



Prifysgol Cymru
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

BA(Hons) Business Management
Contracting Methods in Project
Management: A Comparative
Analysis Using Heathrow Terminal 5

Student Name: Alexandra Clapa

Student ID: 2243446

Course Name: Project Management- LCBB6006

Lecturer Name: Zainab Atta

Session: June 2026

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Contracting in Project Management and the Heathrow Terminal 5 Context	3
3. Project Context: Heathrow Terminal 5	4
4. Turnkey Contracting	5
5. Multicontract Contracting	6
6. Do-it-Yourself (DIY) Contracting	6
7. Multicontract + DIY Contracting	8
8. Comparative Evaluation of the Four Contracting Methods	9
9. Conclusion and Recommendation	10
10. References	12

1. Introduction

Project management is essential for temporary projects to accomplish organisational goals. The Association for Project Management (2023) defines project management as employing methods, techniques, competencies, knowledge, and experience to fulfil project goals within constraints. Firms must decide what to create and how to organise activities according to time, budget, quality, scope, resources, and risk restrictions. Contracting is necessary when a company lacks the technical experience, personnel, equipment, or professional skills to finish a difficult job. Thus, contracting affects governance, accountability, risk allocation, and project performance (PL Projects, 2025). Projects help businesses build knowledge, increase resource capabilities, reallocate risks, and focus personnel on vital tasks. Contracting does not ensure project success since different techniques establish different owner-contractor relationships. Based on project complexity, owner knowledge, target completion speed, and job allocation, no single project delivery technique is ideal (Mahdi and Alreshaid, 2005). This article compares the merits and downsides of project management under four contractual frameworks: Turnkey, Multicontract, DIY, and Multiplecontract plus DIY, using Heathrow Terminal 5 (T5) as an example.

2. Contracting in Project Management and the Heathrow Terminal 5 Context

According to Jedd (2007), a contractual model delegates project, interface, and risk management to specific organisations. This choice is significant since initiatives require internal and external expertise. Project owners can have a single contractor handle most delivery tasks, utilise many expert contractors, or use internal resources and outsourced components. Each method affects the owner's coordination, integration, monitoring, and risk management. Mahdi and Alreshaid (2005) found that project attributes and owner competencies should guide technique selection, not prior performance. Thus, contracting is a procurement, organization, and risk-distribution option.

Contractual and pricing strategies differ. Turnkey, multicontract, DIY, and multicontract + DIY structure project responsibilities and work packages, while pricing mechanisms determine contractor income, according to the UN Center for Transnational Corporations (1981). An enterprise can employ many contracts and establish various rates with contractors using a multicontract framework. This matters because picking a task performance is distinct from choosing to pay. Thus, this essay focuses on the four organisational contracting approaches rather than fixed-price, cost-plus, time-and-materials, or other pricing structures.

3. Project Context: Heathrow Terminal 5

Heathrow Terminal 5 is a superb example of the four contracting methods due to its size and technical and organisational complexity. T5 upgraded Heathrow Airport with a main terminal, satellite buildings, baggage-handling facilities, transit links, and technological systems (Armstrong, 2008). Gil and Tether (2010) estimate T5's infrastructure cost £4.2 billion, with work beginning in 2002 and the terminal opening in March 2008. According to their study, the project needed a balance between risk management and design flexibility to accommodate shifting development needs. T5 needed more than basic construction and technological integration to function as a single airport terminal.

T5's intricacy makes it perfect for contract analysis since specialists must collaborate. T5, a megaproject case study of systems integration, did not improve operational integration, according to Davies, Gann, and Douglas (2009). Brady and Davies (2010b) highlight that luggage, and travel concerns delayed the opening despite the building program meeting schedule and budget goals. These examples demonstrate the need of responsibility and cooperation in complicated initiatives. Thus, the next sections examine how each of the four contracting methods affects the identical T5 project.

4. Turnkey Contracting

Turnkey contracting involves one primary contractor completing the project, according to Cambridge Dictionary (2022). The contractor controls phases and subcontractors before delivering a finished structure. BAA might have hired one large entity to oversee terminal buildings, electrical and mechanical systems, baggage infrastructure, technology, testing, and ultimate handover for T5 (Global Infrastructure Hub, 2021). This strategy would ease responsibility for BAA since one main entity would deliver the promised result. This might greatly reduce the number of contractual interfaces the client oversees and simplify problem-solving. In projects with specified output demands and a trained contractor who can supply everything, Turnkey is perfect.

Turnkey contracting may reduce coordination and delivery difficulties, says Laias Erras (2025). In T5, hundreds of technical interconnections must operate as one system, so a significant contractor may reduce supplier disputes for the customer. The principal contractor may overlap design, procurement, and construction to improve program efficiency. Project characteristics determine whether integrated delivery systems can help with single-point accountability and early coordination (Bhatt et al., 2019). Turnkey may handle T5 and ease client management.

