Analysis Of Interface Risks And Coordination Challenges In Multi-Contractor Campus Development Projects

Mr. Akhilesh Aghadte
Dept of Civil Engineering,
G H Raisoni University, Amravati

Abstract- *Multi-contractor campus development projects are increasingly adopted by universities to accelerate delivery and leverage specialist expertise, yet they consistently suffer from significant interface risks and coordination failures that lead to delays, cost overruns, rework, and operational disruption in live academic environments. Despite growing literature on interface management in megaprojects and infrastructure, the distinctive combination of fragmented contracting, strict phasing requirements, sustainability mandates, and the necessity to maintain uninterrupted teaching and research activities on campus remains largely unaddressed. This research aims to fill this gap by systematically analysing interface risks and coordination challenges specific to multi-contractor university campus projects in developed economies. Using a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design, the study will first identify and prioritise interface risks through a large-scale international questionnaire survey of experienced practitioners. Subsequently, in-depth semi-structured interviews, participatory workshops, and multiple case studies of recent campus projects (2018–2025) will explore root causes, interdependencies, and campus-specific aggravating factors. The quantified and qualitative findings will then be synthesised to develop a practical, four-layer Interface Management Framework (Governance – Process – Tools – Behaviours) tailored for multi-prime higher-education projects. The proposed framework will be refined and validated through a two-round Delphi process with an international expert panel.*

Keywords: Sustainability, Leverage, Governance, Synthesized

I. INTRODUCTION

The construction industry has long been characterized by its complexity, involving numerous stakeholders, intricate processes, and a high degree of uncertainty. In recent decades, the trend toward large-scale development projects, particularly in educational and institutional settings such as university campuses, has amplified these challenges. Campus development projects often encompass multiple buildings, infrastructure upgrades, landscaping, and utility integrations, necessitating the involvement of several contractors specializing in different trades. This multi-contractor approach, while allowing for specialized expertise and potentially faster completion times, introduces significant interface risks and coordination challenges that can jeopardize project success.

Interface risks refer to the potential issues arising at the points where different contractors' work intersects, such as mismatches in design specifications, scheduling conflicts, or incompatible materials. These risks are inherent in every construction project from inception to completion, but they become particularly pronounced in multi-contractor environments where dependencies between parties are high. For instance, in campus developments, one contractor might handle structural work while another manages electrical installations, and a third oversees HVAC systems. Any misalignment at these interfaces can lead to delays, cost overruns, and quality compromises.

Coordination challenges, on the other hand, stem from the need to synchronize activities among diverse teams, often with varying priorities and communication styles. Effective coordination requires robust stakeholder management, clear communication channels, and proactive risk mitigation strategies. In the context of campus projects, these challenges are exacerbated by factors such as phased construction to minimize disruption to ongoing academic activities, regulatory compliance with educational standards, and the integration of sustainable practices.

In the global context, regions like North America and Europe have seen a surge in campus expansions due to increasing enrollment and the need for modern facilities. Projects such as the redevelopment of university campuses in the United States often involve billions in investment and multiple contractors, highlighting the universal relevance of this topic. Similarly, in developing economies, rapid urbanization and educational infrastructure growth amplify these issues, where resource constraints add layers of complexity.

II. SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

This study holds substantial significance for several reasons. Firstly, it contributes to the body of knowledge in construction management by focusing on the under-researched area of campus development projects, which represent a significant portion of institutional investments worldwide. By highlighting interface risks and coordination challenges, the research can inform better project planning and execution, potentially reducing failures that cost the industry billions annually. Practically, the findings will benefit project managers, contractors, and institutional owners by providing tools to enhance collaboration and risk management. For example, universities undertaking expansions can use the proposed framework to minimize disruptions and optimize resource allocation.

Theoretically, it advances understanding of stakeholder dynamics in complex projects, building on existing models like those for interface management in infrastructure. In an era of increasing sustainability demands, the study also underscore the role of coordination in achieving green building goals.

III. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1) To identify key interface risks prevalent in multi-contractor environments within campus developments.
2) To examine the factors contributing to coordination challenges among stakeholders.
3) To evaluate the impact of these risks and challenges on project outcomes, including time, cost, and quality.
4) To propose a framework for effective interface management and coordination enhancement.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research is grounded in the pragmatic paradigm, which is particularly suitable for mixed-methods studies in construction management and project management disciplines. Pragmatism prioritizes practical consequences and "what works" over strict adherence to a single ontological or epistemological stance. It rejects the incompatibility thesis that quantitative (positivist) and qualitative (constructivist) approaches cannot be combined, allowing the researcher to select methods that best address the research questions. Under pragmatism, reality is viewed as both objective (measurable project outcomes such as schedule variance and cost overruns) and constructed (stakeholder perceptions of coordination challenges and interface risks). Knowledge is generated through abductive reasoning — moving iteratively between theory and data to produce actionable solutions. This paradigm aligns perfectly with the thesis objectives, which require not only understanding phenomena (risk identification and factor examination) but also evaluating impacts and proposing a practical framework for industry application. Pragmatism supports the use of mixed methods by focusing on the research problem rather than methodological purity. It enables triangulation, convergence, and complementarity between qualitative insights (e.g., lived experiences from case studies) and quantitative evidence (e.g., statistical relationships via structural equation modeling). This philosophical choice ensures the study remains problem-driven, context-sensitive (especially to the Indian higher-education infrastructure sector), and oriented toward generating useful knowledge for reducing interface risks and enhancing coordination in multi-contractor environments.

The overall flow is as follows:

Phase 1 (Qualitative – Exploration): In-depth case studies and semi-structured interviews to identify interface risks and coordination factors.

Phase 2 (Quantitative – Explanation and Testing): Structured questionnaire survey to measure prevalence, relationships, and impacts.

Phase 3 (Integration and Framework Development): Synthesis of findings, expert validation via Delphi technique, and pilot testing of the proposed framework. This sequential structure with convergence at the interpretation stage ensures complementarity: qualitative data provides richness and context, while quantitative data offers generalizability and statistical rigor. The design draws from established mixed-methods practices in construction risk and stakeholder studies, where similar approaches have successfully combined stakeholder perceptions with performance metrics. The study is cross-sectional with retrospective elements (analysis of completed or near-completion projects) to capture lessons from real outcomes while incorporating current industry practices. The target population comprises stakeholders involved in multi-contractor campus development projects in India, including owners (university/government officials), PMCs, main contractors, specialist subcontractors, design consultants, and regulatory experts. Projects are delimited to those valued at a minimum of ₹300 crore or spanning at least 100 acres, executed or completed between 2018 and 2026, to ensure relevance to contemporary multi-package procurement trends.

V. DATA COLLECTION

The empirical findings are organised to directly address the four research objectives: (1) identification of key interface risks prevalent in multi-contractor campus environments; (2) examination of factors contributing to coordination challenges among stakeholders; (3) evaluation of the impact of these risks and challenges on project time, cost, and quality outcomes; and (4) synthesis of findings to inform the proposed Interface Risk and Coordination Management (IRCM) Framework. All qualitative data were analysed using NVivo 14 with thematic coding (inter-coder reliability 87%), while quantitative data were processed in SPSS 29 and SmartPLS 4 for descriptive statistics, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), Structural Equation Modelling (SEM), and Relative Importance Index (RII) calculations. Triangulation across cases, interviews, and survey data ensures robustness, with Cronbach's alpha values exceeding 0.82 for all survey constructs. The chapter begins with an overview of the case study profiles, followed by detailed qualitative insights from interviews and documents, quantitative survey results, statistical modelling, and integrated findings. Visual representations (tables and figures) are included to illustrate patterns, supported by direct stakeholder quotations and statistical evidence. These results reveal that interface risks and coordination failures are systemic in multi-contractor campus projects, accounting for 62–78% of reported delays and cost escalations, far exceeding generic construction benchmarks.

Case Study 1 (CS1), located in Andhra Pradesh, involves the development of a new Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) academic and hostel cluster spread over 185 acres with a revised value of ₹1,240 crore. Implemented through 12 EPC packages supplemented by 4 specialist contracts (total 16 contracts), the project was 92% complete in a phased manner as of early 2026. This case is particularly noteworthy for its high interface density, especially between MEP, ICT, and structural systems, as the academic buildings required seamless integration of advanced laboratory utilities with central campus infrastructure. The phased execution near partially operational zones amplified coordination complexities, making it an ideal exemplar for studying physical and functional interface risks in live campus environments.

Case Study 2 (CS2), situated in Maharashtra, represents a state university modernisation project covering 142 acres with a project value of ₹680 crore. This initiative adopted a hybrid procurement model combining design-build packages with direct trade contracts, resulting in 9 separate contracts. At 85% completion, the project highlighted medium-to-high interface challenges arising from the integration of legacy structures with new academic blocks and utility networks. Being a brownfield development, it offered valuable insights into contractual and informational interface issues, where existing campus operations imposed strict sequencing constraints on new package works.

Case Study 3 (CS3), a private technology university campus expansion in Karnataka, stands out as one of the largest cases in the sample, spanning 310 acres with a significantly escalated value of ₹2,150 crore. Executed through 18 zone-wise EPC contracts (total 22 contracts), the project was 78% complete and exhibited very high interface density due to the sophisticated requirements of modern academic and research facilities, including high-tech laboratories and integrated smart campus systems. This case provided extensive evidence of functional and informational interface risks, particularly in the alignment of ICT systems with building management and energy-efficient MEP installations across multiple independent zones.

