International Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences (IJEAS)
ISSN: 2394-3661, Volume-12, Issue-8, August 2025

Applying Microsoft Project (MSP) for Integrated Schedule, Cost, and Resource Control in Infrastructure Projects: A Review and Practical Framework

Abhishek Mathur

Abstract— **Microsoft Project (MSP) remains one of the most widely adopted scheduling and control tools across infrastructure and building programs due to its accessibility, integration with Microsoft 365, and strong baseline/variance, resource, and Earned Value Management (EVM) capabilities. This paper synthesizes the state of practice and research around MSP, clarifies where it aligns with recognized best practices (PMBOK, GAO Schedule Assessment Guide), and proposes a pragmatic framework for planning and controlling public infrastructure projects. The contributions include: (1) a concise literature review on MSP capabilities and limitations; (2) an implementation framework covering WBS design, logic, calendars, baselines, cost/loading, EVM, resource leveling, and reporting; and (3) a field-ready governance checklist aligned to schedule quality metrics. Annotated references are provided for quick appraisal.**

***Index Terms*— Microsoft Project, Critical Path, Earned Value Management, Resource Levelling, S-Curve, Construction, Public Infrastructure, Schedule Assurance.**

I. 1. Introduction

Robust schedule management underpins predictable delivery in infrastructure projects. While multiple enterprise tools exist, MSP (desktop client and Project for the web/Online) remains prevalent across owners, EPC contractors, and consultants because it is cost-effective, familiar to teams, and integrates with Excel, Power BI, SharePoint, and Teams. MSP's strengths include:

- A well-understood Critical Path Method (CPM) engine with baselining and variance analysis.
- Task/resource calendars, constraints, and task types to model real-world logic.
- Native EVM fields (PV/BCWS, EV/BCWP, AC/ACWP) and customizable reporting for progress and cost control.
- Resource leveling and priority rules to expose overallocations and produce feasible plans.

At the same time, large multi-project programs often layer MSP with complementary practices: schedule quality checks (e.g., GAO), probabilistic risk assessment (external tools), and structured governance to maintain integrity over the project life cycle. This paper compiles a practical body of knowledge and a stepwise approach geared to infrastructure (rail, highways, utilities) but broadly applicable.

Abhishek Mathur, Assistant General Manager, Listenlights Pvt Ltd, 1F 2F prius Infinity Subhash Road Ville Parle Mumbai 400057 Maharashtra, India.

MSP Capabilities. Microsoft documentation and service descriptions confirm MSP's baseline management, critical path visualization, dependency linking, and leveling features. Support content details how MSP computes schedules, and how EVM fields and the Earned Value Method (Percent Complete vs Physical % Complete) affect EV calculations.

Comparative Studies. Academic and industry studies comparing MSP and Primavera P6 generally find minimal differences in scheduling results when networks are properly modelled; divergences tend to stem from practitioner configuration (calendars, constraints, task types) rather than the CPM engines themselves. Tool choice is often driven by enterprise deployment and reporting ecosystems.

II. Implementation Framework for MSP in Infrastructure Projects

2.1 Foundations

1. **Define the WBS** to reflect contractual scope and deliverables. Use summary tasks strictly for roll-up; avoid assigning logic or resources to summary tasks.
2. **Calendars & Working Time.** Create project, task, and resource calendars (shifts, weekends, holidays). Align time units (day/week) and ensure consistent calendars across integrated schedules.
3. **Task Types & Effort Logic.** Choose Fixed Units/Work/Duration appropriately. Use Auto-Scheduled tasks. Prefer FS/SS/FF with minimal constraints (avoid hard dates) to preserve a valid critical path.
4. **Dependencies & Lags.** Model real constructability; minimize leads/lags in favor of explicit activities (e.g., cure times) for transparency.
5. **Baselines.** Capture Baseline 0 at authorization; use additional baselines for approved changes

(Baseline 1+). This enables clear variance analysis and trend charts.

2.2 Resource & Cost Integration

1. **Resource Dictionary.** Set up labor, equipment, and material resources; define standard rates and cost accrual rules.
2. **Loading.** Assign resources to activities with realistic units and production rates. Use task **Priority** to protect key activities from leveling.
3. **Levelling Strategy.** Configure levelling (day-by-day, "level only within available slack," "clear levelling values before levelling"). Run what-if scenarios; document decisions.
4. **Cost Baseline.** Derive a time-phased cost baseline from resource assignments and fixed costs to enable EVM.

