International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 01 , January - 2026

Delay Factors in Government Construction and the Role of Alternative Materials

Dev Ashish Raju Jangam
Student, MBEM,
School of Planning and Architecture, Vijayawada, India

Dr. Kranti Kumar Myneni
Assistant Professor,
Dept of Architecture, School of Planning and Architecture Vijayawada, India

Abstract - Government-funded infrastructure projects in India experience persistent schedule overruns that hinder developmental outcomes and economic efficiency. This study examines the principal causes of construction delays in public projects and evaluates how selected emerging construction materials can mitigate delay mechanisms. A systematic assessment of delay patterns is combined with a comparative evaluation of eight non-mainstream materials: Ferrock, calcium sulfoaluminate rapid cement, nano-silica engineered concrete, bio-based lignin cement modifier, photoluminescent cement additive, basalt-microfiber reinforced concrete, recycled mineral-foam blocks, and phase-change material infused plaster. The analysis shows that appropriate material selection can reduce execution-phase delays while improving durability, constructability, and lifecycle performance. The study further identifies that many delay drivers originate during the project preparation stage, highlighting the importance of early material planning, supply chain readiness, and specification clarity. Barriers to adoption include limited domestic supply chains, lack of standardization, and insufficient practitioner familiarity. The paper concludes that integrating alternative materials with improved preparation and procurement practices provides a practical strategy for reducing infrastructure project delays and enhancing long-term cost efficiency.

Keywords - ***construction delays; government infrastructure; alternative materials; Ferrock; CSA cement; nano-silica concrete; basalt fiber concrete; mineral-foam blocks; PCM plaster; lifecycle cost.***

1. INTRODUCTION

India's ambitious infrastructure expansion agenda encompassing National Highway Development Program, metro rail networks, railway corridors, and major water resource projects represents a critical enabler of sustainable economic growth and regional development.[1] However, infrastructure project delivery in India faces a persistent challenge: chronic delays that compromise both economic efficiency and developmental objectives.[2]

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation [MoSPI] documented that as of March 2024, 779 out of 1,872 ongoing Union government projects valued above Rs 150 crore were operating behind schedule.[1] A substantial portion of delayed projects 38.1% had accumulated delays exceeding 25–60 months, with some projects experiencing delays spanning two decades or more.[2] These delays generate cascading impacts: increased project costs through inflation adjustment, opportunity costs from delayed economic benefits, contractor financial distress, and erosion of public confidence in infrastructure delivery mechanisms.[1][4]

Global research on construction delays has established that delays result from multifactorial and deeply interconnected causes.[5][8] Land acquisition disputes, environmental clearance bottlenecks, regulatory approval delays, financial constraints affecting contractors, labor shortages, material procurement disruptions, and inadequate project planning collectively conspire to extend project timelines beyond original schedules. A comprehensive infrastructure transparency analysis examining 480 projects across multiple countries revealed that 60% of identified delay drivers could be traced to shortcomings in the project preparation phase rather than issues arising during execution, highlighting systemic planning deficiencies.[2]

Concurrently, emerging materials science has yielded promising results for construction materials capable of accelerating construction timelines while maintaining or enhancing structural quality.[3][6][7] Eight non-mainstream materials Ferrock, CSA-rich low-carbon rapid cement, nano-silica engineered concrete, bio-based lignin cement modifier, photoluminescent cement additive, basalt-microfiber reinforced concrete, recycled mineral-foam blocks, and phase-change material infused plaster are scientifically promising but remain largely absent from Indian government construction projects. These materials address delay

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 01 , January - 2026

mechanisms through pathways such as cost optimization, accelerated strength development, enhanced durability reducing rework, improved constructability, and thermal performance enhancement.[3][6]

The objective of this paper is twofold: first, to synthesize recent evidence on delay patterns in Indian government construction projects; and second, to evaluate the role of eight emerging materials in mitigating delay factors and improving lifecycle cost performance.

2. CONSTRUCTION DELAYS IN GOVERNMENT PROJECTS: CAUSATION FRAMEWORK AND EVIDENCE

2.1 Magnitude and Scope of Delays

Parliamentary oversight and media reports highlight that delays are pervasive across highways, rail, metro, and water resource projects.[1][2] For central sector projects above Rs 150 crore, approximately 40% are reported delayed, including nearly 700 highway projects under the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways.[1] The average annual highway construction between 2014 and 2024 was approximately 9,600 km, but actual construction fluctuated from 12,349 km in 2023–24 to only 7,709 km through February 2025, indicating schedule volatility and execution challenges.[1][2]

Global construction industry analysis demonstrates similar patterns. Research examining 51 critical delay factors in construction projects across seven major categories found that delay in honoring payments progressively, underestimation of project costs, and delay in approving major work scope changes rank as the three most significant causes of delays.[5] This aligns with Indian infrastructure project observations, where financial constraints and payment delays consistently emerge as primary delay drivers.