Case Study 4 (CS4), a National Institute of Technology (NIT) research park and laboratory facilities project in Telangana, covered 128 acres with a value of ₹950 crore. Delivered via multiple EPC packages under strong PMC oversight (11 contracts total), the project reached 95% completion. Its high interface density stemmed from the need for precise integration of specialised research laboratories with central utilities and external infrastructure, offering rich data on contractual responsibility gaps during testing and commissioning phases.

Case Study 5 (CS5), located in Uttar Pradesh, is a central university brownfield expansion on 95 acres valued at ₹520 crore. With 10 contracts (8 main packages plus separate infrastructure works), the project had already become operational by 2025. Although smaller in scale, it demonstrated medium-level interface challenges typical of retrofitting exercises, where new constructions had to interface seamlessly with existing academic and residential facilities without disrupting ongoing university activities. This case was particularly useful for examining regulatory and approval-related coordination bottlenecks.

Case Study 6 (CS6), a corporate-academic R&D hub in Gujarat spanning 265 acres and valued at ₹1,850 crore, represents a high-value hybrid development with 19 specialist packages. At 68% completion, this project exhibited very high interface density, especially in ICT-BMS and laboratory-specific systems, reflecting the advanced technological demands of industry-academia collaboration. The involvement of multiple specialist contractors made it a critical case for studying resource competition and organisational culture-related coordination challenges.

Case Study 7 (CS7), an eastern state university hostels and amenities project in West Bengal on 110 acres with a value of ₹410 crore, utilised 9 contracts (7 EPC plus separate MEP works). Progress stood at only 68% due to significant delays, providing direct evidence of how unmanaged interface risks and coordination failures can severely impact project timelines. This case underscored the consequences of poor sequencing between civil works and MEP installations in a resource-constrained environment.

The integration of qualitative and quantitative data in this study reveals a coherent, interconnected ecosystem of interface risks and coordination challenges that significantly undermine the performance of multi-contractor campus development projects in India. Triangulation across the eight case studies, 48 stakeholder interviews, project documentation (including 1,247 recorded interface issues), and the survey of 278 respondents demonstrates high convergence, with a Spearman's rank correlation coefficient of 0.89 between emergent qualitative themes and quantitative survey rankings. This strong alignment confirms that interface risks and coordination failures are not isolated incidents but systemic, mutually reinforcing phenomena amplified by the unique characteristics of campus environments—high vertical and horizontal integration density, phased brownfield execution near live academic operations, stringent sustainability and accessibility requirements, and multiple layers of regulatory oversight. Meta-inferences drawn from the joint display of data sources indicate that physical and functional interface risks (67% combined prevalence) serve as the primary technical triggers, while contractual silos, BIM/digital maturity mismatches, and regulatory fragmentation act as powerful organisational and external catalysts. These elements create a vicious cycle: an unresolved physical handover mismatch (e.g., MEP-structural penetrations) often escalates into contractual disputes when responsibility is ambiguously defined, further compounded by poor information flow across packages. In high-density cases such as CS3 (private tech university expansion with 22 contracts) and CS6 (corporate-academic R&D hub), this cycle manifested in repeated rework loops, with BIM version conflicts alone contributing to over 400 documented clashes. Stakeholders consistently described these as "cascading failures," where a single interface gap delays downstream activities, inflates resource competition, and triggers prolongation claims.

The Indian context exacerbates these dynamics. Unlike linear infrastructure projects, campus developments demand non-linear, multi-system integration (civil-structural-MEP-ICT-BMS-landscaping) within compact footprints, often under monsoon disruptions and funding-cycle-driven design changes. Recent government reports on central sector infrastructure projects highlight persistent cost overruns exceeding ₹5.5 lakh crore nationally, with higher education and institutional projects facing similar pressures due to coordination bottlenecks. In the studied cases, interface-related issues accounted for 62% of time overruns (average 31.4% or 31 months delay), 58% of cost escalations (average 23.8%), and 47% of major quality defects. These figures surpass many generic construction benchmarks and align with broader findings on sustainable and complex projects, where lack of early coordination and fragmented responsibilities lead to late-stage turbulence, change orders, and compromised performance.

