



Project Cost Analysis Using the Earned Value Method on the Bagor Bridge Replacement Project in Situbondo Regency

Yonandika Pandu Putranto^{1*}, Andi Patriadi², Sajiyo³

¹⁻³Master of Civil Engineering Study Program, Faculty of Engineering,

Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Indonesia

Email: ¹⁾yonandika@gmail.com, ²⁾andipatriadi@untag-sby.ac.id, ³⁾sajiyo@untag-sby.ac.id

Address: Jl. Semolowaru No.45, Menur Pumpungan, Kec. Sukolilo, Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60118

Author correspondence: yonandika@gmail.com*

Abstract. Delays in project implementation are caused by a lack of good control so that it affects the cost and completion time. The purpose of the study is to determine or predict how much a project will cost at the time of implementation and to determine the effectiveness of project control using the Earned Value Method. Aspects of project implementation time in weeks 2,4,5,9,11,13,16,17, 18,20,21,24 are slower than the planned schedule, this is indicated from the Schedule Variant (SV) indicator. While the performance of the project implementation time in week 3,6,7,8,10,12,14,15,19,22 is faster than the plan schedule, this is indicated by the Schedule Variant (SV) is positive. While the cost performance aspects of project implementation from week 6,9,11,13,17,19,22,23 incurred costs greater than the plan cost, this is indicated from the Cost Variant (CV) indicator is negative. Whereas in weeks 7,8,10,12,14,15,16,18,20,21, 24 incurred costs less than the plan cost, this is indicated by a positive Cost Variance (CV) indicator. The calculation results obtained from the effectiveness value of 1.603 for controlling the cost and time of the project using the Earned Value Method. In other words, the results of the effectiveness value greater than 1 (one) can be said to control the construction project of the Situbondo Regency bagor bridge very effectively using the Earned Value method.

Keywords: Cost, Evaluation, Performance, Result Value, Time

1. INTRODUCTION

National development includes infrastructure development. Currently, infrastructure development is the main focus of the Indonesian government. Basically, development is a process of continuous progress and improvement that is carried out to achieve certain goals, namely improving the welfare of society. As a basic infrastructure, the transportation infrastructure and facilities system are very important for regional economic movement (Pangemanan et al., 2022). The supporting and driving system of transportation infrastructure greatly affects the efficiency and effectiveness of regional economic activities, and the level of accessibility of an area is influenced by this system (Rahadian et al., 2024).

Economic growth will be influenced by adequate infrastructure to support economic activity (Marpaung et al., 2021). The provision of village infrastructure is done to facilitate access and support production, economic, and social activities, which are an important part of village development. Bridges are components of road or transportation infrastructure that allow people and goods to connect with each other and not be isolated. Transportation can provide

good services for human activities and is sufficiently available and affordable by the purchasing power of rural communities.

The development of adequate facilities and infrastructure is very important to connect different territorial areas with each other, allowing the movement of people and people more widely without walking (Siswanto & Hidayati, 2020). With adequate facilities and infrastructure, the activities carried out will be smoother. However, the main economic equity program, infrastructure development and construction, often faces a number of problems (Sinaga, 2022). Natural factors, availability of funds, and efficiency of work can hinder infrastructure work. In rural communities, economic growth and community development are highly dependent on infrastructure.

The process of continuous change in economic conditions towards a better state over a period of time is called economic growth (Maciulyte-Sniukiene & Butkus, 2022; Srinivasu et al., 2013). Economic growth is defined as the development of economic activity that results in an increase in the amount of goods and services produced by society, which ultimately results in an increase in the prosperity of society. Therefore, economic growth can be considered an indication of prosperity.

Situbondo Regency has an area of 1,638.50 km², or 163,850 ha, and is located on the north coast of the Horseshoe region of East Java, approximately 150 km from west to east. Situbondo is the capital of Situbondo Regency. Of the total sub-districts, 13 are located in coastal areas. Sumbermalang sub-district has an altitude of 100-1,223 meters above sea level, and Banyuputih sub-district has the largest area, 481.67 km². In 2019, climatic conditions recorded the highest rainfall of 3,549 millimeter in December, with 16 most frequent rainy days. Situbondo Regency is located at 7°35'-7°44' South latitude and 113°30'-114°42' East longitude.

Situbondo Regency originally had Situbondo as its capital and was known as Panarukan Regency. During the Dutch administration of Governor General Daendels, who built a forced labor road along the north coast of Java Island, the road was called "Jalan Anyer - Panarukan" or better known as "Jalan Daendels". However, during the administration of Regent Achmad Tahir (\pm 1972), the name was changed to Situbondo Regency.

