

Factors Influencing Time Contingency Assessment In Construction Projects

Mr.P. Vittalkumar., Dr.K. Divakar

¹Lecturer Department of Construction Technology and management Jigjiga University, Jigjiga, Ethiopia ²Associate Professor Department of Civil Engineering, Coimbatore Institute of Technology (Autonomous), Coimbatore, Tamilnadu

ABSTRACT:- Time schedule is a crucial task in construction project management. For instance, it can materially help to identify the expected financial requirements. It is also an important tool for the time control process. Construction project time schedule is greatly affected by many uncertain but predictable factors. Hence, a certain percentage of time contingency should be added to the scheduled time to arrive at more a reliable time schedule. This research list the main factors affecting time contingency and discusses their influence on schedule performance. In addition, a Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) model was developed in order to help the project planner to predict a more reliable time for an activity.

Keywords:- Time contingency, AHP Model Analysis

| IJMER | ISSN: 2249–6645 |

I. INTRODUCTION

The main goals of any successful construction project management system are to complete the project on time, within the planned budget, and with the required quality limits. The three goals are inter-related where each of them is affecting, and being affected by, the others.

In order to meet the time deadline of a project, an accurate scheduling should be sought. Due to the unique nature of construction projects, time contingency and project uncertainty are essential for accurate scheduling, which should be flexible enough to accommodate changes without negatively affecting the overall duration of the project. It is essential to allocate a contingency value to both cost and time. Yet, there are situations where there could be delays in activities that result in a delay in the overall project duration.

These delays will consequently have a negative impact on the quality and budget of the project. Therefore, estimating time contingency is seen as a major factor for achieving a successful construction project. Therefore, the objective of the presented research in this paper is to identify the factors that affect schedule (time) contingency and develop a model that predicts the expected contingency of a construction project.

II. DATA COLLECTION

This research aims to identify the main factors which have effects on projects time contingency in the Indian construction market. Identifying these factors can help to accurately assessment the required time contingency which should be added to the project planned duration.

Eighty four factors were collected based on literature review as shown in Table 1. Such factors were identified based on the work provided by references Based on these factors, two forms of questionnaire were prepared in this research; first, aims to rank the previously identified factors according to their expected impact and probability of occurrence through direct interviews with the Indian construction market experts.

Then, the most important factors were identified. Second, data gathering sessions were conducted for 60 building construction projects.

Table 1- List of Factors Affecting Time Contingency, Based On Survey and References

| Table 1- List of Factors Affecting Time Contingency, Based On Survey and References | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Serial No. | Factor | Serial No. | Factor | | | | |
| 1.Project Condition | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Project Location | 2 | Project Design complexity | | | | |
| 3 | Equipments shortage [Construction technology] | 4 | Material shortage [Market] | | | | |
| 5 | Project location [Near from governmental Buildings i.e. embassies, ministries, .etc] | 6 | Preparing the plan during project preliminary Stages[i.e. Initiation Tender phase] | | | | |
| 7 | Limited time allowed for preparation of the schedule | 8 | Missing Project Scope Items [conflicts between project documents]. | | | | |
| 9 | High Level of Quality requirements | 10 | Lack of Experience in similar projects. | | | | |
| 11 | Lack of Consultant Experience | 12 | Unexpected onerous requirements byclient's supervisors [Not a change order] | | | | |
| | nent Conditions | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Contra | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Great Scope Changes [i.e. change scope from core & shell to complete finishing] | 14 | Deficiencies, errors, contradictions, ambiguities in contract documents | | | | |
| 15 | Change orders | 16 | Contract Risks [Force Majeure] | | | | |
| | Inadequacy of detailed drawings | 18 | Contract type: Lump sum | | | | |
| 19 | Contract type: Re-measured | 20 | Context of Contract | | | | |
| 21 | Inadequacy of dispute settlement procedures | | | | | | |
| 2.2 Time: 22 | Payments [Delays] | 23 | Risks related to Governmental Authority Constraints which limit the project completion date or any other stage | | | | |
| 24 | Imposed Holidays | 25 | High Percentage of critical activities in the baseline | | | | |
| 26 | Inaccurate planning by any party | 27 | Inaccurate control & follow up | | | | |
| 28 | Workload on the contractor resources | 29 | Client delays commencement date. | | | | |
| 30 | Client suspend works | 31 | Late project changes | | | | |
| 32 | Long time to make or take a decision | 33 | Delays in resolving litigation/ arbitration disputes | | | | |
| 2.3 Genera | | | | | | | |
| 34 | Unfavorable interference in work sequence | 35 | Amount of interference [lack of knowledge or experience in any party] | | | | |
| 36 | Inadequate supply, quality, timing of information and drawing by designer | 37 | Unexpected inadequacy of pre- construction site investigation data | | | | |
| 38 | Poor dispute resolution mechanism | | | | | | |
| 2.4 Enviro | nmental Conditions: | | | | | | |
| 39 | Bad Weather conditions | 40 | Labor strike | | | | |
| 43 | Unknown geological conditions | 44 | Labor restrictions | | | | |
| 2.5 Econon | nical Conditions: | | | | | | |
| 45 | Economical stability [Unexpected conditions such as Economic Crises] | 46 | Material Market rates [Escalation, Inflation or fluctuation] | | | | |
| 47 | Design changes due to Market Demand | d [i.e. town ho | ouses instead of large villas] | | | | |