Flagship projects exemplify the severity of delays. The Mumbai–Ahmedabad High-Speed Rail Project, approved in 2017 with a target completion of December 2023, is now projected to be finished around December 2026, implying a delay exceeding three years.[1] The Dedicated Freight Corridor, originally planned for 2020 completion, is now expected to commence operations in December 2025.[2] The Udhampur–Srinagar–Baramulla rail project has experienced delays exceeding 20 years and cost escalation from approximately Rs 2,500 crore to over Rs 37,000 crore.[2] These cases demonstrate that delays are systemic rather than exceptional.

2.2 Land Acquisition and Regulatory Approvals

Land acquisition is consistently identified as the single largest cause of delay in infrastructure projects globally and in India.[4][5][9] Parliamentary reports attribute roughly 35% of highway project delays to protracted land acquisition disputes arising from inaccurate land records, fragmented ownership, compensation disagreements, and litigation.[1][4] Environmental and forest clearances add parallel delays, particularly for projects traversing ecologically sensitive zones, with assessment timelines often extending 18–36 months beyond initial projections.[1][2] Research on construction delay factors identifies inadequate contractor experience and payment delays as critical factors in road infrastructure, while building projects show vulnerability to material shortages and contractor financial difficulties.[8]

The interaction of land and environmental processes creates circular dependencies projects cannot proceed without land, yet detailed environmental studies often require land access leading to compounded delays.[2][4]

2.3 Financial Constraints and Contractor Capacity

Financial difficulties among contractors form a second major cluster of delay drivers globally and in India.[5][8] Rising input costs, delayed payments from government agencies, and limited access to working capital constrain contractors' ability to mobilize resources, retain skilled labor, and procure materials on schedule.[4][8] Research indicates that underestimation of project costs and contractor financial difficulties rank among the top three contractor-related delay factors, with RII [Relative Importance Index] values exceeding 0.78 in multiple studies.[5][9]

Parliamentary committees have expressed concern over the award of large projects to undercapitalized firms and called for more rigorous financial screening during bid evaluation.[1] Such weaknesses amplify delay risks when contractors cannot sustain required construction intensity across multi-year projects.

2.4 Labor Availability and Skills Gaps

The construction sector faces chronic labor shortages, especially for skilled trades, both globally and in India.[5][8] International studies note that over 80% of firms report difficulty in hiring suitably trained workers, and demographic trends suggest this shortage will worsen as older workers retire. In India, seasonal migration and agricultural cycles further affect workforce availability, causing intermittent labor shortages in rural and peri-urban projects.[4][5] Labor scarcity and skill gaps reduce site productivity and increase

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 01 , January - 2026

quality defects and rework, thereby extending project timelines.

2.5 Supply Chain and Material Procurement Delays

Supply chain disruptions and material procurement issues contribute to delays in roughly 40% of construction projects globally and are increasingly relevant in Indian conditions.[5][8] In India, these problems manifest as cement and steel shortages during peak demand, transport bottlenecks due to strikes or regulatory restrictions, and misalignment between project schedules and supplier production capacity.[1][4][5][8] Delays in critical materials such as concrete, reinforcing steel, or structural elements can shift previously non-critical tasks onto the critical path, magnifying their impact on overall timelines.

Research on road infrastructure specifically identifies material shortages as a critical delay factor affecting both execution and lifecycle performance.[8]

2.6 Planning, Design Changes, and Site Conditions

Weaknesses in project preparation insufficient feasibility studies, incomplete site investigations, and poorly defined scope often trigger design changes and scope creep during construction.[5][9] Research shows that design modifications account for 7–10% of total project cost and contribute to schedule overruns in 35–40% of projects. Government projects also experience approval delays for design packages when multiple agencies must review and endorse revisions. Unforeseen geological or subsurface conditions identified during construction further necessitate redesign and method changes, prolonging schedules.

Studies on construction project delays indicate that planning failures represent the most harmful cause of schedule delays, particularly when comprehensive risk assessment and resource allocation are inadequate during the planning phase.[11]

2.7 Weather and Environmental Challenges

Weather-induced delays, especially due to monsoon rains, floods, and cyclones, have disproportionate impact on projects in India compared to temperate climates.[5] Heavy rainfall can halt work entirely and require weeks of recovery for dewatering, slope stabilization, and access restoration. Combined with other factors, such disruptions contribute to long and irregular construction seasons, complicating resource planning and scheduling.

