling	4 days	Fei 10-06-32	Tue 14-06-22	18	Aggregate[1 Brass].Cement[1 bag],Labo
20		-	1.2.15	Filing	3 days	Wed 15-06-22	Fri 17-06-22	19	,xa
21		-	1.2.56	Compaction	2 days	Sat 18-06-22	Mon 20-06-22	20	Labour 1, Vibrator
22		-	1237	Plants Lovel Slab Casting	3 days	Tue 21-66-22	Thu 23-06-22	21	Aggregate[1 Brass]_Coment[1 bag]_Labe
-		-		No. 2				**	P AS AF



	Actual Duration	Duration With ACM
Duration In Days	547	402



Graph 1 Duration In Days

Above graph shows the after applying the ACM to the project we can reduce duration of the project by 140 days ie almost 4-5 months.

5-0-1	GANET	DWRT TOOLS	P - Project Profes	sienal (Preduct A	ctivation Failed)			7 - 8 3
TASK RESOURCE REPORT PROJECT V	RW H	FORMAT						
Task Calendar - Task Views Task Usage - D Other Views Task Views	rage * A heat * Zw Sert S* *	Outine Tables	Shighlight: [No Tilter: [No Cuta	Highlight] - 1 Filter - 1 Group -	imescale: Mantha •	Q Entire S Project Zoom	elected Tasks Spit	New Writes Marris
Task Name	Fired Cost +	Fixed Cost Account	Total Cost .	Instre .	Variance +	Actual +	900z mail 1, 2022 N D I F M A N	Half 2, 2522 Half 1, 2525 Half A I J A S O N D J F M A M J J
 DAGA PLAZZO 	10.00	Prorated	₹ 21,975,448.00	£ 0.00	£ 21,975,448.89	₹ 84,063.56	-	1
* MOBILISATION	10.03	Procated	0.05	₹ 0.00	C 0.03	01.05	e 01-	84
Mobilization of site	\$ 0.00	Provated		10.00	£0.00	10.00		
Mabilisation of Civil contractor	0.05	Pressted	# 0.00	C 0.00	C0.03	0.0 9	4	
* SUBSTRUCTURE	10.00	Procused	₹ 267,848.00	C 0.00	\$ 267,848.00	€ 75,400.00	ř-	-
EARTH WORK	2 6.00	Preside	2 0.09	20.00	20.00	2 0.00	<u>h</u>	
EXCAVATION -Towar Area	₹ 6,200.00	Procated	× 50,000.00	\$ 0.00	¢ 30,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	1.10	B,Labour 1,Labour 2
18	2 0:00	Procated	\$ 60,000,00	10.05	₹ 60,400.00	8 40,400.00	i Li	abour 1,Labour 2,Aggregate(5 Braix)_Coment(50
Centre line checking and approval from Arch.	₹ 0.00	Proceed	C 0.00	C 0.05	£0.00	90.0 9	5	
Footing Startering	1000	Provated	10.001(9.5	2 0.00	£ 5,003.00	0.05	50	Carpainter 1, Carpainter 2, Carpainter 3, Carpainte
Footing Reinforcment	\$ 0.00	Promated	2 6,790.00	20.00	2 6,790.00	2 0.00	1	Ritter 1, Fitter 2, Fitter 3, Fitter 4, Fitter 5, Steel [1 kg
Footing Casting	10.00	Procated	\$ 29,450.00	20.00	£ 28,452.00	0.05	1	Labour 1, Labour 2, Labour 3, Labour 5,
Playto column. Shuttering	10.00	Procated	₹ 13,500.00	1 20.00	\$ 13,532.00	0105		Carpainter 1, Carpainter 2, Carpainter 3, Carpaint
Planth Column Readforoment	¢ 0.00	Procated	1 9,040.00	10.00	T 9:042.00	10.05		Fitter 1, Fitter 2, Fitter 3, Fitter 4, Fitter 5, Steel[1
Plinth column Casting	10.00	Procated	¥ 28,000.00	t 0.00	₹ 28,101.00	7 0.00		Aggregate[1 Brass],Cement[1 bog],Labour 1,L
Footing Escavation Filling	2000	Procated	\$ 15,400.00	¥ 0.00	\$ 15,402.00	20.05		JCB, Labour 1, Labour 2, Labour 3
Planth Beam Shattening	\$ 0.00	Procated	¥ 12,610.00	\$ 0.00	₹ 12,602.00	10105		Carpainter 1, Carpainter 2, Carpainter 3, Carpa
Pirzh bean Reinforcement	10.00	Procated	₹ 10,540.00	¢ 0.00	₹ 12,542.00	1010		Fitter 1, Fitter 2, Fitter 3, Fitter 4, Fitter 5, Fitte
Plinth Bean costing	\$0.00	Proceed	¢ 18,650.00	10.00	C 18,631.99	10.0 5		Aggregate[1 Brass].Cement[1 bag].Labour 1
Filling	10.00	Provated	\$ 7,500.00	10.00	R 7,500.00	10.05		, ica
Compartion	2000	Procated	\$ 1,900.00	20.00	7 1,902.00	20.05		Labour 1, Vibrator
Planth Level Slab Casting	\$ 0.00	Prorated	2 14,540.00	20.00	\$ 14,642.00	0105		Appregate[1 Brass]_Coment[1 bag],Labour
44 A							100	P
	Port Research Report Person Pers	Section Stream - Control	Control Control of Control o	Image: Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescription< th=""> <th< td=""><td>Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Se</td><td>Image: Image: Image:</td><td>Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescription< th=""></thdescription<></thdescription<></td><td>Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescription< th=""></thdescription<></thdescription<></td></th<></thdescription<></thdescription<>	Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Section) Image: Source (Se	Image: Image:	Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescription< th=""></thdescription<></thdescription<>	Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescription< th=""></thdescription<></thdescription<>