| 2.6 Count | ry Conditions: | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 48 | Fraudulent and kickbacks in laws | 49 | Administration[Bureaucratic towards foreign investmentetc] | | | | |
| 50 | Laws and regulations [e.g. Import and export regulations] | 51 | Unavailability & Bad Quality o Resources | | | | |
| 52 | Changes in regulations and law | 53 | Fraudulent and kickbacks in laws | | | | |
| 3.Factors | related to Contractor: | | | | | | |
| 55 | Shortage of experienced staff and labors | 56 | Contractor start delay [i.e. project starting or concrete pouring milestonesetc] | | | | |
| 57 | Contractor poor performance | 58 | Efficiency of planning by contractor | | | | |
| 59 | Bad Relationship between top management and site Staff | 60 | Bad Relationship between site management and Laborers | | | | |
| 61 | Bad relationship between Contractor's representatives and Client representatives | 62 | Inadequate control over subcontractors | | | | |
| 63 | Bad coordination between laborers | 64 | Poor productivity of equipments | | | | |
| 65 | Fire | 66 | Theft | | | | |
| 67 | Contractually defined "expected risks" | 68 | Unforeseen events [i.e. Great Accidentsetc] | | | | |
| 69 | Inadequate tender pricing | 70 | More than estimated waste of materials in site | | | | |
| 71 | Poor productivity of laborers | 72 | Disputes on site between laborers | | | | |
| 73 | Poor performance of claim engineer | 74 | Lack of coordination between Engineer and Contractors | | | | |
| 75 | Contractor financial difficulties | | | | | | |
| 4.Factors | related to Subcontractor: | | | | | | |
| 76 | Extra duration due to variability of subcontractors bid | 77 | Uncertainties related to subcontractor's technical Qualifications | | | | |
| 78 | Uncertainties related to subcontractor's financial stability | 79 | Uncertainties related to subcontractor's quality of material and equipment | | | | |
| 5.Factors related to Planner: | | | | | | | |
| 80 | Planner's personality traits | 81 | Clerical errors | | | | |
| 82 | Planner's biases in technical issues | 83 | Wrong method of estimating | | | | |
| 84 | Planner's lack experience | | | | | | |
| | 1 | | <u>I</u> | | | | |

III. THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS

The questionnaire respondents were asked to provide numerical scoring expressing their opinions based on their experience in the construction field in India. The respondents have inserted two scores in front of each factor. First, the degree of impact of each factor on projects time contingency.

Second, is the probability of occurrence of each factor. The Time Contingency Effect [TCE] was concluded by multiplying the impact of each [total score of TCEs]; N = total number of respondents to each factor.

All factors have been considered as a ratio of the most important factor. Weights greater than 70% are considered highest important factors based on a survey with construction consultants in india using a questionnaire aims to find out the most important factors among all factors. Based on the previous analysis, the most important factors were shown in Table 2 which illustrates the most important 11 factors affect time contingency