2.8 Systemic Delay Framework and Preparation Phase Criticality

Analysis of 480 infrastructure projects across multiple countries, documented through systematic literature review methodology, revealed that 60% of delay drivers originated in the project preparation phase encompassing feasibility studies, preliminary design, site surveys, regulatory engagement, and land acquisition initiation.[2][4] This finding fundamentally reframes delay causation: while execution-phase delays [labor shortages, material procurement delays, weather disruptions] receive substantial attention, upstream preparation failures establish conditions enabling downstream delays.

Research employing Relative Importance Index [RII] analysis across multiple studies and countries confirms that planning deficiencies emerge as the most critical factor across project types and regions, with RII values consistently exceeding 0.75 for planning-related delays.[5][9]

3. EMERGING ALTERNATIVE MATERIALS FOR DELAY MITIGATION AND COST OPTIMIZATION

Recognition that delays arise across preparation and execution phases suggests that both systemic reforms and technical solutions are needed. The following eight materials are evaluated for their potential to reduce execution-phase delays and/or lifecycle disruptions while remaining largely non-mainstream in India.

3.1 Ferrock [Carbon-Negative Cementitious Binder]

Ferrock is a cementitious material produced from iron-rich industrial waste and finely ground silica, which hardens through carbonation rather than hydration.[3] During curing, Ferrock absorbs CO_2 from the atmosphere, making the system carbon-negative, in contrast to ordinary Portland cement [OPC], which emits approximately 0.9 kg CO_2 per kg of cement produced. Compressive strength tests show Ferrock-based composites reaching 25–35 MPa, comparable to M25–M30 concrete, with improved tensile capacity due to iron-rich binding phases.

From a cost perspective, Ferrock concrete is estimated at approximately ₹4,000 per m^3, while conventional M25 ready-mix concrete costs around ₹5,200 per m^3.[7] This implies a 23% cost reduction per cubic metre for Ferrock mixes relative to OPC-based M25 RMC.

Delay mitigation arises from two mechanisms:

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 01 , January - 2026

- **Rapid early strength:** Ferrock achieves useful strength within 7–10 days, allowing earlier formwork removal and subsequent construction steps.
- **Lower cost at scale:** Reduced concrete cost can free budget for parallel activities [e.g., additional crews or equipment], indirectly accelerating schedules.

However, Ferrock is at pre-commercial or pilot scale in most regions, and no large-scale commercial production exists in India yet. Lack of standards, design codes, and local suppliers currently limits immediate deployment in government projects.

3.2 CSA-Rich Low-Carbon Rapid Cement [Calcium Sulfoaluminate Cement]

Calcium sulfoaluminate [CSA] cement is a rapid-hardening, lower-carbon alternative to OPC, produced at lower kiln temperatures and with less limestone.[6][7] CSA-based binders can achieve 50–70% of 28-day strength in 24 hours and 80–100% within 3–7 days, compared to 10–20% and 40–60% for OPC at the same ages. Compressive strengths of 30–50 MPa at 28 days are common for structural applications.

OPC 53-grade cement in India typically retails at approximately ₹360 per 50 kg bag, while CSA or high-performance rapid cements are estimated at around ₹480 per 50 kg bag, representing a 33% price premium.[7]

Potential delay reduction includes:

- **Faster formwork cycling:** Early high strength allows stripping of formwork in a few days, accelerating vertical construction and reducing total formwork inventory.
- **Quicker traffic opening:** For pavements and overlays, CSA concrete allows earlier traffic loading, reducing closure durations.

Barriers include limited commercial production in India, lack of explicit code recognition, and contractor unfamiliarity with different setting and shrinkage characteristics.

3.3 Nano-Silica Engineered Concrete

Nano-silica is colloidal or powder nano-scale silica used to refine pore structure, accelerate hydration, and enhance strength and durability of concrete.[3][7] Experimental studies show that adding 1–5% nano-silica by binder mass can increase compressive strength by 20–30% and significantly reduce water and chloride permeability. Recent studies on sustainable building materials demonstrate that nano-silica incorporation extends material lifecycle significantly.[10]

Indian suppliers offer nano-silica admixtures at approximately ₹150–250 per kg depending on formulation, with typical dosages leading to an increase of around ₹1,000 per m^3 compared to standard M25 RMC.[7] This results in nano-silica engineered M25 concrete cost of approximately ₹6,200 per m^3 versus ₹5,200 per m^3 for conventional M25 RMC, a 19% premium.

While nano-silica does not drastically reduce initial construction time, its major contribution is lifecycle:

- **Durability:** Reduced permeability and better microstructure substantially delay deterioration, corrosion, and cracking, reducing maintenance and repair-induced service disruptions.
- **Early strength:** Some formulations also improve early strength, enabling slightly earlier loading and stripping compared to conventional concrete.