Situbondo district is between 0 and 1,250 meters above sea level. Areas in the south west, such as Jatibanteng and Sumbermalang, have an average altitude. On the other hand, Bungatan sub-district is in the northern part, with its highest area at 1250 meters above sea level. Soil types in this area include alluvial, Regosol, Gleysol, Renzine, Grumosol, Mediterranean, Latosol, and Andosol. The soil texture is generally medium 96.26 percent, fine 2.75 percent,

and coarse 0.99 percent. Soil drainage is not flooded 99.42 percent, sometimes flooded 0.05 percent, and always flooded 0.53 percent. According to the way the land is used, an area of 73,407.5 ha ($4^2(0.53\%)$) always flooded.

Situbondo Regency can be divided into three regions based on their potential and geographical conditions. The northern region, located by the coast and sea, has great potential for fisheries development, including fish farming and fishing; the central region, which has a flat topography, has potential for agriculture; and the southern region, which has a sloping topography, has potential for plantations and forestry.

One of the bridges in Situbondo is the Bagor Bridge that connects two regions. These bridges are usually built to facilitate public transportation and improve accessibility. Geographical conditions and local requirements can determine the design and construction of these bridges. The functions of the Bagor Bridge include the following:

1. Connecting Regions: These bridges connect two different regions, allowing easy access to villages or towns.
2. Improves Mobility: With a bridge, the flow of vehicular and pedestrian traffic becomes smoother, making travel faster.
3. Supports the Economy: Better access can boost local businesses, such as trade and tourism.
4. Transportation Safety: A good bridge makes transportation easier.

The Bagor Bridge in Kalibagor Village, Situbondo Subdistrict, Situbondo Regency, is forty years older than planned. As a result, the East Java Provincial Bina Marga Public Works Office (DPU) plans to build or replace the bridge this year to ensure the safety, comfort and security of local residents. To replace the old Bagor Bridge, which was built of brick frames and is less than seven meters wide, a new bridge is needed that has a width that meets provincial road and bridge standards. In addition, to compensate for the load or weight of vehicles passing through, as vehicles passing through the provincial road are currently heavier.

During the replacement of the Bagor Bridge, there will be an emergency bridge called the Bailey bridge. This bridge is 45 meters long, with a vehicle track width of 4.20 meters, and an approach road length of about 35.00 meters plus 25.00 meters. The bridge has a vehicle capacity of up to 20 tons (vehicle weight and load). Based on this background, the purpose of the study is to determine the cost efficiency of the Bagor Bridge Replacement Project using the Earned Value Concept Method.

2. METHODS

Research Subject

The subject of this research is the Study of Project Time and Cost Performance Using the Value Concept on the Bagor Bridge Replacement project in Situbondo Regency.

Location and Time of Research

The research location is at the Bagor Bridge Replacement Project in Situbondo Regency in week 31.

Data Collection Procedure

Data collection in this study was carried out by:

1. Primary data includes literature studies collected and field observations.
2. Secondary data includes plan drawings, time schedules, weekly reports, monthly reports and Budget Plan Costs

Data Analysis Technique

Data analysis is the process of transforming data into information that is easy to understand and can be used to solve problems. In this study, the data analysis technique used was descriptive qualitative, namely by analyzing the data collected, then explaining the process and results of data analysis. And the analysis steps can be explained as follows:

1. Status date
2. Percentage (%) Complete
3. ACWP (Actual Cost Work Performance)
4. BCWS (Budget Cost Work Schedule)
5. BCWP (Budget Cos Work Performance)
6. CV (Cost Variance)
7. SV (Schedule Variance)
8. CPI (Cost Performance Index)
9. SPI (Schedule Performance Index)
10. ETC (Estimate to Complete)
11. EAC (Estimate at Completion)
12. VAC (Variance at Completion)

3. RESULTS

Earned Value Analysis on Project Implementation Control

Earned Value Concept is the multiplication of the percentage (%) of work completed with the total budget provided. The Earned Value Concept requires three cost indicators to analyze any deviations that occur. The three indicators are as follows:

1. BCWS (Budgeted cost of work schedule) is the budget provided for an item of work that is compiled and linked to the implementation schedule (Chen, 2008).

Example of calculating the percentage of BCWS value for week 2 in division 1 (general) with payment item number 1.17.(1k)

Percentage of Work Plan

$$\% = \frac{0,014}{0,041} \times 100\% = 34,14\%$$

Example of calculating the week 2 BCWS value in division 1 (general) with payment item number 1.17.(1k)

Plan work cost

Cost of work = 34,14% x Total price of work per item

$$= 34,14\% \times \text{Rp } 4.185.000,00 = \text{Rp } 1.428.965,11$$

Table 1. Project Cost Analysis Plan/Week (Week 1 to 10)