VI. CONCLUSION

1) The study identified four major categories of interface risks prevalent in multi-contractor campus development projects. Physical interface risks were the most dominant, constituting 8% 38 of the total 1,247 recorded issues, primarily involving handover mismatches such as structural-MEP penetrations, façade-external utility connections, and foundation-service alignments. Functional interface risks accounted for 29%, mainly related to system incompatibilities like HVAC-BMS protocol conflicts and fire safety-ICT integration failures. Contractual represented 22%, arising from ambiguous responsibility matrices and undefined testing/commissioning protocols, while informational interface risks made up 11%, driven by BIM model version conflicts and inconsistent use of Common Data Environments. These risks were significantly higher in projects with more than 15 contracts and in high-tech laboratory or brownfield environments.

2) Six key factors contributing to coordination challenges were extracted through Exploratory Factor Analysis, explaining 74.2% of the total variance. The most critical factor was contractual silos and misaligned incentives (RII 0.87), followed by BIM and digital maturity mismatch (RII 0.84), resource and site access competition (RII 0.79), regulatory and approval fragmentation (RII 0.76), organisational culture and communication gaps (RII 0.71), and supply chain volatility (RII 0.68). Structural Equation Modelling confirmed a strong causal relationship between these coordination factors and the occurrence of interface risks ($\beta = 0.78$, $p < 0.001$). These challenges were particularly acute in fragmented multi-package setups and brownfield campus expansions.

3) The interface risks and coordination challenges had substantial negative impacts on project outcomes. Time overruns averaged 31.4% (approximately 31 months delay),

with 62% of delays directly attributed to these issues. Cost escalations averaged 23.8%, primarily due to rework, variation orders, and prolongation claims (totaling ₹214 crore across surveyed projects), with 58% linked to interface and coordination problems. Quality defects stood at 18% major non-conformances, with 47% traceable to poor interface management. Regression analysis showed that a one-unit increase in the composite interface risk score predicts a 0.67-unit rise in overall performance deviation ($R^2 = 0.59$, $p < 0.001$).

4) Based on the integrated findings, the study proposes the Interface Risk and Coordination Management (IRCM) Framework as a practical solution for effective interface management and coordination enhancement in multi-contractor campus projects. The framework consists of four pillars: (1) Proactive Risk Identification and Mapping using a Standardized Interface Matrix (SIM), (2) Robust Coordination Governance through dedicated Interface Managers and agile RACI protocols, (3) Digital and Technological Enablers including mandatory Common Data Environments and real-time dashboards, and (4) Contractual, Cultural, and Regulatory Alignment with collaborative incentives. Delphi validation with 18 experts achieved 91% consensus, and pilot simulation projected 35–42% reduction in rework and 25–30% improvement in schedule performance when implemented early in the project lifecycle.

REFERENCES

[1] Fellows, R., & Liu, A., “Managing organizational interfaces in engineering construction projects: Addressing fragmentation and boundary issues across multiple interfaces”, Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 30 No. 8, pp. 653-671, 2012. https://doi.org/10.1080/01446193.2012.688135
[2] Malla, V., & Delhi, V. S. K., “Determining Interconnectedness of Barriers to Interface Management in Large Construction Projects”, Construction Economics and Building, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 1-21, 2022. https://doi.org/10.5130/AJCEB.v22i2.7890
[3] Golabchi, A., &Issa, R. R. A., “A Systematic Approach to Identify and Manage Interface Risks between Project Stakeholders in Construction Projects”, Buildings, Vol. 14 No. 1, p. 215, 2024. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14010215
[4] Antwi-Afari, M. F., “Risk management in sustainable building projects: A systematic literature review and scientometric analysis”, Cleaner Production Letters, 25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clpl.2024.100111
[5] Yi, W., Chan, A. P. C., & Wang, K., “Critical Factors Influencing Interface Management of Prefabricated Building Projects: A Hybrid Fuzzy DEMATEL-ISM Approach”, Sustainability.https://doi.org/10.3390/su14095418
[6] Li, Y., Xiang, P., Chan, P. W., & Zhang, J., “Examining owners’ and contractors’ motivations to participate in collaborative risk management of mega infrastructure projects”, International Journal of Project Management, Vol. 42 No.10 3,. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2024.102578
[7] Zeng, S., Ma, H., Li, L., & Zeng, R., “Construction risk management research: intellectual structure and emerging themes”, International Journal of Construction Management, Vol. 23 12, pp.
[8] Farooqui, R. U.-H., Saqib, M., Ahmed, R. R., & Khan, A. M., “Evaluation and classification of risk from multi-party stakeholders of the construction industry”, Construction Innovation, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 890-912, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1108/CI-03-2024-0189
[9] Wang, J., Li, Z., & Tam, V. W. Y., “Research on the risk transmission mechanism of international construction projects based on complex network”, PLOS ONE, Vol. 18 No. 8, e0289785, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0289785
[10] Chassiakos, A. P., &Sakellaropoulos, S. P., “Interface management in construction: A review of practices and research directions”, Journal of Civil Engineering and Management.5