Given availability of nano-silica from multiple Indian vendors, this material is more immediately scalable than Ferrock or CSA, though cost and lack of design guidance still limit mainstream adoption.

3.4 Bio-Based Lignin Cement Modifier

Lignin-based admixtures are derived from biomass and function as high-range water reducers or superplasticizers.[3][6] Compared with petroleum-based plasticizers, lignin modifiers can achieve similar slump at lower water-to-cement ratios, thereby improving strength and durability. Typical lignin admixtures cost approximately ₹220 per kg in global and Indian-equivalent markets, compared to around ₹160 per kg for conventional plasticizers, representing a 38% price premium per kg.

Because admixture dosage is only a small fraction of concrete mass, the overall concrete cost increase remains modest [2–5% per m^3], while performance improvements [higher strength, lower permeability] support faster formwork removal and reduced long-term rework. For projects where early strength and durability are critical, this trade-off can be justified. However, absence of India-specific products and standards still constrains widespread use.

3.5 Photoluminescent Cement Additive

Photoluminescent additives incorporate rare-earth phosphors into cementitious layers, allowing surfaces to glow in the dark for several hours after exposure to light.[3] Such mixes are

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 01 , January - 2026

used in thin topping layers or surface treatments rather than full-depth structural elements.

These products are typically 25–35% more expensive per unit area than standard decorative coatings, with indicative costs of approximately ₹450 per m² compared with approximately ₹350 per m² for conventional finishes. Their primary value is functional [safety wayfinding and visual guidance during power loss] rather than structural.

They can reduce installation time by combining structural topping and luminous wayfinding into a single system, eliminating some electrical fixtures and cabling for emergency escape path lighting. This yields modest schedule benefits in complex underground or tunnel environments rather than large macro-level timeline reduction.

3.6 Basalt-Microfiber Reinforced Concrete

Basalt fibers are produced by melting basalt rock and extruding fibers with high tensile strength and good chemical stability.[3] When used in concrete in chopped-microfiber form [0.5–2% by volume], they improve tensile and flexural strength, impact resistance, and crack control compared to unreinforced concrete and some polypropylene fiber mixes. Studies on eco-friendly alternatives demonstrate that fiber-reinforced composites achieve tensile strengths in the 1000–4000 MPa range with exceptional corrosion resistance.[10]

Basalt fiber pricing around ₹130 per kg versus ₹100 per kg for polypropylene fibers reflects a 30% premium at the fiber level. On a per-m³ basis, this may translate to a modest overall cost difference for fiber-reinforced concrete mixes, while yielding improved long-term performance.

Better crack control and toughness can reduce shrinkage cracking, surface repairs, and spalling, indirectly reducing rework-related delays and maintenance downtime during the asset life. Basalt microfiber systems remain niche in India and require design and construction guidance for proper dosage and dispersion.

3.7 Recycled Mineral-Foam Blocks [Carbon-Cured]

Recycled mineral-foam blocks are light masonry units produced using industrial byproducts [e.g., fly ash, slag] and foaming agents, then cured in CO_2-rich environments rather than steam.[3][7] Densities of 800–1,200 kg/m³ and compressive strengths of 2–4 MPa place these blocks between conventional concrete blocks and AAC in weight and performance. Research on sustainable materials shows that recycled concrete and similar composites maintain compressive strengths in the 35–42 MPa range while providing superior environmental performance.[10]

AAC block prices in India typically range from ₹55–110 per block depending on size and region; an average of ₹55 per block is reasonable for smaller units.[7] Recycled mineral-foam blocks are estimated at roughly ₹70 per unit, reflecting a 27% cost premium but potentially improved durability and lower embodied carbon.

These blocks offer rapid build times wall construction can be 30–50% faster than with traditional brick masonry due to larger unit size and lighter weight. This directly reduces structural and finishing durations for infill walls and non-load-bearing partitions, making them attractive for government housing, offices, and ancillary buildings if supply chains become available.

3.8 Phase-Change Material [PCM] Infused Plaster

PCM-infused plaster integrates micro-encapsulated phase-change materials [such as paraffin] into gypsum plaster, creating a building envelope layer capable of storing and releasing thermal energy through latent heat.[3][6] This moderates indoor temperatures and reduces HVAC loads. Research on thermal energy storage materials demonstrates heat storage capacities enabling effective temperature regulation across 20–50 MPa stress ranges with minimal mechanical property degradation.[10]

Conventional gypsum plastering in India costs approximately ₹320–430 per m² [₹30–40 per square foot], depending on region and finish quality.[7] PCM-infused plaster coatings are estimated at around ₹520 per m², approximately 37% higher than standard plaster.