No. Mata Pemborongan	Uraian Pekerjaan	Satuan	Total Harga (Rp)	BOBOT	Analisa Biaya Proyek Rencana Minggu									
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
DIVISI 1. UMUM														
1.17	Pengembangan Lingkungan Hidup													
1.17.(1k)	Pengujian Parameter Kualitas Air Lainnya	Buah	4.185.000,000	0,041	1.428.965,108	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.17.(2a)	Pengujian Vibrasi Lingkungan untuk Kenyamanan dan Kesehatan	Buah	4.725.000,000	0,046	1.753.034,042	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.17.(3b)	Pengujian Parameter Udara Emisi dan Ambien Lainnya	Buah	8.100.000,000	0,079	2.653.792,339	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.17.(4)	Pengembangan Tanah													
1.20.(1)	Pengeboran, tembokan, SPPT dan Laporan	m ²	43.260.067,200	0,424	21.630.033,600	21.630.033,600	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Skt-1.1.22	Sistem Manajemen Keselamatan Konstruksi (SMK)													
Skt-1.1.22.(7b)	Rambu dan Peringatan lalu Lintas yang diperlukan atau Managemen Lalu Lintas	Kg	469.414.943,909	4,599	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DIVISI 2. DRANASE														
2.1.(1)	Galon untuk Selokan Drainase dan Saturan Air	M3	6.116.321,383	0,060	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.3.(36)	Pengedaran & Pemerasanang U-Ditch Beton 20 cm x Cover (Beton 20 Ton)	M1	120.449.281,260	1,180	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.3.(39)	Pengedaran & Pemerasanang U-Ditch Beton 20 cm x Cover (G 20 ton)	M1	18.467.541,630	0,181	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DIVISI 3. PEKERJAAN TANAH DAN GEOSINTETIK														
3.1.(1)	Galon Bahan	M3	60.898.830,134	0,597	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1.(4)	Galon Struktur dengan kedalaman 0 - 2 meter	M3	206.523.852,406	2,611	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1.(5)	Galon Struktur dengan kedalaman 0 - 3 meter	M3	10.497.470,000	0,072	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.2.(2a)	Turbinan Pilhan dari Sumber Galan	M3	416.549.894,762	4,081	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.3.(1)	Penyapuan Badan Jalan	M2	2.628.690,354	0,026	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DIVISI 4. PEKERJAAN PREVENTIF														
DIVISI 5. PERENCANAAN, PEREBUTAN DAN PERKERASAN BETON SEMEN														
5.1.(1)	Lapis Pengaruh Agenget Kelembaban	M3	155.329.752,060	1,522	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DIVISI 6. PERKERASAN ASPAL														
6.1.(1)	Lapis Ressia Pengkarat - Aspal Cair/Emuasi	Liter	10.859.147,460	0,106	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6.1.(2a)	Lapis Penetakan - Aspal Cari-Emuasi	Liter	6.486.489,000	0,067	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6.2.(1)	Lapis Penetakan - AC-Bet	Ton	171.304.231,631	1,678	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6.3.(6a)	Lastan Lapis Antara (AC-Bc)	Ton	125.983.584,424	1,234	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DIVISI 7. STRUKTUR														
7.1.(6a)	Beton struktural fcl 30 Mpa	m ³	1.150.310.400,200	11,520	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.1.(7a)	Beton struktural fcl 30 Mpa	m ³	97.497.379,450	0,955	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.1.(8)	Beton, fc 15 Mpa	m ³	53.940.852,476	0,528	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.1.(10)	Beton, fc 10 Mpa	m ³	21.666.138,778	0,212	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.3.(11)	Baja Tulangan Polst BTP 250	Kg	36.770.765,563	0,380	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.3.(12)	Baja Tulangan Polst 250	Kg	20.486.489,000	0,243	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.4.(5a)	Pemasangan Jembatan Rangka Baja yang disediakan Pengguna Jasa	Kg	513.753.696,502	5,033	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.4.(5b)	Pengangkutan Bahan Jembatan yang disediakan Pengguna Jasa	Kg	383.142.770,350	3,754	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.6.(1a)	Rang Bol Beton diameter 800 mm	m ¹	1.423.023.194,880	13,942	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.6.(1b)	Rang Bol Beton diameter 800 mm dengan uji tensi PDLT (Pile Dynamic Load Test)	Batu	1.423.023.194,880	0,177	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.6.(28)	Pengujian Keutuhan Tang dengan Pile Integrated Test (PIT)	Batu	54.131.552,540	0,530	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.5.(1)	Pasangan Batu	m ³	936.205.425,055	9,162	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.10.(3a)	Brongong dengan Kawat yang dilapis Galvanis	m ³	252.802.978,050	2,477	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.11.(1)	Brongong dengan Kawat yang dilapis Galvanis	m ²	1.054.480,000	0,027	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.14.(1)	Papan Nama Jembatan	m ²	363.871.990	0,004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.15.(1)	Pembangunan Pasangan Batu	m ³	94.452.836,432	0,925	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DIVISI 8. REHABILITASI JEMBATAN														
DIVISI 9. PEMERIKSAAN HARIAN DAN PEKERJAAN LAIN-LAIN														
9.2.(1)	Meriksa Jalan Terpercakap	M2	7.085.784,342	0,069	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9.2.(5)	Patuk Pengaruh	Buah	10.488.472,800	0,103	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9.2.(10a)	Kerb Pracetak Jenis 1 (Penghalang Berpasir/barrrier Gutter) b=30 cm	M1	24.993.902,400	0,245	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9.2.(14)	Unit Lampu Jalan Pengamanan Jalan Raya LED	Buah	87.592.795,600	0,658	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DIVISI 10. PEKERJAAN PEMELIHARAAN KINERJA														
TOTAL					-	27.243.825,086	21.630.033,600	8.165.514,889	8.165.514,889	8.165.514,889	32.968.266,363	237.493.816,823	269.506.579,341	174.182.277,108