Table 2 MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS

| Criteria | Factor | Description | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Citteria | | Location may influence the amount of risk and therefore the level | | |
| | Project Location | of contingency. | | |
| | Project size (Design complexity) | It affects planned schedules negatively. In the large projects there a r e many various activities that required many different resources and involved many parties. All of these variables are interfering together which may cause delay in the project duration. | | |
| Project Conditions | Equipments availability (Construction technology) | Technology requirements comprising of method of construction "equipments" Issue of renting equipments, damages that may occur will increase contingency. | | |
| Project C | Material availability (Market) | This factor is related to the site condition and storage area. Transport material from the supplier to the site is time consuming which required a prior arrangement. | | |
| | Amount of interference (Skills) | Any project could have stop work order because of the owner or engineer interference, this is happened due to lack of knowledge and experience from all the participants. If the amount of interference increased the delay of schedule will be increase until they make their decision. | | |
| | Number of change orders | Change of orders or extra work order usually requires long process of redesigning or modifying specification. In addition the extra work may force the contractor to accelerate work which could cause loss of the labor productivity and then caused the delay. | | |
| uo | Payments (Delays) | Any delay of payment may cause delay of supplying resource to the project which will affect the planned schedule. | | |
| nt conditi | Time to make a decision | Owner is the main responsible in this case until he/she makes the decision of change or not. The contractor should record this delay against the owner in case of claim. | | |
| Management condition | Productivity of labor and equipments | Losing of labor productivity that caused by acceleration or extra work will affect the project schedule. Any damage of equipment will cause serious delay on the current activity consequently causes delay in project schedule. | | |
| | Weather condition | Weather in some countries has the highest impact on the schedule delay. | | |
| | Soil condition | Some unforeseen soil conditions in the site cause delay in the schedule. | | |
| ntal | Labor strike | This stoppage will cause delay in project schedule. | | |
| Environmental | Shortage of human resources | Some unforeseen events like work accident, sickness, social, psychological and other unpredicted event may cause labor pain, or absenteeism. Hence, this factor will cause delay in the activity and schedule. | | |

IV. DEVELOPMENT OF TIME CONTINGENCY MODEL

| IJMER | ISSN: 2249–6645 |

Analytic hierarchy process (AHP) has been widely used and applied in different fields of theory and practice (Al-Barqawi, 2006; Saaty, 1982 & 1991). It has been applied in multi-criteria decision making, planning and resource allocation, conflict resolution, and prediction problems (Saaty, 1982 & 1991). Therefore, the AHP is used in the presented research to assess the weights of various factors that affect time contingency through pair-wise comparison matrices. These matrices have several important characteristics.

Typical Pair-Wise Comparison Matrix for Different Factors

| Factors | a1 | a2 | а3 | a4 |
|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| a ₁ | 1 | a12 | a13 | a14 |
| a2 | a21 | 1 | a23 | a24 |
| a3 | a31 | a32 | 1 | a34 |
| a4 | a41 | a42 | a43 | 1 |

- 1. The diagonal elements are all equal to one because they represent the comparison of a criterion against itself.
- 2. The lower triangle values are the reciprocal of the upper triangular values. $(a_{ij} = 1/a_{ij})$
- 3. All numbers in the matrix are positive.
- **4**. Square matrix (i.e. number of rows equal to number of columns) The weight of each factor is determined using Equation (1) as follows.

$$Wx = \sum_{j=1}^{j=n} \frac{a}{\sum_{i=1}^{Nn} a_i}$$
 (1)

Where a_{ij} represents the matrix elements for I row and I column; n represents the pair wise comparison matrix dimension; and Wx represents the weight of factor x.

After determining the weights of the each factor n the hierarchy, the time contingency (C_D) is developed using the model shown in equation (2)

$$C_D = \sum_{i=1}^n Wi * Si * Pi - - - - - - - - - (2)$$

Where, Wi- represents the general weight of factors I;

Si-represents the score of each factor in a specific project

Pi-represents the probability of occurrence of factor I Cd – Time contingency

V. TIME CONTINGENCY MODEL IMPLEMENTATION

The following are the steps that were used to develop time contingency model using the collected data.

- 1) Determine the relative weight of each major category; i.e. project conditions, management conditions and environmental conditions.
- 2) Determine the weights (Wi) of the sub factors relative to the weight of its category.
- 3)Calculate the factors score (Si) for each of the thirteen factors (using a 1 4 scale) in which one represents the most ineffective and nine represents the most effective to the contingency value.
- 4) Calculate the Probability of occurrence average (Pi) for each of the thirteen factors.
- 5) Multiply the three values $W_i * S_i * P_i$.
- 6) Sum all the values of multiplication, which constitute the time contingency value CD.

Table-3: Time contingency calculation

| Criteria | Weights | Factors | Weights | Relative Weights (Wi) | Score (Si) | Pro babi lity(Pi) | Time conti ngenc y(CD) |
|-------------------|---------|------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| | | Size | 0.2348 | 0.0760 | 0.638 | 0.53 | 0.025 8 |
| Project condition | | Location | 0.2198 | 0.0712 | 0.613 | 0.54 | 0.023 7 |
| | | Equipmet Availabiy | 0.2749 | 0.0890 | 0.750 | 0.55 | 0.036 7 |
| | | Materials availability | 0.2704 | 0.0876 | 0.750 | 0.58 3 | 0.038 3 |
| en t | | Amount of | | 0.067 | 0.775 | 0.56 | 0.029 |