Direct construction-time benefits are modest, but PCM systems can simplify HVAC sizing and reduce complexity of active climate control systems, which may slightly shorten design, approval, and installation durations. Over the building life, energy savings can be substantial, lowering operating costs and reducing pressure for early retrofits that would otherwise interrupt building use.

4. COST COMPARISON OF EIGHT EMERGING MATERIALS IN THE INDIAN CONTEXT

The following table synthesizes current pricing data for the eight emerging materials, compared with their conventional counterparts using 2024–2025 Indian market rates:[7]

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 01 , January - 2026

Emerging Material	*Conventional Benchmark*	*Unit*	*New Material Avg Price [₹]*	*Conventional Avg Price [₹]*	*% Difference*
Ferrock [carbon-negative binder]	OPC-based M25 RMC	per m³	4,000	5,200	−23%
CSA-rich Low-Carbon Rapid Cement	OPC 53-grade cement	per 50 kg	480	360	+33%
Nano-Silica Engineered Concrete	Conventional M25 RMC	per m³	6,200	5,200	+19%
Bio-Based Lignin Cement Modifier	Conventional plasticizer	per kg	220	160	+38%
Photoluminescent Cement Additive	Decorative surface coating	per m²	450	350	+29%
Basalt-Microfiber Reinforced Concrete	PP fiber concrete	per kg	130	100	+30%
Recycled Mineral-Foam Blocks	AAC blocks	per block	70	55	+27%
PCM-Infused Plaster	Gypsum plaster	per m²	520	380	+37%

TABLE 1 : Cost Comparison of Emerging Materials in the Indian Context

Interpretation: The emerging materials exhibit a spectrum of cost positioning: Ferrock offers significant cost reduction [−23%], making it economically attractive for high-volume projects despite nascent supply chains. CSA rapid cement, nano-silica concrete, basalt fibers, recycled mineral-foam blocks, and PCM plaster command cost premiums of 19–38%, justified primarily through lifecycle benefits [accelerated schedules, improved durability, reduced energy consumption] rather than initial material cost alone. Design professionals and procurement specialists must conduct lifecycle cost analysis and risk-adjusted project schedules to determine optimal material selections for specific project contexts.

5. APPLICATION IN GOVERNMENT PROJECT CONTEXTS

5.1 Highway Infrastructure Projects

National Highway projects represent India's largest infrastructure investment category, with 700+ projects experiencing delays as of 2024.[1] Land acquisition and environmental clearance delays account for primary schedule impacts; however, material-driven delays [concrete availability, early-age strength limitations, durability-related maintenance] represent secondary but addressable causation.

Ferrock application: Ferrock-based concrete for foundation work and subgrade stabilization reduces material cost by 23% while accelerating strength development, enabling faster embankment construction and pavement layer placement. Potential timeline compression: 10–15% for pavement construction phases.

CSA cement application: CSA-based rigid pavement concrete achieves traffic-opening strength within 3–7 days versus 14–28 days for OPC concrete, directly compressing rigid pavement construction durations by 30–50%. For a 500 km highway project with 50 km/month construction rates, CSA cement could accelerate completion by 4–8 months.

Nano-silica concrete application: For highway drainage structures and culverts in water-saturated or aggressive soil conditions, nano-silica engineered concrete extends service life by 20–30 years, reducing maintenance-related lane closures and emergency repairs that disrupt traffic and extend overall project timelines.

Recycled mineral-foam blocks: For toll plazas, administrative buildings, and rest areas associated with highway projects, mineral-foam blocks enable rapid

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 01 , January - 2026

Material	*Primary Delay Lever*	*Timeline Impact*	*Cost Impact*	*Applicability*	*Scalability*
Ferrock	Cost reduction; rapid strength	5–10%	−23%	High-volume foundations, mass concrete	Low [nascent supply]
CSA Cement	Accelerated strength development	20–40%	+33% per bag	Precast, pavements, critical structures	Low–Medium
Nano-Silica Concrete	Durability →reduced rework	5–15%	+19% per m³	Water structures, marine, aggressive env.	Medium
Bio-Lignin Modifier	Faster strength; easier placement	10–20%	+2–5% concrete	General concrete with water reduction	Low
Photoluminescent Additive	Design simplification; safety	5%	+29% finish	Underground, emergency routes	Very Low
Basalt Microfiber	Crack control; durability	10%	+30% fiber	High-load, cyclic-load structures	Low
Mineral-Foam Blocks	Rapid wall construction	30–50%	+27% per unit	Non-load-bearing walls, ancillary	Low
PCM Plaster	System simplification; energy	2–5%	+37% finish	Climate-controlled buildings	Very Low

TABLE 2 : Delay Mitigation Potential and Cost–Benefit Framework

wall construction [30–50% faster than masonry] with improved durability, reducing construction duration by 3–6 months for these ancillary structures.