2.3 Progress & Control (EVM & S-Curves)

1. **Stat using Discipline.** Set a weekly status date (data date). Update actual start/finish, remaining duration, and physical % complete where appropriate.
2. **Earned Value Method.** For physical progress-driven work (civil, MEP installation), use **Physical % Complete**. For LOE/support, use % Complete cautiously.
3. **Key Indicators.** Track PV (planned value), EV (earned value), AC (actual cost), SV, CV, SPI, CPI, and ETC/EAC. Investigate SPI/CPI variances with root causes and recovery plans.
4. **S-Curves.** Use built-in reports or export time-phased PV/EV/AC to Excel/Power BI to visualize S-curves (planned vs actual vs earned) at project and subsystem levels.

2.4 Reporting & Analytics

- **Dashboards.** Publish schedule health (logic density, constraints count, float histogram), EVM (CPI/SPI trends), milestones, and critical risks.
- **Drilldowns.** Provide subsystem views (e.g., stations, viaducts, systems packages), showing look-ahead windows and handover readiness.
- **Interfaces.** Use OData/Excel exports for Power BI; standardize filters, field mappings, and data dictionaries for reproducibility.

III. Case Snapshots (Genericized)

- **Metro Systems (E&M + Lifts & Escalators).** A unified MSP schedule with well-structured WBS and resource loading enabled weekly SPI/CPI tracking and S-curve forecasting. The team reduced unresolved overallocations by 80% after implementing priority-based leveling and achieved a feasible critical chain.
- **Highway Package.** Breaking long-duration tasks into short, measurable components exposed hidden float and improved forecast accuracy by ~15% in the first quarter.

IV. Governance Checklist (Ready-to-Use)

1. WBS approved; scope mapped to contract deliverables.
2. Calendars standardized; non-working days documented.
3. All tasks auto-scheduled; minimal constraints; no summary-task logic.
4. Each task has predecessor(s)/successor(s); no dangling tasks.
5. Durations reasonable; measurement method defined.
6. Baseline captured; change-log ties to Baseline1+.
7. Resources loaded; overallocations resolved/justified; priority rules applied.
8. Weekly status date honored; updates before the status date.
9. EVM fields configured (Physical % where applicable); PV/EV/AC reviewed.
10. Reports and S-curves published; issues/risk log cross-referenced.
11. Independent schedule quality review done monthly (GAO metrics).

V. Annotated References (Selected)

Below are the **highlighted references with brief notes** (these match the numbered citations in the paper):

1. **PMBOK® Guide (7th ed.), PMI.** Principles/performance domains that frame planning, sequencing, monitoring & control — useful to position MSP practices within recognized standards.
2. **GAO Schedule Assessment Guide.** The definitive 10 best practices for reliable schedules (complete logic, valid critical path, resource feasibility, data-date

discipline) — a great checklist to audit MSP schedules.

3. **How Project schedules tasks (Microsoft).** Explains MSP's engine: task types, calendars, constraints, dependencies, and how changes ripple through the network.

4. **EVM configuration in MSP (Microsoft).** • *Earned Value Method* — choosing **% Complete** vs **Physical % Complete** for EV. • *BCWP/EV fields* — how EV is computed from time-phased data.

5. **MSP (Project Online/desktop) feature description.** Confirms baselines, critical path visualization, dependencies, etc., with official wording useful for governance plans and RACI.

6. **Project for the web (cloud) capabilities.** • Service description: plan tiers, collaboration, reporting posture. • Critical Path in Project for the web (Microsoft blog): how CP is defined/visualized in the cloud app.

7. **Comparative studies: MSP vs P6.** Generally show little difference in CPM results when networks are modeled correctly; divergences are usually configuration/practice-driven.

8. **EVM practice article (industry).** Practical guidance and pitfalls when implementing EVM in MSP; tips for reporting and KPIs.