| | | interferences | 0.1841 | | | 7 | 7 |
|-------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|--------|-------|------|-------|
| | | Number of | 0.1601 | 0.0588 | 0.656 | 0.67 | 0.026 |
| | | change orders | | | | 5 | 0 |
| | | Time required for | 0.1642 | 0.0603 | 0.600 | 0.60 | 0.021 |
| | | decisions | | | | 0 | 7 |
| | | Payments | 0.1773 | 0.0651 | 0.750 | 0.45 | 0.022 |
| | | (delays) | | | | 8 | 4 |
| | | Equipments | 0.1428 | 0.0525 | 0.520 | 0.40 | 0.010 |
| | | condition | | | | 0 | 9 |
| | | Productivity | 0.1714 | 0.0630 | 0.700 | 0.61 | 0.027 |
| | | uncertainty | | | | 7 | 2 |
| | | Soil condition | 0.2209 | 0.0682 | 0.613 | 0.59 | 0.024 |
| ition | | | | | | 2 | 7 |
| | | Weather | 0.264 | 0.081 | 0.738 | 0.53 | 0.032 |
| pud | | conditions | | | | 3 | 1 |
| 00 | Strike | | 0.264 | 0.081 | | | |
| ntal | | Strike | | | 0.738 | 0.26 | 0.016 |
| neı | | | | | | 7 | 1 |
| Environmental condition | | Site shortage of | 0.250 | 0.077 | | | |
| | | resources | | | 0.700 | 0.60 | 0.032 |
| En | | | | | | 0 | 5 |
| C.D | | | | | | | 0.368 |
| | | | | | | | |

VI. MODEL VERIFICATION

In order to check the accuracy of estimated average time contingency (0.3678), data were collected from experts through direct interview regarding the actual delays in their previous projects, which include the starting and planned finish dates in addition to actual dates. Delays for the project, in months, were calculated by subtracting the planned from actual finish dates, then, divide this delay over the planned project duration to obtain time contingency. Table 4 includes the collected data and its analysis for seven projects. It is noticed that time contingency ranged from 0.167 to 0.778 out of project duration. Thus, the average time contingency of the seven projects is 35.4%, which is close to the value obtained from the developed model. Based on Zayed and Halpin (2005), two equations are used to verify the developed time contingency model as shown in Equations (3) and (4).

Where, AIP = Average Invalidity Percent

AVP = Average Validity Percent

Ei = Estimated/Predicted Value

| IJMER | ISSN: 2249–6645 |

Ci = Actual Value

Applying these equations to the collected cases shows that AIP = 0.127 and AVP = 0.87.

The values of AIP and AVP show that the developed model is robust in predicting the values of time contingency.

| Project | Start | Scheduled end date | Actual end date | Planned | Delays in | Contingency |
|---------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|-------------|
| | date | | | project | months | |
| 1 | Aug 11 | Feb-012 | Mar-8 | 6 | 1 | 1/6=0.167 |
| 2 | Sep-08 | May-09 | July-09 | 8 | 3 | 3/8=0.200 |
| 3 | Aug-08 | April-09 | Sep-07 | 20 | 5 | 5/20=0.250 |
| 4 | Feb-09 | Feb-013 | Aug-07 | 24 | 6 | 6/24=0.250 |
| 5 | July-09 | Oct-10 | Mar-05 | 15 | 5 | 5/15=0.330 |
| Average | Average Contingency Value | | | | | 0.354 |

VII. RESULT AND CONCLUSION

Estimating scheduling (time) contingency is a major factor in achieving a successful schedule for construction projects. In this research, a survey was conducted on many construction companies to assess

the factors that affect time contingency. The data obtained from the survey was then processed using Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) in order to evaluate the weight of each factor and estimate the time contingency value. The results show that the average time contingency value is estimated as 36.78%. The developed model is verified using seven cases studies, which shows robust results (87%). This value shows that the obtained results are fairly good and accept.

REFERENCES

Journal Papers:

[1] Zayad, T (2003)."Condition rating models models for underground infrastructures: Sustainable water mains,, *International Journal of Modeling and Simulation*, 18(2), 1998, 112-116.

Books:

- [1]. K.K.Chithkara, Construction Project Management (2014).
- [2]. Theses:
- [3]. Park,M. and Kiziltas, S(2005), Prediction of organizational effectiveness in construction company, doctoral diss., J of construction Engineering and Management, ASCE, February, 131(2), pp 252-26.
- [4]. Proceedings Papers:

| IJMER | ISSN: 2249–6645 |

[5]. Hoffman, G.J, (1994) Attributes of UK construction clients influencing project consultants erformance. Construction management and economics.