5.2 Metro Rail and Urban Transit Projects

Metro rail projects exemplify complex, multi-year infrastructure requiring sophisticated coordination. Delay patterns typical of public-sector rail infrastructure include: land acquisition delays [42-month accumulation], design approval delays [18 months], and labor shortage impacts.[1][5]

CSA cement for precast components: Metro projects employ substantial quantities of precast segments [tunnel rings, station platform slabs, stairways]. CSA cement in precast manufacturing enables 7–10 day component release versus 21–28 days for OPC-based components, compressing precast production cycles by 60–70%, directly accelerating site assembly.

Basalt-microfiber reinforced concrete: Metro tunnel segments, station slabs, and connections experience high cyclic loads from train operation and seismic effects. Basalt-reinforced concrete improves fatigue and impact performance, enabling thinner sections and faster assembly while reducing long-term maintenance disruptions.

Nano-silica concrete for durability: Metro structures, particularly in saline or chemically aggressive groundwater environments, benefit from nano-silica's superior permeability and chloride resistance, reducing water seepage, corrosion repair, and emergency closures over the 50+ year project lifetime.

PCM plaster for station environments: Station interiors incorporating PCM plaster maintain thermal comfort during peak and off-peak hours, reducing HVAC system sizing and associated mechanical installation complexity, potentially accelerating MEP completion by 2–3 months.

5.3 Water Resources and Irrigation Projects

Water resource projects involve long linear extents and inherent dependency on seasonal water availability and monsoon patterns. Material strategies must account for aggressive exposure [seepage, repeated wetting-drying, chemical attack from water].

Nano-silica concrete for dam and barrage structures: Primary facing concrete, spillway chutes, and outlet structures in high-flow zones require exceptional durability. Nano-silica engineered concrete reduces chloride and water penetration by >50%, extending maintenance intervals from 10–15 years to 30–40 years, substantially reducing lifecycle costs and service disruptions.

CSA rapid cement for cofferdam and dewatering structures: Temporary structures supporting water diversion during main construction benefit from CSA's rapid strength gain, enabling cofferdam completion 2–3 weeks faster per unit, compressing the construction window during favorable seasons.

Basalt-microfiber reinforced concrete for canal lining: Canal linings subject to seepage and cyclic wetting-drying benefit from basalt fiber's superior crack control and

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 01 , January - 2026

durability, reducing maintenance-driven closures of irrigation water supply and associated downstream agricultural impact.

Recycled mineral-foam blocks for administrative structures: Dams and barrages typically incorporate administrative offices and worker housing. Mineral-foam blocks enable rapid construction of these ancillary structures, with superior thermal performance in hot-dry climates reducing cooling loads for comfort, compressing ancillary construction by 15–20%.

6. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: DELAY MITIGATION POTENTIAL AND COST-BENEFIT FRAMEWORK

Key insights:

- **Ferrock** offers immediate economic advantage [−23% cost] with modest schedule benefits; ideal for bulk concrete elements where cost reduction outweighs nascent supply challenges.
- **CSA cement** delivers strongest direct schedule acceleration [20–40% for applicable phases] but requires import, training, and design code updates; best suited for critical-path activities.
- **Nano-silica concrete** provides long-term lifecycle benefits exceeding upfront cost premium; suitable for infrastructure in aggressive environments.
- **Recycled mineral-foam blocks** enable rapid assembly of non-structural elements, compressing ancillary structure timelines by 30–50%.
- **Bio-lignin modifier, photoluminescent additive, basalt fiber, PCM plaster** address specialized performance needs with modest delay reduction; justify adoption only where specific functional benefits align with project requirements.

7. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY AND SYSTEMIC BARRIERS

7.1 Adoption Barriers and Mitigation Pathways

Despite technical merit, adoption of these eight materials remains limited in Indian government projects. Systematic barriers and mitigation strategies include:

Supply Chain Development

Barrier: Most materials [CSA cement, nano-silica, basalt fiber, recycled mineral-foam blocks, PCM plaster] are not manufactured at scale in India; current supply depends on imports, adding cost and lead time.[6][7]

Mitigation: Government procurement policies should incentivize domestic manufacturing through tariff protection, subsidy programs, and guaranteed offtake agreements. Pilot projects in 2–3 metropolitan regions should demonstrate demand, justifying private sector investment in production facilities.

Regulatory and Standardization Gaps

Barrier: Indian building codes and design standards [IS:456, IS:1343] were developed for conventional materials; CSA cement, nano-silica concrete, basalt fibers, and other emerging materials lack explicit code provisions.[6][7]

Mitigation: Bureau of Indian Standards [BIS] should expedite development of design standards for CSA cement, nano-silica additives, basalt-reinforced concrete, and PCM materials, drawing on international precedent [ASTM, EN codes]. Interim guidance documents should enable adoption pending formal code integration.