However, the same duty transfer carries severe downsides. Unexpected risks can raise project costs, thus contractors working on highly uncertain megaprojects must use contingencies and risk allowances. Gil and Tether (2010) demonstrate that design flexibility allowed T5 adapt to changing operational and technical demands. Significant changes after contract signing might cause costly variations, disagreements, or program disruption under a strict Turnkey framework. Additionally, BAA would have less influence over detailed design and expert contractor selection. Thus, Turnkey might simplify T5's contractual structure, but its limited flexibility and dependency on one contractor would make it unattractive for a project with high technological complexity and expanding needs.

5. Multicontract Contracting

A multicontract method outsources various job packages to specialist organisations, according to Innovation M Services (2025). For Heathrow T5, BAA may acquire structural construction, luggage handling systems, tunnels, rail linkages, mechanical and electrical installations, and IT (Global Infrastructure Hub, 2021). Each contract's contractor may be an expert, offering access to specific skills. A skilled baggage-system contractor may install the automated handling system better than a general contractor. Multicontracting lets goods be competitively bid or altered without renegotiating. Multicontracting may increase T5 technical quality, vendor selection, and client monitoring.

Customer coordination and integration risk are multicontracting's key drawbacks. Separate contractors may finish their packages, but project success hinges on their seamless integration (Coleman, 2026). Caldwell, Roehrich, and Davies (2009) noted that T5 had many organisations and technological systems. The baggage contractor may install the system, but it may not function with electrical systems, software, terminal configurations, airline restrictions, or operational staff. Thus, BAA would require project-management abilities to handle contractor relationships.

Contracts may also complicate communication and duties. One late contractor may disrupt others and request extra time or money. The T5 launch issues demonstrate that successful components are not enough (Brady and Davies, 2010b). Therefore, multicontracting offers specialist competence, adaptability, and strong client monitoring but also raises communication, coordination, and integration risks.

6. Do-it-Yourself (DIY) Contracting

The DIY strategy engages customers most directly since the project owner uses its own people, expertise, and organisational resources for most tasks (Flowlance, 2026). T5 would see BAA manage project governance, design, engineering, construction management, technology integration, and other

outsourced delivery processes. This method allows the owner organization full control over project decisions, its key benefit. BAA may change operational goals without consulting a major contractor on design changes. DIY may appeal to firms with strong internal project and technology skills.

DIY can help the customer collect and save data. A corporation that finishes a significant project may save risk, design, technology, stakeholders, and project controls (Elvis, 2025). T5 expertise might enhance Heathrow projects for an airport operator that changes infrastructure often. Employees may know the airport's long-term needs better than contractors, whose contracts end. DIY may benefit an organization long after a project.

A T5 megaproject with such technological variety is beyond the resources of many owner firms. Airport operations and megaproject building demand similar but distinct skills. Tunnelling, mechanical systems, rail infrastructure, baggage automation, IT, aviation security, and others were needed for T5. Permanent internal teams that can do everything need massive recruiting, equipment, training, and monitoring. More crucially, FMB (2025) implies many of those resources may not be needed after construction. DIY may waste resources and expose BAA to hazards best handled by experts.

DIY places project responsibility on the client, assert Russell, Pferdehirt, Nelson (2018) and Brady and Davies (2010a). The customer executes the task, therefore mistakes, talent shortages, productivity challenges, and technology issues cannot be simply transferred to an external contractor. Project peaks where resource demand exceeds organisational capacity may cause complications. DIY interior renovations are possible, but the £4.2 billion T5 program's internal delivery is unlikely. DIY may boost owner control and organisational learning, but T5's scale, resource needs, and technology requirements make it unsuitable as the only delivery option.

7. Multicontract + DIY Contracting

Multicontract + DIY offers project outsourcing and internal control. According to Hayes and Stéphanie Tillement (2022), this technique lets the client focus on its expertise and strategic goals while contracting technical experts or temporary resources. Lane (2008) suggests BAA manage program oversight, systems integration, risk governance, stakeholder management, and strategic decision-making for Heathrow Terminal 5 (T5) while outsourcing structural construction, tunnelling, baggage systems, railroad infrastructure, and electrical installations. This makes the hybrid technique perfect for complex projects when the client has good management abilities but cannot efficiently handle all specialist operations internally.

Responsibility management is a major benefit of the finest company. Professional engineering firms could manage tunnels and automated luggage systems, while BAA understood Heathrow's long-term operational needs. Davies, Gann, and Douglas (2009) state T5 needs competent project leadership for a large external supplier network. Multicontract + DIY combines external knowledge with internal control. Organisational learning is supported by consumer interaction. Internal managers learn project systems, technology, and risk management from contractors. Gil and Tether (2011) observed that cooperation and adaptation reduced T5 uncertainty, suggesting a mixed arrangement.