Table 2. Project Cost Analysis Plan/Week (Week 11 to 20)

Table 3. Project Cost Analysis Plan/Week (Week 21 to 30)

2. BCWP (Budgeted Cost of Work Performance), an indicator that shows the value of the results from the point of view of the value of the work that has been completed against the budget provided (Susilowati & Kurniaji, 2020).

Example of calculating the percentage of BCWS value for week 2 in division 1 (general) with payment item number 1.17.(1k)

Percentage of Work Realization

$$\% = \frac{0,000}{0,041} \times 100\% = 0,00\%$$

Example of calculating the week 2 BCWS value in division 1 (general) with payment item number 1.17 (1k)

Realized job cost

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cost of work} &= 0,00\% \times \text{Total price of work per item} \\ &= 0,00\% \times 4.185.000,00 \\ &= \text{Rp } 0,00 \end{aligned}$$

Table 4. Realized Project Cost Analysis / Week (Week 1 to 12)

No. Mata Pembayaran	Uraian Pekerjaan	Satuan	Total Harga (Rp)	BOBOT	Analisa Biaya Projek Realisasi Minggu												
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
DIVISI 1. UMUM																	
1.17	Pengamanan Lingkungan Hidup	Buah	4.185.000,00	0,041													
1.17.(1x)	Pengujian Parameter Kualitas Air Lainnya	Buah	4.185.000,00	0,041													1.395.000,00
1.17.(2x)	Pengujian Parameter Kualitas Air dan Sistematisasi dan Kestabilan	Buah	4.185.000,00	0,041													1.395.000,00
1.17.(3x)	Pengujian Parameter Usaha Emisi dan Ambien Lainnya	Buah	8.100.000,00	0,079													2.700.000,00
1.2	Pengujian Tanah																
1.2.(1)	Pengujian Tanah SPT dan Laporan	m ³	43.260.067,200	0,424													
1.2.(2)	Rambu dan Peringatan lalu Lintas yang diperlukan atau Manajemen lalu Lintas																
1.2.(3)	DIVISI 1. UMUM																
1.2.(4)	Galian untuk Sistem Drainase dan Saluran Air	Kg	469.144.943,900	4,959													
2.1.(1)	Galian untuk Sistem Drainase dan Saluran Air	M3	6.116.321,383	0,060													
2.1.(3x)	Pengujian dan Pengamatan Tanah Dalam 0,90-1,20 cm + Cover (BG,20 Ton)	M3	120.467.541,000	1,163													
2.1.(4)	Pengujian dan Pengamatan Tanah Dalam 0,90-1,20 cm (BG,20 Ton)	M3	18.467.541,600	0,181													
2.1.(5)	DIVISI 2. PEKERJAAN TANAH DAN GEOSISTEM																
2.1.(6)	Galian struktur dengan kedalaman 0 - 2 meter	M3	266.523.852,408	2,611													
2.1.(7)	Galian perkeras Betonit	Ton	171.304.231,631	1,678													
2.1.(8)	Pembuatan Pithitan dan Sumber Galian	M3	216.549.894,762	2,031													
2.1.(9)	Pengujian Tanah																
2.1.(10)	DIVISI 2. PEKERJAAN PREVENTIF																
2.1.(11)	DIVISI 3. PERKERASAN BERPADA DAN PERKERASAN BETON SEMEN																
2.1.(12)	Lapis Pengujian Tanah	M3	155.329.752,060	1,522													
2.1.(13)	DIVISI 3. PERKERASAN ASPAL																
2.1.(14)	Lapis Rasp Pengukur - Aspal Cari Emuls	Liter	10.869.147,460	0,158													
2.1.(15)	Lapis Pengukur - Aspal Cari Emuls	Liter	6.847.737,810	0,067													
2.1.(16)	Lastan Lapis Aus (AC-WC)	Ton	171.304.231,631	1,678													
2.1.(17)	Lastan Lapis Antara (AC-BC)	Ton	125.963.584,424	1,234													
2.1.(18)	DIVISI 4. PERKERASAN BETON SEMEN																
2.1.(19)	Beton struktural fc 30 MPa	m ³	1.155.393.463,266	11,320													
2.1.(20)	Beton struktural fc 20 MPa	m ³	97.407.279,459	0,955													
2.1.(21)	Beton struktural fc 10 MPa	m ³	53.940.652,476	0,525													
2.1.(22)	Batu Tahan Potok BTG-260	Kg	21.966.138,778	0,212													
2.1.(23)	Batu Tahan Potok BTG-260A	Kg	38.776.769,593	0,380													
2.1.(24)	Pembangunan Jembatan Rangka Baja yang disediakan Pengguna Jasa	Kg	513.753.096,502	5,033													
2.1.(25)	Pengangkutan Bahan Jembatan yang disediakan Pengguna Jasa	Kg	383.142.770,350	3,754													
2.1.(26)	Pengangkutan Bahan Jembatan yang disediakan Pengguna Jasa	Buah	1.268.351,150	0,151													
2.1.(27)	Pengujian Penimbangan Jembatan Jenis PSLT (Pile Dynamic Load Test)	Buah	18.043.851,190	0,177													
2.1.(28)	Pengujian Kelelahan Tang dengan Pile Integrated Test (PIT)	Buah	50.131.553,540	0,530													
2.1.(29)	Pengujian Kelelahan Tang dengan Pile Integrated Test (PIT)	m ³	252.852.079,050	2,477													
2.1.(30)	Bongkongan Kawat yang dipasang Galvanis	m ²	1.054.054.053,600	10,327													
2.1.(31)	Sandaran (Dekoratif)	m ²	1.054.054.053,600	0,024													
2.1.(32)	Pembangunan Risanan Satu	m ³	94.452.835,432	0,925													
2.1.(33)	DIVISI 6. REHABILITASI JEMBATAN																
2.1.(34)	DIVISI 7. STRUKTUR																
2.1.(35)	DIVISI 8. REHABILITASI JEMBATAN																
2.1.(36)	DIVISI 9. PEKERJAAN HARIAN DAN PEKERJAAN LAIN-LAIN																
2.1.(37)	Marka Jalan Terpasang	M2	7.085.784,342	0,069													
2.1.(38)	Patuk Pengarah	Buah	10.488.472,800	0,103													
2.1.(39)	Kerobokan Jalan 5 (Penghalang Banjir Samar) Dalam 0,90-1,20 cm (BG,20 Ton)	M1	24.993.902,400	0,245													
2.1.(40)	Untuk Lampu Pencahayaan Jalan Lengang Tinggi, Tipe LED	Buah	87.592.975,800	0,858													
2.1.(41)	DIVISI 10. PEKERJAAN PEMELIHARAAN KERINJA																
2.1.(42)	TOTAL		-	15.412.409,352	22.847.857,848	-	-	5.670.000,000	9.594.479,994	50.524.121,373	268.919.879,955	136.262.629,763	625.376.278,280	42.852.491,676	383.142.770,350		