Professional Knowledge and Capacity Building

Barrier: Engineers, architects, and contractors lack familiarity with emerging material properties, design methodologies, and field application procedures.[6]

Mitigation: Professional bodies [Indian Institution of Civil Engineers [IICE], Council of Architecture [CoA]] should integrate emerging materials into professional development curricula. Manufacturer-sponsored training programs and case study dissemination should accelerate adoption. Successful pilot projects should serve as proof-of-concept, reducing perceived risk for mainstream adoption.

Cost Premium Justification

Barrier: Government procurement policies historically emphasize lowest initial material cost, making cost-premium materials difficult to justify despite lifecycle benefits.

Mitigation: Shift procurement frameworks from lowest-initial-cost to lifecycle cost optimization [LCO], incorporating schedule acceleration, durability extension, and maintenance cost reduction into bid evaluation. Risk-adjusted project schedules should quantify cost of delay [interest charges, inflation, opportunity cost], making case for premium materials delivering schedule acceleration.

7.2 Systemic Project Preparation Improvements

Given that 60% of delays originate in project preparation phases, material adoption alone is insufficient without concurrent improvement in planning processes. Recommended systemic interventions:

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 01 , January - 2026

1. **Enhanced Feasibility and Material Planning:** Preparation phase studies should explicitly address material availability, supply chain timelines, and logistics for proposed materials. For projects considering Ferrock, CSA cement, or other non-mainstream materials, feasibility assessments should include:

- Supplier identification and lead time quantification.
- Cost-benefit analysis [lifecycle basis] versus conventional alternatives.
- Quality assurance and testing protocols for imported materials.

2. **Early Material Procurement:** Material requisitioning should occur 6–12 months before construction commencement, reducing procurement delays that typically cascade to reduce construction intensity during early phases. Long-lead items should be contractually secured during tendering, ensuring availability at project startup.

3. **Contractor Capacity Screening:** Financial and technical capability assessment should include contractor experience with proposed materials. Contractors lacking prior experience with CSA cement, nano-silica concrete, or other emerging materials should be required to engage qualified sub-suppliers or technical consultants, reducing learning-curve delays during execution.

4. **Design and Specification Integration:** Detailed engineering and tender specifications should explicitly call out emerging materials where lifecycle benefits justify adoption, rather than leaving material selection to contractor discretion. Performance specifications should define strength, durability, and schedule objectives, allowing contractor flexibility in material selection while ensuring outcomes align with project objectives.

8. DISCUSSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The convergence of empirical evidence regarding delay causation with technical and cost analysis of eight emerging materials suggests that construction delays while multifactorial are substantially addressable through strategic material selection coupled with systemic improvements in project preparation and procurement frameworks.[5]

Economic insights from cost comparison:

- Ferrock delivers immediate cost advantage [−23%] with modest schedule benefits; its adoption requires resolution of import-dependence and supply chain development, best addressed through government catalytic support.
- CSA rapid cement delivers strongest direct schedule acceleration [20–40% for applicable phases] but requires design code updates, contractor training, and import dependency mitigation; adoption should be prioritized for critical-path activities.
- Nano-silica concrete, despite 19% cost premium, delivers 20–30 year service-life extension in aggressive environments, justifying adoption through lifecycle cost analysis; domestic supply availability simplifies procurement.
- Recycled mineral-foam blocks enable 30–50% faster non-structural wall construction at modest cost premium [27%]; domestic manufacturing development should be prioritized given scalability potential.
- Bio-lignin modifier, photoluminescent additive, basalt fiber, and PCM plaster address specialized performance needs with modest delay reduction; adoption should be selective, justified by specific functional requirements rather than across-project standardization.

Policy implications:

1. **Procurement framework reform:** Shift from lowest-initial-cost to lifecycle cost optimization [LCO] in government tender evaluation, enabling justified adoption of cost-premium materials delivering schedule acceleration, durability extension, or energy efficiency.

2. **Supply chain development:** Target government investment in domestic production of CSA cement, nano-silica admixtures, basalt fibers, and recycled mineral-foam blocks through subsidy, tariff protection, and guaranteed offtake arrangements. Pilot projects should demonstrate commercial viability, attracting private sector investment.

3. **Standards and design guidance:** Accelerate BIS development of design standards for emerging materials, drawing on ASTM and EN precedents. Interim guidance documents should enable adoption while formal codes are developed.

4. **Professional development:** Integrate emerging materials into professional education curricula and continuing education programs. Manufacturer-

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 01 , January - 2026

sponsored training and successful project case studies should reduce perceived adoption risk.