Most problematic is that the client still integrates. Managing contractors with internal teams might produce communication challenges, delays, and increased costs for BAA. Brady and Davies (2010b) demonstrate that T5's initial operational challenges reveal that successful construction does not guarantee integration. Since Multicontract + DIY balances control with expert talents, its success depends on governance, communication, and cooperation.

8. Comparative Evaluation of the Four Contracting Methods

When consumer direct interaction shifts, control and risk transfer invert. Turnkey offers little daily interaction and unambiguous responsibility, but it may raise risk premiums, contractor dependency, and flexibility. Multicontracting offers expert procurement and owner control over suppliers, but it also requires coordination and interaction. DIY emphasises internal control and organisational learning but requires considerable resources and places most project risk on the owner. Multicontract + DIY balances these factors by outsourcing specialised workers and holding critical duties in-house. This analysis validates academic studies indicating different project delivery methodologies suit distinct owner and project characteristics (Mahdi and Alreshaid, 2005).

Heathrow Terminal 5's best contracting method is multicontract + DIY. Turnkey would have reduced contractual obligations but may have given one supplier too much decision-making power in a changing project. Complete DIY would have offered BAA full control but required unrealistic engineering and building skills. Pure Multicontracting would have provided speciality expertise but left customers with difficult supplier interfaces without internal operational capabilities. The hybrid method enables BAA to integrate the project while external businesses deliver well-defined specialist items. Organising T5's wide participant network requires systems integration (Davies, Gann and Douglas, 2009). This technique balances control, competence, flexibility, risk management, and knowledge retention well.

Multicontract + DIY is not the best contracting method for every project despite these preferences. Turnkey may be better for smaller, well-defined warehouse building because the owner may not need a huge internal project team. If skilled, a speciality firm modernising its internal digital system may opt DIY. Multicontracting may suit a customer with solid program management but several specialists' demand. The academic study on project delivery selection also indicates that project characteristics affect delivery choices. Project responsibility, talent, and risk vary; hence the ideal contracting technique is contextual.

9. Conclusion and Recommendation

In summary, the examination reveals that Turnkey, Multicontract, DIY, and Multicontract + DIY offer varied methodologies for distributing project accountability, risk, oversight, proficiency, and collaboration. Employing Heathrow Terminal 5 as a case study illustrates that no singular approach is generally applicable, since efficacy is contingent upon the intricacy of the project and the client's proficiency. Turnkey solutions provide explicit responsibility and diminished client engagement, although they may constrain adaptability and heighten reliance on a single provider. Multicontracting offers access to specialised knowledge and enhanced client oversight of specific job packages, although it introduces considerable coordination and integration challenges. DIY enhances internal governance and organisational education, it demands considerable resources, expert expertise, and assigns the majority of project accountability to the customer. These disparities affirm that contracting choices should align with the unique demands and hazards of the project, rather than being determined exclusively by expense or ease.

For Heathrow Terminal 5, the Multicontract + DIY approach is the most suitable contracting strategy as it offers the optimal equilibrium between internal oversight and external expertise. BAA may maintain accountability for program oversight, systems integration, operational necessities, stakeholder engagement, and strategic choices, whereas specialised contractors execute technically complex tasks like tunnelling, baggage systems, rail infrastructure, and electrical installations. This configuration is especially appropriate for a multifaceted megaproject as it enables the distribution of knowledge to the companies most capable of delivering it, all while ensuring client supervision.

Subsequently, it is advisable for businesses overseeing similarly intricate projects to contemplate Multicontract + DIY, provided they have robust internal project management skills. This methodology must be underpinned by well-defined roles, efficient communication, robust governance, synchronised risk management, and thorough systems integration. Ultimately, the optimal

contracting approach must be chosen based on project intricacy, organisational competence, resource availability, risk exposure, and the degree of control necessary.

10. References

APM (2023). *What is project management?* [online] *Apm.org.uk*. Association for Project Management. Available at: <https://www.apm.org.uk/resources/what-is-project-management/> [Accessed 9 Aug. 2026].

Armstrong, D. (2008). *Heathrow airport to open massive international terminal*. [online] SFGATE. Available at: <https://www.sfgate.com/travel/article/heathrow-airport-to-open-massive-international-3221022.php> [Accessed 10 Aug. 2026].

Bhatt, N., Gothi, K., Sardhara, S. and Sarkar, D. (2019). Conformance evaluation of lean integrated project delivery (LIPD) for Indian construction industry. *Proceedings of the Creative Construction Conference 2019*, [online] pp.241–248. doi:10.3311/cc2019-035.

Brady, T. and Davies, A. (2010a). From hero to hubris – reconsidering the project management of Heathrow’s terminal 5. *International Journal of Project Management*, 28, pp.151–157. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2009.11.011.