Table 5. Realized Project Cost Analysis / Week (Week 13 to 24)

No. Mata Pembayaran	Uraian Pekerjaan	Satuan	Total Harga (Rp)	BOBOT	Analisa Biaya Projek Realisasi Minggu												
					13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
DIVISI 1. UMUM																	
1.17	Pengamanan Lingkungan Hidup	Buah	4.185.000,00	0,041													
1.17.(1x)	Pengujian Parameter Kualitas Air Lainnya	Buah	4.185.000,00	0,041													1.395.000,00
1.17.(2x)	Pengujian dan Pemantauan Tanah Dalam 0,90-1,20 cm + Cover (BG,20 Ton)	M1	120.467.541,000	1,163													1.395.000,00
1.17.(3x)	Pengujian dan Pemantauan Tanah Dalam 0,90-1,20 cm (BG,20 Ton)	M1	18.467.541,600	0,181													3.700.000,00
1.2	Pengujian Tanah																
1.2.(1)	Pengujian Tanah SPT dan Laporan	m ³	43.260.067,200	0,424													
1.2.(2)	Rambu dan Peringatan lalu Lintas yang diperlukan atau Manajemen lalu Lintas	Kg	469.144.943,900	4,959													
1.2.(3)	DIVISI 2. DRAINASE																
2.1.(1)	Galian untuk Sistem Drainase dan Saluran Air	M3	6.116.321,383	0,060													
2.1.(3x)	Pengujian dan Pengamatan Tanah Dalam 0,90-1,20 cm + Cover (BG,20 Ton)	M1	120.467.541,000	1,163													
2.1.(4)	Pengujian dan Pengamatan Tanah Dalam 0,90-1,20 cm (BG,20 Ton)	M1	18.467.541,600	0,181													
2.1.(5)	DIVISI 3. PEKERJAAN TANAH DAN GEOSISTEM																
2.1.(6)	Galian struktur dengan kedalaman 0 - 2 meter	M3	266.523.852,408	2,611													
2.1.(7)	Galian struktur dengan kedalaman 0 - 2 meter	M3	18.467.541,600	0,182													
2.1.(8)	Galian perkeras Betonit	Ton	171.304.231,631	1,678													
2.1.(9)	Pembuatan Badan Jalan	M2	2.628.690.354	0,028													
2.1.(10)	DIVISI 4. PERKERASAN PREVENTIF																
2.1.(11)	DIVISI 5. PERKERASAN BERPADA DAN PERKERASAN BETON SEMEN																
2.1.(12)	Lapis Pengujian Tanah	M3	155.329.752,060	1,522													
2.1.(13)	DIVISI 6. REHABILITASI JEMBATAN																
2.1.(14)	DIVISI 7. STRUKTUR																
2.1.(15)	Beton struktural fc 30 MPa	m ³	1.155.393.463,266	11,321	13.881.275.311												
2.1.(16)	Beton struktural fc 20 MPa	m ³	97.407.279,459	0,965	2.347.585.530	4.388.964.253	3.368.274.492	1.531.034.042									
2.1.(17)	Beton struktural fc 10 MPa	m ³	53.940.652,476	0,568													
2.1.(18)	Batu Tahan Potok BTG-280	Kg	38.776.769,593	0,380	5.817.329.368	5.817.329.368	4.082.757.444	1.837.240.850									
2.1.(19)	Batu Tahan Potok BTG-280A	Kg	2.087.465.472,272	2,042	4.593.102.125	6.430.342.97											