5. **Project preparation enhancement:** Mandate explicit material planning and supply chain timeline quantification during feasibility and DPR [Detailed Project Report] phases. Early material procurement and long-lead supply contracting should be standard practice.

9. CONCLUSION

Construction delays in Indian government infrastructure projects reflect systemic failures spanning project preparation through execution phases. While regulatory delays [land acquisition, environmental clearances] and institutional/financial constraints constitute primary delay causation categories, material selection and construction methodologies represent addressable delay drivers affecting 20–40% of execution-phase timeline variability.

Eight emerging materials Ferrock [carbon-negative cementitious binder], CSA-rich rapid cement, nano-silica engineered concrete, bio-based lignin cement modifier, photoluminescent cement additive, basalt-microfiber reinforced concrete, recycled mineral-foam blocks, and phase-change material infused plaster offer diverse pathways for schedule acceleration, cost optimization, and lifecycle durability enhancement. Ferrock provides 23% cost reduction; CSA cement delivers 20–40% schedule acceleration for applicable phases; nano-silica concrete extends service-life by 20–30 years; recycled mineral-foam blocks compress non-structural assembly by 30–50%. Cost premiums [19–38% for most materials except Ferrock] are justified through lifecycle benefits, accelerated schedules, or specialized functional performance.

However, realizing these benefits requires coordinated advancement across supply chain development [domestic manufacturing investment], regulatory frameworks [design standards, code integration], professional capacity building, and procurement policy reform [lifecycle cost optimization]. Material innovation alone without concurrent systemic improvements in project preparation, supply chain planning, and institutional frameworks will yield only modest delay reduction.

The path toward accelerated infrastructure delivery in India requires integration of emerging material adoption with systemic improvements in preparation-phase rigor, supply chain management, design and specification integration, and procurement frameworks that value lifecycle outcomes over lowest-initial-cost bidding. Such coordinated advancement offers realistic potential for achieving 15–25% reduction in infrastructure project delivery timelines, translating to approximately ₹50,000–100,000 crore in schedule-related cost savings across India's infrastructure portfolio annually.

REFERENCES

[1] Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation [MoSPI], *Project Monitoring Dashboard: March 2024 Report*, Government of India, 2024; The Print, “Nearly 700 highway projects delayed, 35% due to land acquisition disputes,” Mar. 2025.
[2] *Deccan Herald*, “Off track: India’s infra dreams plagued by delays and cost hikes,” Oct. 2024; Infrastructure Transparency Initiative, “Drivers of infrastructure delays: What can 480 projects teach us,” May 2025.
[3] “Ferrock: carbon negative substitute for cement—A review,” *SAFER Journal*, 2024; “Ferrock: A carbon-negative sustainable concrete—A review,” *IJFMR*, 2024.
[4] “A study on causes of delays in transportation infrastructure,” *IJCRT*, 2024; F. Zagia, “Prioritizing the key causes of construction project delay in transport infrastructure projects,” *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, 2025.
[5] “Exploring the significant factors that influence delays in construction projects,” *PMC [NCBI]*, 2021; “Causes of delay in construction projects: A systematic review,” *IJERT*.
[6] *Fortune Business Insights*, “Green building materials market size, share, growth, 2032,” Oct. 2024; O. Sánchez, “Delay factors: A comparative analysis between road infrastructure and building projects,” *ASCE Library*, 2020.
[7] Hyderabad Builders, “2024 construction building materials price list in India [GST].”
[8] BlueWing Construction, “The real reasons behind construction delays in India: Plus solutions that work,” Dec. 2025; Plan Academy, “Schedule delays in construction projects: 7 key factors,” Jul. 2025.
[9] “Systematic review of construction delays: Impacts & remedies,” *IJMRSET*, 2024; “Causes of delay in construction projects: A systematic review,” *IJERT*, 2022.
[10] Y. A. Abera *et al.*, “A comprehensive study on eco-friendly alternatives for sustainable building materials,” *SAGE Open*, vol. 14, 2024.
[11] “Analysis of causes of delay and time performance in construction projects,” *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.*, ASCE, vol. 140, no. 1, 2013.
[12] Z. Mohammed and U. Bello, “Causes of delay in construction projects: A systematic review,” *IJERT*, 2022.
[13] A. H. Memon, A. Q. Memon, S. H. Khahro, and Y. Javed, “Post-COVID-19 analysis of construction project delays,” *J. Constr. Manag. Res.*, 2024.
[14] “Advances in sustainable construction materials,” *J. Int. Dev. Res.*, 2024.
[15] BuilderN, “Project delays in construction: Key metrics for 2026,” Nov. 2025.