



جامعة الجميع الذكية
EVERYONE'S SMART UNIVERSITY

Everyone's Smart University

Project (Spring 2021)

Student Name	Roqiah Hassan Jaber Duahyl	اسم الطالب
Students I.D	2021203200	الرقم الجامعي

Section

Master

Date

Thursday

18 / 03 / 2021.

Course Code

(PMG506)

Advanced project Management

Instructions:

- آخر موعد للتسليم هو يوم الخميس 2021-05-08 في تمام الساعة 9 مساءً.
- الإجابة متاحة باللغة الإنجليزية أو اللغة العربية مع مراعاة أن تكون المصطلحات العلمية باللغة الانجليزية.
- يتم تسليم المشروع في صيغة ملف pdf مع الالتزام نموذج الجامعة ولن تقبل أي مستندات أخرى.
- يجب مراعاة أقسام البحث الرئيسية (مقدمة Introduction، دراسات علمية سابقة Literature Review، طريقة البحث Methodology، النتائج والمناقشة Results and Discussion، وأخيراً المراجع References. وان كان هناك ملحقات Appendices يتم إضافتها)
- يجب الالتزام بـ Theme موحد كما يلي:
- حجم الخط 12.
- نوع الخط Arial.
- لون الخط أسود.
- المسافة بين الأسطر 1.5 line spacing
- عدد صفحات البحث (لا يقل عن ثلاث صفحات ولا يزيد عن ست صفحات).

Instructor's Name: ~~Eng. Amaal Aburumman~~ Eng. Dr. Akram M. S. Ali

Introduction

This project involves building a social hall for the general public in Fulton County, Georgia. The social hall is to be used for major social gatherings, and residents will use it to assemble during major public events, including literary plays, artistic shows; it will also act as an educational center to sensitize the youth on significant issues affecting them, such as drug abuse, racism and drug abuse, and government officials can use it to spell out their plan on how to implement government policy while also taking the opinions of the general public on various developmental projects that they would wish to be given priority. The public will also have a chance to ask questions and request information on using their taxes to be assured that their taxes are used for the intended purposes and in the most effective manner possible.

It is anticipated that the total building cost for constructing the social hall will approximately be \$1,291,700. These fees include various charges, including architectural fees, which will be around \$106,700; contractor fees including GC, overhead, and profit at about \$237,000 and labor fees at approximately \$116,200. Building and construction materials will make the most significant portion of the project's budget at around sixty percent of the total building cost.

The fees for carrying out an environmental impact assessment, which gives an overview of the possible effects that such a construction project will have on the surrounding environment and provide possible mitigation measures against such products, are also included in the final total building cost of the project. It is, however,

essential to note that these are just estimates, and the total building cost may be higher or lower than what has been quoted depending on prevailing market trends.

Literature Review

There are various methods for carrying out project estimates, including the top-down and bottom-up project management strategies. The top-down approach involves beginning with the project objective and separating it into more modest planning units (Sharples et al., 2018). The planning units are then redefined to broader aspects before team members are tasked with these aspects.

The top-down approach can identify major tasks more efficiently, whereas details are later defined by the project team (Rabe et al., 2019). The system provides clear insights into the project's further information enabling the project manager to have a comprehensive overview of the project's effect on the proprietors. On the other hand, the bottom-up strategy involves identifying various tasks to be undertaken and putting them into different work packages. The project's team players make this identification of functions. The strategy is time-consuming, although it results in a more detailed plan (Dawodu et al., 2021).

Estimating by analogy utilizes a comparable past undertaking to appraise the term or cost of a given present task. It is usually highly used when there is restricted data concerning a given current project. Estimating by analogy is considered "hierarchical" and is therefore not as exact as other project estimation methods. Estimation by analogy is viewed as a blend of verifiable data and master judgment since the task manager's, and conceivably the team's, insight and judgment are applied to the estimation interaction.

On the other hand, parametric estimation utilizes the connection between factors to ascertain the expense or term. It is, therefore, a more accurate method for assessing both the anticipated cost and duration of a given project (Gajbe et al., 2021). Parametric estimation is dictated by distinguishing the unit cost or term and the number of units

needed for the project or action. However, the analysis should be adaptable to be accurate.

Methodology

In choosing the methodology for carrying out project estimation, the most crucial factor to consider is cost and time. All projects need to start and be carried into a prosperous completion during the set-out period of duration. It is important to note that the time that it takes for a given project to be completed affects the total cost that such a project will cost. Most projects tend to cost more when they are carried out into completion in a short period, while others tend to cost less when carried out in a short period.

In our case, the project will cost more if it takes a more extended period since the construction of the social hall is in high demand, and the general public cannot wait longer to start realizing the benefits of the social hall. I will therefore use the top-down approach as the best method in the estimation of the anticipated project cost of the construction of the social hall in Fulton County. Using the top-down approach will be much less compared to the details that would have been identified when using the bottom-up approach. Still, time is more critical in this project, and the details provided by the top-down approach can be sufficient for this case (Jamhawi et al., 2017).

References

- Dawodu, A., Oladejo, J., Tsigas, Z., Kanengoni, T., & Cheshmehzangi, A. (2021). Underutilization of waste as a resource: Bottom-up approach to waste management and its energy implications in Lagos, Nigeria. *Intelligent Buildings International*, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508975.2021.1873097>
- Gajbe, S. B., Tiwari, A., Gopalji, & Singh, R. K. (2021). Evaluation and analysis of data management plan tools: A parametric approach. *Information Processing & Management*, 58(3), 102480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2020.102480>
- Jamhawi, M. M., & Hajahjah, Z. A. (2017). A bottom-up approach for cultural tourism management in the Old City of as-salt, Jordan. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 7(1), 91-106. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jchmsd-07-2015-0027>
- Rabe, B. G. (2019). Bottom-up versus top-down: The evolving American climate policy Odyssey. *Multilevel Environmental Governance*, 131-153. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9780857939258.00017>
- Sharples, C., McIntosh, P., & Comfort, M. (2018). Geodiversity and Geoconservation in land management in Tasmania – A top-down approach. *Geoheritage*, 355-371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-809531-7.00020-4>