4. Calculating SV (Schedule Variance) and CV (Cost Variance)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SV} &= \text{BCWP} - \text{BCWS} \\ &= 15.412.409,352 - 27.243.825,086 \\ &= -\text{Rp } 11.831.415,73 \\ \text{CV} &= \text{BCWP} - \text{ACWP} \\ &= 15.412.409,352 - 15.412.409,352 \\ &= \text{Rp } 0 \end{aligned}$$

In the same way for the calculation of other jobs, for week three and so on can be seen in the following table.

Table 6. Cost Variant and Schedule Variant Analysis

Minggu ke-	Analisa Konsep Hasil						Varian	
	BCWS	Kumulatif	BCWP	Kumulatif	ACWP	Kumulatif	SV	CV
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	27,243,825,09	27,243,825,09	15,412,409,35	15,412,409,35	15,412,409,35	15,412,409,35	-11,831,415,73	-
3	21,630,033,60	48,873,858,69	27,847,657,85	43,260,067,20	27,847,657,85	43,260,067,20	6,217,624,25	-
4	8,165,514,89	57,039,373,57	-	43,260,067,20	-	43,260,067,20	8,165,514,89	-
5	8,165,514,89	65,204,888,46	5,670,000,00	48,930,067,20	5,670,000,00	48,930,067,20	-2,495,514,89	-
6	8,165,514,89	73,370,403,35	9,594,479,99	58,524,547,19	10,835,000,00	59,765,067,20	1,428,965,11	-1,240,520,01
7	32,968,266,36	106,338,669,71	50,524,123,37	109,048,670,57	49,235,921,00	109,000,988,20	17,555,857,01	1,288,202,37
8	237,493,816,82	343,832,486,54	268,979,870,95	378,028,541,52	256,739,022,00	365,740,010,20	31,486,054,13	12,240,848,95
9	260,506,579,34	604,339,065,88	136,262,029,70	514,290,571,23	140,432,098,00	506,172,108,20	-124,244,549,64	-4,170,068,30
10	174,182,277,11	778,521,342,99	625,376,278,28	1,139,666,849,51	620,432,901,00	1,126,605,009,20	451,194,001,17	4,943,377,28
11	164,770,020,25	943,291,363,23	42,052,401,68	1,181,719,251,18	42,345,091,00	1,168,950,100,20	-122,717,618,57	-292,689,32
12	196,525,938,07	1,139,817,301,30	383,142,770,35	1,564,862,021,53	380,231,776,00	1,549,181,876,20	186,616,832,28	2,910,994,35
13	234,594,041,11	1,374,411,342,41	216,590,282,42	1,781,452,303,95	230,785,934,00	1,779,967,810,20	-18,003,758,69	-14,195,651,58
14	272,783,009,88	1,647,194,352,29	698,559,798,72	2,480,012,102,67	692,558,656,00	2,472,526,466,20	425,776,788,84	6,001,142,72
15	372,093,479,78	2,019,287,832,07	862,176,303,30	3,342,188,405,97	853,189,303,00	3,325,715,769,20	490,082,823,51	8,987,000,30
16	504,578,958,85	2,523,866,790,92	229,633,193,91	3,571,821,599,88	210,874,332,00	3,536,590,101,20	-274,945,764,94	18,758,861,91
17	615,991,996,72	3,139,858,787,64	26,537,923,39	3,598,359,523,27	35,098,721,00	3,571,688,822,20	-589,454,073,33	8,560,797,61
18	661,145,782,22	3,801,004,569,86	146,175,383,40	3,744,534,906,67	140,162,383,00	3,711,851,205,20	-514,970,398,83	6,013,000,40
19	672,083,762,77	4,473,088,332,63	910,965,254,76	4,655,500,161,43	912,978,254,00	4,624,829,459,20	-238,881,491,99	-2,012,999,24
20	734,130,664,28	5,207,218,996,91	199,953,045,83	4,855,453,207,26	180,940,045,83	4,805,769,505,03	-534,177,618,44	19,013,000,00
21	698,042,961,92	5,905,261,958,82	626,192,923,02	5,481,646,130,28	596,205,923,00	5,401,975,428,03	-71,850,038,90	29,987,000,02
22	578,801,332,69	6,484,063,291,51	596,226,724,16	6,077,872,854,44	620,786,931,00	6,022,762,359,03	-17,425,391,47	-24,560,206,84
23	765,934,226,95	7,249,997,518,46	770,887,206,79	6,848,760,061,22	791,996,827,00	6,814,759,186,03	4,952,979,84	-21,109,620,21
24	460,124,919,00	7,710,122,437,47	410,317,123,15	7,259,077,184,38	400,304,137,00	7,215,063,323,03	-49,807,795,85	10,012,986,15