Brady, T. and Davies, A. (2010b). Learning to deliver a mega-project: The case of heathrow terminal 5. *The University of Brighton*, [online] pp.174–198. doi:9780415800051.

Caldwell, N.D., Roehrich, J.K. and Davies, A.C. (2009). Procuring complex performance in construction: London heathrow terminal 5 and a private finance initiative hospital. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 15(3), pp.178–186. doi:10.1016/j.pursup.2009.05.006.

Cambridge Dictionary (2022). *Turnkey*. [online] @CambridgeWords. Available at: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/turnkey> [Accessed 10 Aug. 2026].

Colleman, M. (2026). *Managing gaps and risks in split/multi-contracting BESS projects*. [online] Dentons.com. Available at: <https://www.dentons.com/en/insights/articles/2026/february/12/managing-gaps-and-risks-in-split-multi-contracting-bess-projects> [Accessed 10 Aug. 2026].

Davies, A., Gann, D. and Douglas, T. (2009). Innovation in megaprojects: Systems integration at London heathrow terminal 5. *California Management Review*, 51, pp.101–125. doi:10.2307/41166482.

Elvis, G. (2025). *Making money online comes down to three main concepts: DIY, DFY, and DWY, and as an entrepreneur, understanding these helps you know how to serve your clients better*. [online] LinkedIn. Available at: https://www.linkedin.com/posts/godstime-elvis-3579a0301_making-money-online-comes-down-to-three-main-activity-7384983259467927552-SRt1/ [Accessed 10 Aug. 2026].

Flowlance (2026). *DFY vs. DWY vs. DIY digital products and services: A complete comparison with examples*. [online] Flowlance.com. Available at: <https://www.flowlance.com/blog/dfy-vs-dwy-vs-diy> [Accessed 10 Aug. 2026].

FMB (2025). *Federation of Master Builders*. [online] Fmb.org.uk. Available at: <https://www.fmb.org.uk/resource/fmb-finds-homeowners-risk-higher-costs-as-9-in-10-refuse-to-call-a-builder-after-diy-goes-wrong.html> [Accessed 10 Aug. 2026].

Gil, N. and Tether, B.S. (2010). Project risk management and design flexibility: Analysing a case and conditions of complementarity. *Research Policy*, [online] 40(3), pp.415–428. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2010.10.011.

Global Infrastructure Hub (2021). *Heathrow terminal 5*. [online] *infrastructuredeliverymodels.gihub.org*. Available at: <https://infrastructuredeliverymodels.gihub.org/case-studies/heathrow-terminal-5/> [Accessed 10 Aug. 2026].

Hayes, J. and Stéphanie Tillement (2022). Outsourcing and safety—An introduction. *SpringerBriefs in applied sciences and technology*, [online] pp.1–7. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-89792-5_1.

Innovation M Services (2025). *What is multi-sourcing? Advantages, disadvantages, and use cases explained*. [online] *Innovation M Services*.

Available at: <https://innovationmservices.com/multi-sourcing-advantages-disadvantages/> [Accessed 10 Aug. 2026].

Jedd, M. (2007). *Process of managing project contracts* | PMI. [online] www.pmi.org. Available at: <https://www.pmi.org/learning/library/process-managing-project-contracts-4525> [Accessed 9 Aug. 2026].

Laias Erras (2025). *Turnkey project: Advantages and features*. [online] GSE Spain. Available at: <https://www.gsegroup.es/en/advantages-of-turnkey-project/> [Accessed 10 Aug. 2026].

Lane, T. (2008). *BAA rejects T5 agreement for T5c*. [online] Building. Available at: <https://www.building.co.uk/news/baa-rejects-t5-agreement-for-t5c/3104624.article> [Accessed 10 Aug. 2026].

Mahdi, I.M. and Alreshaid, K. (2005). Decision support system for selecting the proper project delivery method using analytical hierarchy process (AHP). *International Journal of Project Management*, [online] 23(7), pp.564–572. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2005.05.007.

PL Projects (2025). *Contract management: Best practices for project success*. [online] PL Projects. Available at: <https://plprojects.co.uk/contract-management-best-practices-project-success/> [Accessed 9 Aug. 2026].

Russell, J., Pferdehirt, W. and Nelson, J. (2018). *Allocating and managing constrained resources*. [online] wisc.pb.unizin.org. University of Wisconsin-Madison. Available at: <https://wisc.pb.unizin.org/technicalpm/chapter/allocating-and-managing-constrained-resources/> [Accessed 10 Aug. 2026].

United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations (1981). *Features and issues in turnkey contracts in developing countries (Part I)*. [online] <https://www.unido.org/>. Available at: <https://www.unido.org/publications/ot/9644958/pdf> [Accessed 10 Aug. 2026].