Fig 6 Final Cost for Project (2.19 Cr)

Table 2 Cost In Cr

	Actual Cost	Cost With ACM		
Cost In Cr	2.4	2.19		

Table 1 Duration In Days



| ISSN: 2394-2975 | www.ijarety.in| | Impact Factor: 8.152 | A Bi-Monthly, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal |

|| Volume 12, Issue 2, March-April 2025 ||

DOI:10.15680/IJARETY.2025.1202033



Graph 2 Cost In Cr

Above graph shows the after applying the ACM to the project we can reduce cost of the project by almost 21L, and also reduce cost ie labor cost of the project for 140 days.

VI. CONCLUSION

The selection of an appropriate project delivery method can lead to the success of construction project. However, deciding which one is difficult as each of the primary delivery method has its own disadvantages that somehow can be the reason that contributes to the project failure. None of these primary project delivery methods can be considered as ideal and appropriate to be used to any kind of construction project, as every project is being the only one of its kind. Therefore, the development of new ideal project delivery methods is a necessity to resolve the weaknesses of the existing project delivery method in all aspects towards achieving successful construction project. For that reason Agency Construction Management questionnaire have been prepared by authors for Employee of the construction sites of Amaravati City for high-rise buildings and select apropiate method for Amaravati City.

- Result for responses collected for opinion for project delivery systems, respondence suggest the Design-Build (DB) with 41.7%, and CM-at-Risk (CMAR) with 33.3% with ACM both can be prefer for the Amaravati City for high-rise buildings.
- In our research study after applying the ACM to the project we can reduce duration of the project by 140 days ie almost 4-5 months and reduce cost of the project by almost 21L, and also reduce cost ie labor cost of the project for 140 days

REFERENCES

- 1. Abdul Khader Jeelani Shaik, "Empirical Evaluation of Performance of Construction Management at-Risk (CM at-Risk) Project Delivery System With and Without Agency-CM" Technology & Management (2015)
- 2. Mohammed I Al Khalil "Selecting the appropriate project delivery method using AHP" International Journal of Project Management Volume 20, Issue 6, August (2002)
- 3. Fouad M. Al-Sinan, "Facility Project Delivery Selection Model" Journal of Management in Engineering (1988)
- 4. Ibbs, William et. al. "Alternative methods for choosing an appropriate project delivery system (PDS)" Scholarly Journal (2011)
- 5. Shaik Abdul Khader Jeelani et. al. "Performance Evaluation of Design-Build (D-B) Projects With And Without Agency Construction Management" International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology (2012)
- 6. Edward Oladigbolu et. al. "Effectiveness of the Project Delivery Methods in Construction Management. Lagos State, Nigeria" International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology (2022)
- 7. Davidson Rajan Philip et. al. "A Study on Construction Management with Focus on Public Construction and Maintenance Management" International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (2018)
- 8. S. Z. Syed Zuber et. al. "An Overview of Project Delivery Methods in Construction Industry" International Journal of Supply Chain Management (2018)
- 9. Qingping Zhong et. al. "A Framework for Selecting Construction Project Delivery Method Using Design Structure Matrix" MDPI Buildings (2022)
- 10. Ji-Wei Zhu et. al. "Decision Simulation of Construction Project Delivery System under the Sustainable Construction Project Management" MDPI Sustainability (2020).





ISSN: 2394-2975

Impact Factor: 8.152

www.ijarety.in Meditor.ijarety@gmail.com