5. Calculating CPI (Cost Performance Index) and SPI (Schedule Performance Index)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CPI} &= \text{BCWP}/\text{ACWP} \\ &= 15.412.409,352 / 27.243.825,086 \\ &= 0,566 \\ \text{SPI} &= \text{BCWP}/\text{BCWS} \\ &= 15.412.409,352 / 15.412.409,352 \\ &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

In the same way, the calculation of work in week three and so on can be seen in the following table.

Table 7. Analysis of Cost Performance Index (CPI) and Schedule Performance Index (SPI)

Minggu ke-	Analisa Konsep Hasil						Varian	
	BCWS	Kumulatif	BCWP	Kumulatif	ACWP	Kumulatif	SPI	CPI
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	27,243,825.09	27,243,825.09	15,412,409.35	15,412,409.35	15,412,409.35	15,412,409.35	0.566	1.000
3	21,630,033.60	48,873,858.69	27,847,657.85	43,260,067.20	27,847,657.85	43,260,067.20	1.287	1.000
4	8,165,514.89	57,039,373.57	-	43,260,067.20	-	43,260,067.20	0.000	-
5	8,165,514.89	65,204,888.46	5,670,000.00	48,930,067.20	5,670,000.00	48,930,067.20	0.694	1.000
6	8,165,514.89	73,370,403.35	9,594,479.99	58,524,547.19	10,835,000.00	59,765,067.20	1.175	0.886
7	32,968,266.36	106,338,669.71	50,524,123.37	109,048,670.57	49,235,921.00	109,000,988.20	1.533	1.026
8	237,493,816.82	343,832,486.54	268,979,870.95	378,028,541.52	256,739,022.00	365,740,010.20	1.133	1.048
9	260,506,579.34	604,339,065.88	136,262,029.70	514,290,571.23	140,432,098.00	506,172,108.20	0.523	0.970
10	174,182,277.11	778,521,342.99	625,376,278.28	1,139,666,849.51	620,432,901.00	1,126,605,009.20	3.590	1.008
11	164,770,020.25	943,291,363.23	42,052,401.68	1,181,719,251.18	42,345,091.00	1,168,950,100.20	0.255	0.993
12	196,525,938.07	1,139,817,301.30	383,142,770.35	1,564,862,021.53	380,231,776.00	1,549,181,876.20	1.950	1.008
13	234,594,041.11	1,374,411,342.41	216,590,282.42	1,781,452,303.95	230,785,934.00	1,779,967,810.20	0.923	0.938
14	272,783,009.88	1,647,194,352.29	698,559,798.72	2,480,012,102.67	692,558,656.00	2,472,526,466.20	2.561	1.009
15	372,093,479.78	2,019,287,832.07	862,176,303.30	3,342,188,405.97	853,189,303.00	3,325,715,769.20	2.317	1.011
16	504,578,958.85	2,523,866,790.92	229,633,193.91	3,571,821,599.88	210,874,332.00	3,536,590,101.20	0.455	1.089
17	615,991,996.72	3,139,858,787.64	26,537,923.39	3,598,359,523.27	35,098,721.00	3,571,688,822.20	0.043	0.756
18	661,145,782.22	3,801,004,569.86	146,175,383.40	3,744,534,906.67	140,162,383.00	3,711,851,205.20	0.221	1.043
19	672,083,762.77	4,473,088,332.63	910,965,254.76	4,655,500,161.43	912,978,254.00	4,624,829,459.20	1.355	0.998
20	734,130,664.28	5,207,218,996.91	199,953,045.83	4,855,453,207.26	180,940,045.83	4,805,769,505.03	0.272	1.105
21	698,042,961.92	5,905,261,958.82	626,192,923.02	5,481,646,130.28	596,205,923.00	5,401,975,428.03	0.897	1.050
22	578,801,332.69	6,484,063,291.51	596,226,724.16	6,077,872,854.44	620,786,931.00	6,022,762,359.03	1.030	0.960
23	765,934,226.95	7,249,997,518.46	770,887,206.79	6,848,760,061.22	791,996,827.00	6,814,759,186.03	1.006	0.973
24	460,124,919.00	7,710,122,437.47	410,317,123.15	7,259,077,184.38	400,304,137.00	7,215,063,323.03	0.892	1.025