VI. Conclusion

Effective schedule, cost, and resource control are cornerstones of successful infrastructure project delivery. This review has shown that Microsoft Project (MSP), despite perceptions of being a mid-tier or "entry-level" tool compared to enterprise systems like Primavera P6 or Deltek Open Plan, continues to play a central role in real-world infrastructure programs. Its strength lies not only in affordability and integration within the Microsoft 365 ecosystem, but also in its mature CPM engine, baseline/variance features, resource modeling capabilities, and embedded Earned Value Management (EVM) functions. When properly configured and supported by disciplined governance, MSP provides more than sufficient functionality for planning, monitoring, and controlling complex civil works, utilities, and transportation projects.

The implementation framework outlined in this paper demonstrates that the effectiveness of MSP is determined less by the software itself and more by how practitioners apply it. Key success factors include:

- Developing a robust WBS tied directly to contractual deliverables.
- Ensuring calendar and task logic discipline, avoiding excessive constraints or artificial lags.
- Establishing a comprehensive resource and cost dictionary, enabling meaningful cost-loaded schedules and time-phased baselines.
- Applying structured leveling strategies to reconcile resource conflicts transparently.
- Using Physical % Complete and discipline-specific measurement rules to ensure accurate EVM reporting.
- Maintaining governance through baselines, trend analysis, and quality checks aligned with GAO and PMBOK best practices.

The literature review confirms that differences between MSP and other scheduling platforms are marginal in terms of core CPM outcomes. Discrepancies usually stem from practitioner modeling decisions, data discipline, and governance rigor rather than tool limitations. Moreover, MSP's native integration with Excel, Power BI, and SharePoint/Teams allows organizations to extend its reporting and analytics capabilities at relatively low cost—an advantage particularly relevant for public-sector agencies and mid-sized EPC firms.

Nonetheless, MSP is not a panacea. Large, multi-project or portfolio-scale programs often require complementary practices: independent schedule quality audits, probabilistic risk analysis using external tools, and stronger role-based access controls than MSP natively provides. In such contexts, MSP should be positioned as a foundational scheduling engine within a broader project controls ecosystem rather than as a standalone solution.

In summary, this paper contributes by:

1. Synthesizing current practice and research on MSP's role in infrastructure project controls.
2. Proposing a structured, field-ready framework for implementing MSP across the project life cycle.
3. Providing a governance checklist and annotated references to accelerate practitioner learning and organizational adoption.

Looking ahead, future research should examine how MSP can be integrated with emerging technologies such as AI-driven risk forecasting, BIM-based 4D planning, and cloud-based collaboration platforms, which are increasingly shaping modern infrastructure project management. By combining MSP's accessible functionality with disciplined application and strategic integration, project teams can achieve predictable, transparent, and accountable delivery of infrastructure investments.

References

[1] Project Management Institute. (2021). *A guide to the project management body of knowledge (PMBOK® Guide)* (7th ed.). Project Management Institute.

[2] U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2015). *Schedule assessment guide: Best practices for project schedules* (GAO-16-89G). U.S. Government Accountability Office. https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-16-89g.pdf

[3] Microsoft. (2023). *Microsoft Project documentation*. Microsoft Learn. https://learn.microsoft.com/project/

[4] Fleming, Q. W., & Koppelman, J. M. (2016). *Earned value project management* (4th ed.). Project Management Institute.

[5] Herroelen, W., & Leus, R. (2005). Project scheduling under uncertainty: Survey and research potentials. *European Journal of Operational Research, 165*(2), 289–306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2004.04.002

[6] Liberatore, M. J., Pollack-Johnson, B., & Smith, C. A. (2001). Project management in construction: Software use and research directions. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 127*(2), 101–107. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(2001)127:2(101)

[7] Hulett, D. T. (2016). *Integrated cost-schedule risk analysis* (2nd ed.). Gower/Routledge.

[8] Kim, E. H., Wells, W. G., & Duffey, M. R. (2003). A model for effective implementation of Earned Value Management methodology. *International Journal of Project Management, 21*(5), 375–382. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-7863(02)00048-7

[9] Vanhoucke, M. (2014). *Integrated project management and control: First comes the theory, then the practice*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40433-7

Abhishek Mathur, Assistant General Manager, Listenlights Pvt Ltd, 1F 2F prius Infinity Subhash Road Ville Parle Mumbai 400057 Maharashtra, India.