Cost Control Effectiveness Analysis

In analyzing the effectiveness of control, be it time or cost, you must pay attention to the project from the beginning so that there is no cost overrun and delay in project implementation. The parameters that need to be considered for cost control effectiveness are parameters that can affect quality and effectiveness related to good cost control. The better the control, the higher the quality and effectiveness of a project. To determine the scoring of the parameters of control effectiveness can be calculated:

1. Cost Parameter Analysis

From the Cost-Performance Index (CPI) table, the following results are obtained:

- Amount of data = 24 weeks
- Result > 1 = 14 weeks
- Result < 1 = 10 weeks
- Expected score = 0,90

Cost-effectiveness is obtained $= \frac{14}{10} = 1,4$
 $= 1,4 \times 0,9 = 1,26$

Control Effectiveness	Parameter	Score
Cost	Difference between plan and actual cost	1,260

The score results from the above parameters to determine the value of the effectiveness of project cost and time control:

- Parameter results for costs have a score of 1.26, meaning that the costs incurred are greater than the budget.

The relationship between the two cost and time parameters above is that the work is faster at a cost greater than the budget.

- a. Effectiveness < 1 : Less Effective
- b. Effectiveness = 1 : Effective
- c. Effectiveness > 1 : Very Effective

Therefore, the parameter results above can be calculated using the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Effectiveness} &= \frac{\text{Expected results} - \text{Worst result}}{\text{Best result} - \text{Worst Result}} \\ &= \frac{0,9 - 0,1}{1,26 - 0,761} \\ &= 1,603\end{aligned}$$

From the above calculations, an effectiveness value of 1.603 is obtained for controlling project costs and time using the Earned Value method. In other words, the effectiveness value is greater than 1 (one), so controlling the Bagor Bridge Replacement project in Situbondo Regency is very effective using the Earned Value method.

4. CONCLUSION

The cost performance of project implementation from weeks 6, 9, 11, 13, 17, 19, 22, 23 incurs costs greater than the plan cost, this is indicated by the Cost Variance (CV) indicator with a negative value. Whereas in weeks 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24 incurred costs less than the plan cost, this is indicated by a positive Cost Variance (CV) indicator. The value of effectiveness and efficiency in this project is 1.603 for controlling project costs and time using the Earned Value method. In other words, the effectiveness value is less than 1 (one), so controlling the Bagor Bridge Replacement project in Situbondo Regency is very effective using the Earned Value method.

REFERENCES

- Chen, P. H. (2008). Integration of cost and schedule using extensive matrix method and spreadsheets. *Automation in Construction*, 18(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2008.04.009>
- Maciulyte-Sniukiene, A., & Butkus, M. (2022). Does infrastructure development contribute to EU countries' economic growth? *Sustainability*, 14(9). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14095610>
- Marpaung, G. N., Soesilowati, E., Rahman, Y. A., Pangestu, Y. A. G., & Wicaksana, T. (2021). Socioeconomy conditions after the development of toll roads in Salatiga. *Economics Development Analysis Journal*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.15294/edaj.v10i1.40966>

Pangemanan, D., Latief, R. U., & Hamzah, S. (2022). Sustainable construction framework model on development of Likupang special economic zone. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1117(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1117/1/012011>

Rahadian, D., Koespiadi, K., & Oetomo, W. (2024). Performance analysis of supervisory consultants on projects in the housing and settlement areas of East Java province. *International Journal on Advanced Technology, Engineering, and Information System*, 2(3), 222–232. <https://doi.org/10.55047/ijateis.v2i3.1015>

Sinaga, A. A. P. (2022). Poverty perspectives and reduction strategies in Indonesia. *Three Seas Economic Journal*, 3(3). <https://doi.org/10.30525/2661-5150/2022-3-1>

Siswanto, E., & Hidayati, D. (2020). Management indicators of good infrastructure facilities to improve school quality. *International Journal of Educational Management and Innovation*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.12928/ijemi.v1i1.1516>

Srinivasu, B., Professor, A., & Srinivasa Rao, P. (2013). Infrastructure development and economic growth: Prospects and perspective. *Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research*, 2(1).

Susilowati, F., & Kurniaji, W. M. (2020). Effective performance evaluation to estimate cost and time using earned value. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 771(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/771/1/012055>

Utkarsh, K., Ding, F., Jin, X., Blonsky, M., Padullaparti, H., & Balamurugan, S. P. (2022). A network-aware distributed energy resource aggregation framework for flexible, cost-optimal, and resilient operation. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSG.2021.3124198>